

**A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
TR010062**

**4.4 Consultation Report
Annex N Tables evidencing regard
had to consultation responses**

APFP Regulations 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

**Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

Volume 4

June 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009**

A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
Development Consent Order 202x

**4.4 CONSULTATION REPORT
ANNEX N TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD HAD TO
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010062
Application Document Reference	4.4
Author:	A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	13 June 2022	DCO Application

CONTENTS

M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank

Penrith to Temple Sowerby

Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Kirkby Thore

Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Crackenthorpe

Appleby to Brough

Bowes Bypass

Cross Lanes to Rokeby

Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor

A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner

Dualling the remaining sections

Comments on the Consultation

General Project comments

Community Impact

Construction

Economics

Engineering Design and Development

Environmental

Land

Need Case

No Reason Given

Request For Further Information

Traffic, Transport and Junctions

Walking, Cycling and Horse-riders

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'M6 J40 to Kemplay Bank – Environment' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
616	151462, 153901		148623, 152262	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing support for the proposed measures to mitigate potential noise pollution, with specific reference to the underpass at Kemplay Bank and acoustic barrier at Wetheriggs Park.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project. The impacts of the Project on noise, and proposed mitigation, are reported in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).	No
139		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that landscape and visual impacts have been appropriately identified and that the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate.	National Highways welcomes the positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report . The full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is reported in the Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
190	148698	Eden District Council	152262	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents suggesting measures to reduce the environmental impact of traffic noise levels by using acoustic barriers and low noise road surfaces to reduce traffic noise levels, specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore Primary School and the stretch of road between the A66 and Clifford Road.	A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the EIA for construction and operation of the Project and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Mitigation measures have been designed into the Project to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise. In the vicinity of the Kirkby Thore school, the mainline is in a deep cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore and earth bunds have	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>been embedded into the design to screen noise emissions from the new road. No adverse likely significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore School are identified.</p> <p>The noise and vibration assessment (ES Chapter 12) has not identified adverse significant effects upon the properties located alongside Clifford Road (north of M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank scheme, immediately north of Wetheriggs park), arising from the operation of the Project. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are proposed.</p>	
527		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats	<p>Respondents suggesting that following the PEI Report, further relevant information be gathered from the Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre, and through engagement with the Penrith and District Red Squirrel Group. Also, respondents suggest that the impact on designated species in the River Eden SAC needs to be mitigated.</p>	<p>The feedback regarding additional contact information to inform the ES is welcomed and noted. The Project team have consulted the Red Squirrel officer at Whinfell and have also subsequently consulted with the Penrith and District Red Squirrel Group. The Project team has also contacted the Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre to request biological records within the relevant Zone of Influence surrounding the Project. This has been used to inform the desk study review of baseline data within the ES.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential impacts, as a result of the Project, on European designated sites, including the River Eden SAC is provided within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Document 3.2) and the accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5 Stage 1 Screening and Application Document 3.6 Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment). Section 6.10 of the ES Chapter details several embedded mitigation measures which will be implemented which result in non-significant effects on the River Eden SAC and River Eden and Tributaries SSSI. Annex C1 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out a Method Statement for Working in and near SAC. This sets out the methods to be employed during any works within or near to any SAC and describe how the key environmental controls will be implemented. This method statement will be further developed by the Principal Contractor.	
147		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents suggesting the addition of further viewpoints to the PEI Report including the A66 looking east and approaching junction 40 of the M6, representative of users of the local road network, the modification of Viewpoint 1.1 Clifford Road to face south or south- west rather than west and the view from the Eamont Bridge area.	ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2), has used representative viewpoints to convey the visual context of the study area and likely views of the Project. The viewpoints have been agreed with the Technical Working Group and represent a range of close, middle and long-distance views from varying receptor groups, including residents, recreational users, motorists and tourists.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Each viewpoint has been photographed with a 360 degree panoramic allowing the flexibility of focusing the view where needed.</p> <p>Comments in regards the inclusion of views from the existing A66 users are noted. Views from the existing A66 are illustrated in the Project Design Report (Document Reference 2.3) highlighting the impact on road users. Due to safety considerations, it is not possible to obtain verifiable photography from a live carriageway. Viewpoint 2.4 within the ES is representative of views from Eamont Bridge.</p>	
801	148594, 149367, 150182, 153365, 153387, 153797, 153839, 153840, 153871, 153965, 154194		152214	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of emissions associated with the scheme on the environment. Respondents say that an increase in traffic would lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions and would therefore be contrary to climate change commitments.</p>	<p>The DCO Application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)).</p> <p>National Highways is required under law (the EIA Regulations) and policy (the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects.</p> <p>The assessment is based upon traffic modelling information for the road network in operation set out in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes no likely significant effect, as the DMRB LA 114 states: "assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in GHG emissions will have a material impact</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets".</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to be net zero in construction. The Climate assessment, presented in ES Chapter 7, however, assesses the potential carbon benefits of proposed Biodiversity mitigation, which may result in the sequestration of carbon.</p>	
1043		Dacre Parish Council	151517, 152261	Environment - Road drainage and water environment and Needs Case	<p>Respondents expressing general concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, including: disruption from the construction of the flooding attenuation pond and drain at Skirsgill Estate, the potential for waste to be dumped in a lay-by and the possible negative impacts of the scheme on rural areas.</p>	<p>A full EIA of the Project is included in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4). This considers the potential impact of the Project on the environment during construction and includes consideration of the construction of flood attenuation ponds and Project drainage within this location.</p> <p>National Highways has also produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) which includes construction mitigation. A flood risk assessment and outline drainage design are also included</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>within Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4). Water quality impacts as a result of the Project are considered within Appendix 14.3: Water Quality Assessment (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4). No likely significant adverse effects are predicted to the receiving water environment.</p> <p>Laybys have been provided on the dual carriageway for short duration stops at intervals that satisfy the requirements of National Highways. The responsibility for litter collection/fly tipping restrictions for this section of the A66 sits with Cumbria County Council.</p> <p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. Details on the landscape and visual assessment and the effect of the Project on the visual amenity of receptors can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
727	154460	Penrith Town Council	148586, 149774,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents expressing a general concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
			152214, 152261, 153350	Noise	specific reference to the potential increased noise levels during construction and operational phases.	reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has also produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	
69		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern in regards the impact the scheme will have on wildlife habitats and conservation areas.</p> <p>i) One respondent states that the Lowther Bridge Site of Invertebrate Significance (SIS) and the Eamont Bridge/Banks of River Eamont Sites of Invertebrate Significance are within the River Eden and Tributaries SSSI and need full consideration due to nationally important river shingles and sandbanks.</p> <p>ii) Other respondents express concern</p>	i) Since the presentation of preliminary biodiversity information within the PEI Report, further work such as field surveys have been completed and the Project design has undergone refinement. A full EIA of the Project is included in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4). ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of significant impacts on ecological receptors (which includes Lowther Bridge SIS, Eamont Bridge/Banks of River Eamont SIS and the River Eden	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>with plans for planting single species woodland adjacent to Gillian Way Business Park, saying that this is inappropriate on grounds of lack of biodiversity, lack of adaptability to climate change and visual divergence from surrounding woodland.</p> <p>iii) Finally, one respondent is concerned about habitat fragmentation of the River Eden SAC at the M6 junction to Kemplay Bank and the Penrith to Sowerby sections of the scheme.</p>	<p>and Tributaries SSSI and the River Eden SAC) and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. It has been noted that the Lowther Bridge SIS and Eamont Bridge/Banks of River Eamont SIS are located within the River Eden and Tributaries SSSI and therefore the nationally important river shingles and sandbanks are considered of National Value within the assessment presented within the ES.</p> <p>ii) The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting measures, are set out in ES Chapter 6 and an indication of how they could be implemented within Order Limits is provided within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). These measures have been developed in more detail since the PEI Report and are secured through implementation of the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The Project does not propose to plant a single species woodland adjacent to Gillian Way Business Park. Planting is considered in the context of ecological mitigation, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions. The restoration</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and creation of habitats and landscaping measures considers resilience to climate change to ensure the mitigation remains effective throughout operation.</p> <p>iii) The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape/ecological features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as species-specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts, creating new areas of habitat and restoring/enhancing linkages to adjacent locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable/sensitive and protected species. These measures are secured through the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Further detail is provided on the anticipated impacts (including habitat fragmentation) associated with the River Eden SAC within the ES and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Document 3.5 and 3.6).	
614	153901			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that reducing traffic congestion would improve air quality, even with increased traffic volumes.	National Highways acknowledges support for the Project.	No
539		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Air quality	The Councils suggesting that further monitoring of air quality is needed after the PEI Report. They suggest that National Highways conduct monitoring of NO ₂ and particulates in the Penrith area on the grounds that initial models of the future concentration of pollutants exceeded limits. Respondents suggest that residential areas near the carriageway also require further monitoring and that an action plan for air quality should be published prior to construction of the scheme.	Since PEI Report submission, baseline air quality monitoring, including NO ₂ , has been carried out at 16 locations across the Affected Road Network (ARN). A proportionate, risk-based approach has been used in selecting baseline air quality monitoring locations and includes undertaking measurements at locations where the preliminary assessment indicated the potential for significant effects. One monitoring location is situated at the junction of Clifford Road and the A592 in Penrith. Baseline monitoring results are set out within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). NO ₂ monitoring has been carried out following Defra's Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16). Monitoring of PM10 and PM2.5 was considered necessary as not considered likely to exceed the relevant the Air Quality Objectives (AQO). As no likely significant effects are identified in-line with DMRB LA105, the preparation of a Project Air Quality Action Plan (PAQAP) is not considered	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						necessary.	
728	153815, 153965, 154460		148586, 152214, 152261	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular the potential for a deterioration in air quality in the local area.	<p>The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Since PEI Report submission, baseline air quality monitoring has been carried out at 16 locations across the Affected Road Network (ARN). Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, are based on guidance in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has also been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p>	No
41		Cumbria		PEI Report -	Respondents expressing concern,	Further investigation supported by	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council Eden District Council		Air quality	based on information contained in the PEI Report, that Penrith air pollution levels are likely to be high. Respondents are concerned specifically with construction dust and operational phase impacts, adding that construction compounds are located near homes. They note that the PEI Report does not include identified receptors presented on scheme drawings, particularly for the M6 J40 Penrith scheme.	<p>monitoring has been carried out since the PEI Report and is reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). The assessment is reported both routewide and on a localised geographic scheme-by-scheme basis. Sensitive human receptors identified include those located in the settlements of Penrith, Kirkby Thore, Warcop, Bowes, West Layton and others along the route of the Project.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridge (DMRB) LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities, for both construction and operation stages, have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan, with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p> <p>The PEI Report was a preliminary</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						assessment and did not specifically identify the receptors within scheme drawings however it is confirmed that these receptors were considered. Sensitive (human and designated ecological sites) receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) are identified following the DMRB LA 105 guidance and shown on the Project drawings presented in the ES and include properties around M6 J40 and Penrith specifically.	
1104		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent stating that the PEI Report identifies little of cultural heritage interest within the scheme boundary. Respondent notes that it is presented that there are no likely significant effects on cultural heritage resources anticipated during construction or operation of the scheme, although temporary impacts on the Grade II* listed Carleton Hall during the construction phase are predicted. Respondent suggests further work is done to explore whether it would be possible to mitigate these impacts.	We have welcomed the further engagement on the matter of Carleton Hall with Historic England. It has been identified that there will not be any physical effects on the listed building. Additionally, no operational impacts of significance are predicted. Any temporary impacts will be minor and construction of this scheme will be largely within the bounds of the existing carriageway. Therefore because of the limited extent of the works, setting impacts will be of limited duration and not significant. Impacts and proposed mitigation are included in the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy (An appendix to the EMP, Application Document 2.7).	No
204	153901		162159	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural	A respondent expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with specific reference to the cultural heritage sites of Penrith	The PEI Report presented a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project on the historic environment. Detailed setting	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				heritage	town centre and the parks at Skirsgill Park.	assessments have been carried out to inform the ES. The impacts of the Project on the historic environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). No significant effect is identified in regards Penrith town centre or the parks within Skirsgill Park.	
1103		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing concern that the underpass beneath Kemplay Bank roundabout has potential to impact upon any surviving archaeological remains in this area. Respondents note that while it is assumed that they will already have been impacted by the construction of the existing roundabout, further work may be required to confirm that this is the case.	The ability to carry out investigation works prior to the DCO has been constrained by the live carriageway and the dense tree coverage of the roundabout. The Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy (an annex to the EMP, Application Document 2.7), sets out how further investigation and recording of any archaeological remains will be carried out.	No
617	151462, 153901		148623	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that the Kemplay Bank underpass will reduce the scheme's visual impact and that the proposed measures will restore the landscape.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project. The visual impacts of the Project are reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No
273	151347	Cumbria County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents suggesting use of design features appropriate for the surrounding ecology and community, for example incorporation of Herdwick sheep imagery.	In designing the Project, National Highways has recognised and reflected on the key characteristics of the landscape. The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and surrounding ecology, with the careful location and sensitive	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials including reclaimed stone where appropriate.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) and in indication of how mitigation could be delivered within Order Limits is provided within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall landscape design principles.</p> <p>Opportunities for further engagement and inputs to the design of the Project will be available at the detailed design stage, when National Highways and its Principal Contractor will engage and consult with local authorities, local communities and other stakeholders to finalise the Project for construction. This could for example involve local design competitions and submissions from school children.</p> <p>Refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for further information on how the Project seeks to deliver social value, through increasing the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the people impacted by the Project engaging</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						with school and college pupils.	
1163		Lake District National Park Authority		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents express concern in regards the lack of planting along the southern side of the M6-Kemplay Bank section and the impact of the large embankment between the two roundabouts.	Planting along the section from M6 to Kemplay Bank will provide a balance between replacing lost screen planting and retaining important views that add to the driver experience. Viewpoints assessed from Skirsgill Land and Mayburgh Henge show that the visual amenity of receptors to the south of the scheme are not significantly affected. The full assessment can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No
1164		Lake District National Park Authority		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents express concern in regards impacts upon longer views from the National Park.	The landscape and visual assessment ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) has scoped out significant effects on the National Park, as due to distance, intervening features and topography there is no change to the view or to the landscape character perceived from the National Park.	No
1165	149772, 152219, 153797, 153965		152214	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with specific reference to the potential impact on the visual appearance of the landscape, including local parkland, green spaces and cycle paths and tourism. Respondents also express concern in regards light pollution.	The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. Details on the landscape and visual assessment and the effect of the Project on the visual amenity of receptors can be found within ES	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The Project includes replacement lighting at the M6 junction, Bowes and at Scotch Corner however the rest of the Project is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Replacement lighting will use modern light fittings, reducing light spill which will reduce the light pollution currently experienced.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the Project on community assets; walkers, cyclists and horse riders; and human health outcomes including with regard to air quality, noise and open space. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p>	
1166	153384			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondent expressing concern in regards the visual impact of the plans to construct Carton Hall underpass as a cutting with 2 bridges and the removal of the green space that is currently in the centre of the roundabout.	This location has been considered in the landscape and visual assessment in ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) which details mitigation measures including replacement planting. A photomontage is also provided of this location to aid the understanding of potential scheme impacts. The photomontage demonstrates that replacement planting will be effective in mitigating any negative impacts in this area.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1168	152230			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondent querying whether earthworks will be "greened".	To mitigate the visual impact the route includes significant landscape earthworks in the form of false cuttings. These landscape earthworks will act to provide visual screening and noise reduction. ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8), set out how mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits and the potential landscaping proposals for embankment areas.	No
1169			149355	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern in regards cutting back an embankment leading to the de-stabilising of the root system on the existing embankment top and trees located on the slope.	A second iteration of the EMP will be prepared pre-construction and will include all required mitigation measures in order to comply with relevant ecological and environmental legislation and good practice. This will include all measures required to ensure the protection (including root zones) of existing woodlands and trees to be retained within the Order Limits during construction. Outline measures to be developed for the second iteration are presented within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) submitted as part of the DCO application.	No
1170			151517, 162159	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern with regard to the impact on parkland located to the east of Skirsgill Park between the River Eamont and the existing M6 Motorway.	The scheme proposes that a replacement bund is provided with screen planting along the northern boundary of the parkland. The area of parkland impacted is minimal as the proposed bund and planting would	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						overlay the existing shelter belt which is reshaped under the scheme proposals and reinstated. For further details of how planting could be implemented within Order Limits, refer to ES Application Document 2.8, Environmental Mitigation Maps.	
203	148611, 153797, 153901, 154460	Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner	152214	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with specific reference to:</p> <p>i) the potential impact on the visual appearance of the landscape, including local parkland, green spaces and light pollution.</p> <p>ii) cycle paths and tourism.</p>	<p>i) The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>Details on the landscape and visual assessment and the effect of the Project on the visual amenity of receptors can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The Project includes replacement lighting at the M6 junction, Bowes and at Scotch Corner however the rest of the Project is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Replacement lighting will use modern light fittings, reducing light spill which will reduce the light pollution currently experienced.</p> <p>ii) ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the Project on community assets; walkers, cyclists and horse riders; and human health outcomes</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						including with regard to air quality, noise and open space. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.	
953	150169, 153337			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents suggesting measures to reduce the potential environmental impact of the scheme by including provisions to protect wildlife such as deer crossing the road. Respondent suggestions include ledges under bridges for otters, and light deflectors to dissuade animals from attempting to cross the road.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of the effects of the Project on biodiversity receptors, as well as setting out details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Measures including otter ledges/fences and light deflection screens will be included to avoid potentially significant impacts on mammal populations as a result of the Project. No adverse impacts on deer as a result of the Project have been identified in the ES. Therefore, mitigation relating to deer, including provision of deer crossing points, is not deemed to be required.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
952	150184, 152230, 153384, 153797, 153965		152214	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern about the potential negative environmental impact on wildlife and their habitats, with specific reference to the loss of habitat in the centre of the Kemplay Bank roundabout and near to Wetheriggs Estate. Respondents also say that numerous SACs and SSSIs will be affected by the scheme.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5 and Application Document 3.6) provides a full impact assessment of the effects of the Project on biodiversity receptors and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project. This includes a full impact assessment on all European (including SACs) and Nationally (including SSSIs) designated sites located within the agreed study areas/Zone of Influence surrounding the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors and habitats where practicable. This includes avoiding the loss of semi-natural habitat where practicable in the centre of the Kemplay Bank roundabout and near to the Wetheriggs Estate. Where this has not been possible, areas of habitat lost as a result of the Project have been replaced in close proximity to the Kemplay Bank roundabout and near to the Wetheriggs Estate as indicatively set out within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).Where potential significant impacts have been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is presented in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
127		Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	<p>Respondents suggesting further information about road drainage and water environment issues should be presented in the ES including identifying Dog Beck as a main river not an ordinary watercourse and more information on where culverts / structures are located along watercourses.</p>	<p>The feedback on the scope and content of the PEI Report is welcomed and noted.</p> <p>Within the ES, Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2), Dog Beck is classified as a main river. A naming convention has been developed for the ES to address inconsistencies where no mapped watercourse names exist, with all main rivers considered.</p> <p>Baseline information on the drainage features associated with the existing road is included within the HEWRAT assessment. Details on other surface</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						water features (such as proposed water crossing points), appropriate for the assessment are included in the ES within Figure 14.1 Surface water features.	
1161		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	Respondents suggesting there should be consideration of Natural Flood Management Options and that a collaborative approach is essential with hydraulic modelling produced for the ES to align with the modelling being undertaken by Cumbria County Council.	Consultation and engagement with key stakeholders in respect of flooding and water management has been carried out through Technical Working Groups, responses to the Autumn 2021 Consultation and information requests submitted on behalf of National Highways. This consultation and engagement has informed the development of the Project and environmental assessment. Through discussions in the Technical Working Groups, details on Natural Flood Management schemes have been shared with the A66 Project team and will be considered through the Designated Funds process. It is not within the scope of the Project to consider these schemes. The hydraulic modelling used by the Council is not directly suitable within the Project assessment however hydraulic modelling has been carried out by the Project and the approach to modelling has been consulted upon and agreed with Cumbria County Council.	No
1162		Cumbria County		PEI Report - Road drainage and	Respondents suggesting further information about road drainage and water environment issues including	National Highways note the consultees' concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council Eden District Council		water environment	how local drainage and flooding issues around Skirsgill Lane and the de-trunked A66 are to be addressed, and what opportunities exist for deculverting.	assessment carried out for the Project and the outline Project drainage design is presented in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy. Skirsgill Lane is considered within this assessment and no increased flood risk as a result of the Project is identified in this area. Where de-trunking works are proposed within the Oder Limits they are included within the flood risk assessment and included within the outline drainage design. The Project has identified some locations where an existing culverted watercourse is diverted away from the dual carriageway which has provided an opportunity to deculvert, where mitigation to reduce or remove an impact has been required. Details of this are contained within ES Chapter 14 Road drainage and the water environment (Application Document 3.2). Existing culverts have been extended to accommodate the dual carriageway and the Project has retained culverts where practicable as flow control to avoid increased flooding downstream.	
778		Environmen t Agency Natural		PEI Report - Road drainage and	Respondents expressing concern about aspects of the road drainage and water environment assessment	The feedback on the PEI Report is welcome and noted. A full EIA has been carried out	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		England		water environment	<p>within the PEI Report. Respondents note a construction site and settlement pond is within a floodplain and should be moved or alternatively wet woodland habitat should be considered as it would protect the road in the event of a flood.</p> <p>Respondents also note that they believe that there is a mistake in the PEI Report, which identifies flood modelling conducted for Myers Beck, rather than Dog Beck, and that flood risk may therefore have been misjudged as a result of this error. Respondents also note there are minor water course crossings and likely discharges that may impact on the SAC.</p>	<p>including a detailed assessment of the potential risks to surface water, as set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and its technical appendices (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed and is set out within the ES Appendices (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4) submitted with the DCO application. These assessments have been updated following feedback on the PEI Report and it should be noted that post the autumn 2021 consultation, the Project has been refined to avoid any interaction with the water environment of Myers Beck and Dog Beck.</p> <p>The construction site and settlement pond have not been moved however they have been considered within the assessment and attenuation ponds have been designed to ensure no flooding occurs during a critical 1 in 100-year storm.</p> <p>The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project. Since PEI Report all ecological field surveys have been completed and the ecological mitigation designs have undergone</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>significant refining and reworking. We have tried to maximise environmental benefits where practicable and appropriate, this includes areas of wetland habitat at this location including areas of marsh and wet grassland. This is shown indicatively within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of potential impacts on European designated sites including water crossings and discharges as a result of the Project and associated mitigation measures, where required, is provided within the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5).</p>	
677		Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents suggesting that further attention be given to issues relating to flooding and drainage. Respondents ask what measures will be taken to prevent surface water runoff, including in areas currently liable to flood, such as Warcop and Skirsgill Lane. Respondents also ask whether there will be a physical barrier between residential properties and new wetland habitats at Eamont.</p>	<p>A full EIA has been carried out of the Project including a detailed assessment of the potential risks to groundwater and surface water, as set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and its technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed and is set out within the ES appendices (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) submitted with the DCO application. This assessment includes consideration of Warcop and Skirsgill Lane. The assessment</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts as a result of the Project are therefore identified.</p> <p>There will be a physical barrier installed between residential properties and proposed wetland habitats at Eamont and an indication of how this could be implemented is provided within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) .</p>	
587	149777, 150184, 152220, 153337, 154249	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council United Utilities Group PLC	148623, 151517	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment with specific reference to a potential increased risk of flooding or adverse impacts on existing drainage, including at Eamont Bridge, Skirsgill Lane and Kemplay Bank roundabout. Respondents query whether the construction of a water attenuation pond is necessary, saying that there are no works or parts of the scheme that would lead to an increase in water flow from the road.</p>	<p>Flood modelling and a flood risk assessment has been carried out as part of the Project and is detailed within Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Number Reference 3.4). This includes consideration of potential impacts at Eamont Bridge, Skirsgill Lane and Kemplay Bank roundabout. The assessment identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Attenuation ponds have been included within the Project design to provide attenuation and treatment of storm water run-off to meet flood and water</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						quality requirements.	
726	150169, 153337, 153384, 153965, 154460	Penrith Town Council Lake District National Park Authority	149355, 151517	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	<p>Respondents suggest measures to reduce the environmental impact of the scheme by planting trees and vegetation to reduce noise and visual impacts.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest protecting existing woodlands and trees along the route during construction.</p> <p>Respondents suggest the creation of a green gateway to Penrith, and the use of slower and lower growing screening to prevent the risk of a tree falling onto a footpath or slipway.</p>	<p>A further iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) will be prepared pre-construction and will include all required mitigation measures in order to comply with relevant ecological and environmental legislation and best practice. This will include all measures required to ensure the protection (including root zones) of existing woodlands and trees to be retained within the Order Limits during construction. Outline measures for this iteration of the EMP are detailed within the EMP (Doc Reference 2.7) submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Tree planting has been expressly considered and adopted as part of the Project in order to mitigate various environmental impacts. The Project landscape and ecological planting uses a mix of appropriate native species. Important and established trees along the route have been identified and will be protected where practicable. There are safety considerations planting large trees near to carriageways, however where space allows the design provides a transition between species rich grassland, woodland edge and woodland planting. This gives a more sustainable and safe green edge to footways and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>carriageways.</p> <p>The suggestion to use tree planting as noise mitigation is noted however, given the seasonal nature of leaf cover for trees and the density of vegetation required, tree planting is not generally adopted as a reliable noise mitigation measure and has therefore not been considered as a noise attenuation measure by the Project.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'M6 J40 to Kemplay Bank' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
169	154460	Eden District Council		Construction	Eden District Council and a respondent expressing support for the proposed construction plans on this scheme to minimise disruption on the A6, A66 and A686 roads.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the proposed construction plans. It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself, as well as the A6 and A686. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans to minimise disruption.	No
646	148582, 148698, 149388, 149417, 151331, 151349, 151462, 152911, 152937, 152944, 152948, 153037,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	154232	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the proposed design of the scheme, in particular the Kemplay Bank underpass, additional lane capacity, and the changes at M6 J40.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the design of the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153316, 153333, 153377, 153384, 153936, 154194						
991		Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner	153321	Land	Respondents expressing support for the proposed use of land, in particular in relation to the location of the attenuation pond and the retention of Toll Bar cottage.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the location of the attenuation pond and the retention of Toll Bar Cottage. We will continue to work with Cumbria Police on detailed design and into construction.	No
584	148590, 153338, 153817, 153926, 153954	Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust	152936	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that the changes will improve connectivity for local residents and businesses, with specific reference to: Kemplay Bank roundabout, Skirsgill depot, Center Parcs, and Penrith.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme around improved connectivity. Facilitating free flowing traffic along the A66 by introducing an underpass at M6 junction 40 to Kemplay Bank will deliver major benefits for local people, including pedestrians and cyclists. Easier access through the junction, especially at peak times, will improve access to Penrith, Center Parcs and other facilities along the route. In addition, we have sought to understand the needs of the emergency services in the Kemplay Bank area and how access will be maintained for the Cumbria Constabulary and Penrith Community Fire and Ambulance Station and providing better and safer access into the likes of Skirsgill Depot.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
690	148582, 148637, 148698, 149352, 149384, 149394, 150178, 150460, 150473, 151353, 152224, 152906, 152911, 152913, 152923, 152925, 152945, 153043, 153327, 153334, 153377, 153817, 153821, 153885, 154230, 154240, 154250, 154461		148586, 150453, 151465, 152236, 152933, 152983, 153321, 153824, 153948	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it will reduce traffic congestion, particularly around M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank roundabout. Measures that respondents believe will improve congestion including additional lanes, and the new underpass at Kemplay.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme from a congestion-relieving perspective. Facilitating free flowing traffic along the A66 by introducing an underpass at M6 junction 40 to Kemplay Bank will deliver major benefits for local people, including pedestrians and cyclists. Easier access through the junction, especially at peak times, will improve access to Penrith.,	No
277	148698, 149772,			Traffic, transport	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it will	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	149786, 149792, 150460, 150462, 151331, 152945, 153803, 153829, 154240, 154460			and junctions - Safety	improve road safety, particularly around M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank roundabout. Measures that respondents believe will improve safety include traffic light control, speed limits, and additional lanes.	from a safety perspective. The improvement to road safety is a Project objective and facilitating free flowing traffic along the A66 by introducing an underpass at M6 junction 40 to Kemplay Bank will deliver major benefits for local people, including pedestrians and cyclists. Removing east/west A66 traffic from the roundabout means we would reduce around 55% of the total traffic flow at this point. Easier access through the junction, especially at peak times, will improve access to Penrith and other facilities around the junction. In addition, we have sought to understand the needs of the emergency services in this area and how access will be maintained for the Cumbria Constabulary and Penrith Community Fire and Ambulance Station.	
982			153959	Traffic, transport and junctions - Commuting	A respondent expressing general support for the scheme as a commuter, without providing further detail.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the scheme.	No
563	152267, 153377, 153799, 153939	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the proposals to retain existing routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, or provide new or modified routes.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. National Highways	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Respondents support the retention of the underpass at Carlton Avenue, and the provision for walking and cycling from the M6 roundabout to Eamont Bridge.	welcomes the support shown for the retention of the underpass at Carlton Avenue and the provision for walking and cycling from the M6 roundabout to Eamont Bridge. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel.	
276	149360, 149786, 153803			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it will improve safety for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, in particular at the entrance to Center Parcs and in the Penrith area.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. National Highways also welcomes the support shown for measures to improve safety for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders at the entrance to Center Parcs and in the Penrith area.	No
790	148550, 148564, 148565, 148566, 148568, 148569, 148572, 148578, 148582, 148583,		148623, 149355, 150194, 150438, 152988, 153381, 153883, 154190, 154192, 154199	General / no reason given / Needs Case	Respondents expressing support for the scheme, particularly the proposals for Kemplay Bank Roundabout and Center Parcs, without providing further details.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the scheme, including for the proposed improvements at Kemplay Bank Roundabout and Center Parcs.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	148585, 148588, 148590, 148591, 148593, 148596, 148600, 148603, 148604, 148613, 148615, 148621, 148626, 149351, 149364, 149370, 149394, 149780, 149793, 150429, 150439, 150462, 151331, 151349, 152243, 152268, 152926, 152943,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153313, 153316, 153333, 153859, 153909, 153910, 153912, 153926, 153950, 153961, 154198, 154240, 154469						
348	148611, 149374, 150169, 150189, 152152, 152948, 153387, 153833, 153909, 153965, 154213		148598, 152214, 152261	Needs Case	<p>Respondents expressing opposition to the scheme in general terms without providing further detail.</p> <p>Respondents also state their opposition to the alternative flyover design for this scheme .</p>	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>As the main point of access to Penrith, M6 junction 40 experiences high volumes of traffic from the M6 and the A66 to the west. M6 junction 40 is also prone to bottlenecks caused by high levels of congestion at the Kemplay Bank roundabout, which affects the flow of traffic along the A66 and for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>north and southbound traffic using the A6. Although the road between M6 junction 40 and the Kemplay Bank roundabout is a dual carriageway, vehicles slowing down as they approach Kemplay Bank can cause safety issues and create problems for both east/ westbound and north/southbound traffic as it passes through the roundabout. Facilitating free flowing traffic along the A66 by introducing an underpass at this location will deliver major benefits for local people, including pedestrians and cyclists. Removing east/west A66 traffic from the roundabout means we would reduce around 55% of the total traffic flow at this point. Easier access through the junction, especially at peak times, will improve access to Penrith and other facilities around the junction. In addition, we have sought to understand the needs of the emergency services in this area and how access will be maintained for the Cumbria Constabulary and Penrith Community Fire and Ambulance Station.</p> <p>The flyover option was considered during the early stages of the Project and is not being taken forward. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Document 4.1). An overview of the benefits provided by the scheme is outlined in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).	
865		Penrith Town Council		Community impact - People -	Penrith Town Council suggests that the acquisition of Thacka Beck Field should be accompanied by improvements to provide community benefit.	The land at Thacka Beck Field is proposed for environmental mitigation. The public liaison officer for this section has met with the town council who are happy with the proposals.	No
200	149380, 151472, 152201, 152220, 152997, 153384, 153912, 153954	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council	151517, 152236	Construction - Access during construction	Respondents suggesting that during construction, temporary access and signage should be provided for businesses and other properties. Respondents suggest that bus routes should remain operational, and that access to the Kemplay Bank police and fire station should be assured. Respondents request for walking, cycling and horse-riding routes to be kept open and alterations made for construction works.	The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan, as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) – Application Document 2.7, compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B 13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include requirements for temporary alternative access to residential areas, community facilities and businesses and details of proposed traffic management measures, including phasing plans, route restrictions and speed limits. . Bus services will be maintained during construction. Regarding the comment about emergency services, the design team	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have been working closely with Cumbria County Council, Cumbria Police, Cumbria Fire and Rescue and our buildability consultant to ensure access will be retained to the 'blue light district' at Kemplay Bank for the duration of the works.</p> <p>Regarding walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH), any WCH routes not being revised as a part of the Project will be sought to be kept open, or temporary diversions provided, wherever practicable, particularly having regard to safety considerations.</p>	
594	148612, 153384, 154462	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council	152236	Construction - Mitigate construction	<p>Respondents suggesting that road closures and associated disruption should be minimised during the construction of the project. Suggestions included to minimise disruption include to upgrade the A6 and A685 to make diverted routes more efficient.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself, as well as the A6 and A685. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as required by the EMP (compliance with which is secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. Within the EMP it is stated that as a minimum, the Principal Contractor is expected to maintain a single open lane in each direction for the duration of the works, except for circumstances where full carriageway closures are required, traffic management is deployed that would otherwise restrict access, during an emergency, or unless otherwise agreed with National Highways or their representative. The lengths of existing dualled carriageway along the A66 are also expected to be maintained, where possible, during the work This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes. The specific points made will be considered as part of matters to be dealt with later under the CTMP.</p> <p>It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, for example bridge installations, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>be publicised in advance.</p> <p>Regarding the suggestion to upgrade the A6 and A685, National Highways considers it has included all necessary works to facilitate (and mitigate the impacts of) the Project within the scope of the DCO. Any further works are therefore beyond the scope of the Project as not directly related but will form part of future improvement considerations.</p>	
360	149366, 149417, 149777, 150429, 152939, 153365, 153815, 153838, 153885, 153888, 153909, 153926, 154240, 154363	Dacre Parish Council	152983, 154232	Construction - Prioritise this section	<p>Respondents suggesting that construction of this scheme, and the M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank roundabout, should be given priority over the other schemes in the Project.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge respondents views on construction sequencing which will be considered further in the detailed design and construction preparation phase.</p> <p>National Highways is currently reviewing the order in which the construction of all proposed schemes across the Project will be built. This decision will be based on a number of factors including efficiency, cost effectiveness and minimising impact on stakeholders.</p> <p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 2 The Project, (Application Document 3.2) (compliance with which is secured in the DCO).	
946			153350	– Land - Compensation	Respondents suggesting that local residents should be compensated for any negative impacts on their property as a result of the scheme, such as loss of property value, or the effect of dirt or dust on their property during the construction phase.	<p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. The environmental assessment that has been carried out has considered the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team propose mitigation measures to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Where the scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on the National Highway's web site.</p> <p>The public liaison officer for your area will continue to liaise with you and as</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the Project moves into the development consent process and, if made, into construction.	
114	149793, 150189, 152921	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that alternative improvements be made to bring about economic benefits and improved facilities. Respondents suggest a Kirkby Stephen bypass, educational opportunities for local workers for long term economic benefit, and improved enforcement and physical measures against nuisance HGV parking. A respondent suggests that Kemplay Bank roundabout works offer an opportunity to address the sewage system underneath, which they say overflows during heavy rain.	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 – Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The proposal to upgrade the A66 is a Project at the heart of the Northern Powerhouse and UK Government levelling-up agenda to build back better and level up the North by improving infrastructure and boosting connections across the region. It is the best way to meet the future needs of those living, working and travelling along the corridor in the 21st century.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Importantly the Economic Appraisal, contained within the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Application Document 3.8) showed that the dualling is best able to meet the transport planning objectives by providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultees; however, Kirkby Stephen is outside of the scope of the Project and no works are planned in this location.</p> <p>With regards to the sewerage system underneath Kemplay Bank roundabout, alterations to the existing drainage network are required as part of the proposed upgrade works. National Highways are liaising with the drainage network asset owner in the design of the proposed drainage system in this area.</p>	
297	149384,		152261,	Engineering design and	Respondents suggesting that an alternative route should be considered	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	149792, 150189, 152948, 153913, 154213, 154243, 154468		153062, 153927	development - Alternative route	with regards to engineering design and development. Suggestions include a route to M6 J41, a route away from Penrith to a new junction south of J40 and routing the A66 through a road over J40 M6. Other respondents suggest that an alternative route that avoids the Kemplay Bank roundabout should be considered.	best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. s. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
586	153384	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Aesthetic design	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting aesthetic design additions and refinements to the scheme including suggestions for lighting at the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank, or for the inclusion of a mural or mosaic about the locality as part of the scheme.	National Highways acknowledge this comment with regards to the importance of the aesthetics of the new structures at Kemplay. The aesthetics of key elements of the Project have been considered when developing the preliminary design and are reflected in the design principles contained in the Design Principles Report (Document Reference 5.11), compliance with which is secured through the provisions of the DCO.	Yes
654	149352, 149366, 153337	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Dacre	153363	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents suggesting engineering design and development changes to mitigate potential noise pollution, reduced air quality and flood risk. Respondents make suggestions regarding wetland design, lighting standards, visual screening	The impact of the scheme on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the Environmental Management Plan	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Parish Council Eden District Council			techniques, the length of acoustic barriers, and use of quieter road surfaces.	<p>(Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/ exceptional dust events.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the potential risks to groundwater and surface water, is set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and its technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4) is included as appendix to the ES chapter and presents the flood risk assessment for the Project and how Project drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The assessment identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the scheme and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.</p> <p>ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the scheme would affect wildlife and habitats and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the Scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the Scheme and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail. Landscape and ecological mitigation measures are illustrated within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The EMP includes the first iteration of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and provides a framework for achieving the design objectives and mitigation measures outlined in the Environmental Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions.</p> <p>The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape/ecological features such as wetlands, hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as species-specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts, creating new areas of habitat and restoring/enhancing linkages to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>adjacent locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable/sensitive and protected species.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments set out within it will be implemented in full. Traffic management plans will be developed for the construction phase, to address both management of construction traffic and also detailed plans for management of road traffic through the construction works. Annex B 13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented.</p>	
102	148698, 149357, 151454, 152152, 152178, 152230, 152911, 152927, 152944,	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commis-	148598, 151350, 154491	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents suggesting design changes to the scheme to reduce congestion, allow efficient construction, and improve safety. Respondents offer multiple detailed proposals for adjustments to traffic directions and road design, including suggestions for improved pedestrian and cycle access, and altered HGV facilities, as well as approaches to address problems with communications and utilities assets</p>	<p>Detailed traffic modelling has been carried out to support the proposals at M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank Roundabout. This has demonstrated that the introduction of smarter traffic signal systems, additional lanes and entry and exits, enhanced road markings and a new underpass at Kemplay will provide an acceptable level of performance to future-proof the Scheme.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153384, 154218, 154468, 162144	itioner Eden District Council			underneath Kemplay Bank roundabout. Respondents also suggest alternative locations for construction compounds.	It is recognised that diversion of utilities and services will be one of the key challenges on this part of the Project and the design team have worked closely with utility companies, our own utility specialists and our buildability consultant to minimise disruption to these existing assets during construction of the new works. Locations for construction compounds were proposed by the Principal Contractors working with our buildability consultants with a view to maximising buildability efficiencies and minimising disruption to users of the existing road network during the construction works. For more information refer to the Environmental Statement Volume 1, Chapter 2 Project Description (Application Document 3.2).	
1139		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Modified design	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting improvements will be required on the A685 through Kirkby Stephen and the A6 (Eamont Bridge) to make these suitable diversion routes.	The introduction of a full-length dual carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner will help us to manage incidents and reduce the number and duration of closures associated with road traffic collisions, reducing the need for the use of diversions. National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultees; however, Kirkby Stephen and the A6 Eamont Bridge are not directly impacted by the proposed improvements and are outside of the scope of the Project. No	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>works are planned in these locations.</p> <p>A full list of likely diversion routes for the construction of scheme 1 is provided in Appendix F of The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). Whilst M6 Junction 39 is mentioned as a likely diversion for the northbound entry and southbound exit (which would go via the A6 and Eamont Bridge), traffic could also be diverted via Junction 41 to the north (also listed as a likely diversion route) and may be more appropriate for traffic travelling to and from Penrith, particularly considering the distance between Junction 39 and Junction 40 is approximately 17km in comparison to Junction 41 which is 4km north of Junction 40.</p> <p>The use of A685 through Kirkby Stephen as a diversion for the construction of M6 Junction 40 would mainly apply to non-HGV long distance traffic. HGVs would be diverted via A1(M), A69 and M6 which will help reduce the impact on Kirkby Stephen.</p>	
1142		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Modified design	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting the A592 junction with Clifford Road is a junction that will require enhancement to improve safety concerns	We are not proposing to amend the junction of the A592 and Clifford Road as it falls outside of the scope of works for the A66 upgrade. Minimal works are proposed in this location to tie the upgrade works into the existing network.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
433	148563, 148582, 148616, 148698, 149388, 153870, 154459	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - More lanes	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting design changes to the scheme to add more traffic lanes, with specific reference to the Kemplay Bank roundabout and M6 J40. Respondents say that this would reduce traffic congestion.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the Project between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. Widening of the approaches to and circulatory carriageway of M6 Junction 40 is planned, together with grade separation of Kemplay Bank Roundabout and the Center Parcs access. The operational assessment for Kemplay Bank and the M6 J40 shows that the proposed junction layouts ensure the junctions have an acceptable operational performance in 2046 on an average weekday. An additional assessment was carried out to assess the performance of the scheme on a typical Friday – the busiest period.	No
683	148589, 148618, 152914, 152923, 153384, 154468, 162157	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council		Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents including Penrith Town Council and Cumbria County Council suggesting design changes to the scheme to include provision of basic rest facilities and overnight parking for motorhomes and HGVs. Respondents say that there is a need for proper facilities for HGVs, rather than lay-bys which are not well serviced, in particular around Penrith. One respondent suggests liaising with Skirsgill depot on the issue.	Overnight facilities for motorhomes or HGV users are not within the scope of the Project but our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and this will be a separate initiative from the A66 NTP Project.	No
961	149361, 153384,			Engineering design and development	Respondents suggesting design changes to the scheme to straighten the road and modify lay-by designs to	The road has been designed to comply with National Highways latest design standards contained within DMRB.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	162157			- Visibility / safety	improve visibility and safety, including the use of safety cameras at junctions, without providing detailed locations.	This includes those design standards relating to horizontal curvature and visibility. All laybys provided along the route will be Type A, which includes a segregation island between the layby and the A66 carriageway. New laybys will be provided in accordance with DMRB standards. New CCTV cameras to monitor traffic flow will be installed at M6 junction 40 and at the Kemplay Bank Roundabout.	
350	148611, 149367, 149374, 150182, 153797, 153871, 153965, 154194			Traffic, transport and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting that demand for road journeys should be reduced, rather than making upgrades to road infrastructure. Respondents also suggest a shift to public transport such as rail.	<p>Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future on the A66. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the need for the Scheme, the problems which it addresses and how it delivers the Project Objectives including support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and Government levelling up agenda. Other objectives include improving road safety and journey times. The A66 currently has a poor safety record on the existing single carriageway</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>sections and the ability to keep the route open during accidents, incidents and other disruptions is significantly affected by the existence of single carriageway sections.</p> <p>In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith which could be upgraded as an alternative. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
799	154194			Traffic, transport and junctions - Reduce number of lanes	A respondent suggesting that three lanes are not needed.	Traffic Modelling of the design proposals has shown that provision of three lanes between M6 junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout is required to accommodate forecast traffic on this section of the route. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	No
733	149374, 150182,	Lake District		Traffic, transport and	Respondents suggesting sustainable transport modes as an alternative to	The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016)	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153797, 153833	National Park Authority		junctions - Sustainable transport	road investment, including suggestions for Park and Ride initiatives and completing the cycle corridors from Penrith to Cockermouth and Penrith to Ullswater.	<p>identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK national priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North. The Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future on the A66. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the need for the scheme, the problems which it addresses and how it delivers the Project Objectives including support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and Government levelling up agenda.</p> <p>In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith which could be upgraded as an alternative. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>Completing cycle corridors from Penrith to Cockermouth and Penrith to Ullswater are not within the A66 Scope. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the Strategic Road Network with other transport modes, whilst working to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						improve the efficiency of the network.	
1154		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - HGVs	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest further survey data of the parking issues around Gilwilly Industrial Estate is required to inform the assessment of impact that additional HGVs are likely to have on existing problem of nuisance and illegal parking	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% due to the Project. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and this will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. National Highways will continue to work with host local authorities to understand current operational difficulties on the adjoining local road network but improvements to Gilwilly Industrial Estate do not form part of the A66 Scope.	No
270	148563, 148584, 148611, 149394, 149773, 149780, 150186, 150429, 150459, 151458,	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner	149355, 154491	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control/ Engineering design and development	Respondents suggesting changes to traffic signals, road markings, signs, speed limits, and physical traffic control to help reduce congestion and improve safety. Respondents suggest improving traffic signals at Eamont Bridge and the M6 J40 roundabout, as well as the removal of traffic signals at the J40 roundabout, and use of a speed limit of 50 mph between Kemplay Bank and J40. Respondents suggest parking enforcement to control nuisance parking in and around	Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs (including signs for local services and places of interest) will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detail in future Project stages. A 50mph speed limit has been included between Kemplay Bank and M6 Junction 40 for a number of reasons including retaining existing connections and links. New traffic signs will be provided to allow the speed limit to be enforced and an area	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152150, 152939, 152944, 153313, 153316, 153384, 153851, 153901, 153909, 153910, 153958, 154459, 154462, 162157	Dacre Parish Council Eden District Council Lake District National Park Authority North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust			Penrith.	for mobile speed enforcement will be incorporated on the eastern side of Kemplay Bank Roundabout to be used as necessary. Parking enforcement in and around Penrith does not form part of the scope of the Project with the enforcement being the responsibility of the local authority.	
700	153384	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner		Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents suggesting that alternative traffic access for communities to the south of the M6 should be considered to help reduce congestion at Kemplay both during construction and as a diversion should roads need to be closed in future. Respondents also suggested that there should be a provision for the diversion of traffic in the event that Eamont Bridge is closed.	Traffic modelling of the proposals has been carried out for M6 J40 to Kemplay Bank Roundabout and has shown an acceptable level of performance. Further details are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) Traffic modelling work has also been carried out to understand the impacts of temporary diversions during construction. In terms of temporary diversion routes, the Project will be looking to minimise the use of these and when required they are more than likely to be implemented overnight. Construction plans, diversions and closures will be finalised during detailed design and shared with those	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>affected. The introduction of a full-length dual carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner will help our ability to manage incidents and reduce the number and duration of closures associated with road traffic collisions, reducing the need for the use of diversions.</p> <p>The design team have worked closely with our buildability consultant to ensure that buildability has been considered and that disruption during construction will be kept to a minimum. The design team are aware that the B6262 is used as a diversion route when Eamont Bridge is closed and measures. We have allowed for a section of removable safety barrier along the scheme. This could be positioned and confirmed during detailed design. The location could be opposite the B6262 if it was deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Future diversions are outside the scope of this Project, and would be subject to agreement with the Local Highway Authority</p>	
1039	152220, 152230, 152930, 152931, 162157			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents suggesting means of improving the safety of walkers and cyclists, including through provision of lighting, installation of traffic lights at crossing points, maintenance of paths, physical barriers for cycle lanes and a cycle lane along the A66.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. The M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabouts have crossing facilities for walking and cycling and these controlled crossings will be either retained or upgraded to tie-in with the proposed upgrade of the entire junction. The existing Toucan	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>crossings are to be retained on the M6 Junction 40 Roundabout, along with the existing share cycle/footways running parallel to the local roads. A new additional section of shared cycleway/footway would be provided on the north-east side of the junction to provide a connection into the Cumbria County Council depot. There is currently a shared footway/cycleway on the north side of the A66 between M6J40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout. This will be upgraded to provide additional width and a buffer strip (as required). The introduction of physical barriers and lighting of PROW's will be considered further at detailed design stage. However, replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Further details on proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(Application Document 2.4)	
278	151462, 153803	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	<p>Respondents suggesting that the scheme facilitates active travel through grade separating active travel routes or adding more direct signalling at the junction.</p> <p>Respondents say that horse-riders should be segregated from the A66 mainline, and that a cycle path should be constructed to Center Parcs.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated walking, cycling and horse-riders underpass or bridge. Any existing or re-routed bridleways will be segregated from the A66 mainline carriageways.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Further information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>The shared path from Penrith to Temple Sowerby (which passes Center Parcs) will be for walking and cycling only. It will not be for use by horses, and no bridleways connect into it. The path will be shared use, it will be segregated from the A66 and fenced off. It will be constructed of a suitable surface to be determined at detailed design stage (likely to be a hard surface but may be compacted stone).</p>	No
98	148563,	Penrith	149355,	Walking,	Respondents suggesting that the	All existing Public Rights of Way	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
148594, 148620, 149350, 149359, 149360, 149369, 149407, 150175, 150186, 151472, 151484, 151491, 152218, 152220, 152238, 152248, 152906, 152907, 152911, 152930, 152963, 152997, 153313, 153314, 153377, 153799, 153822, 153835,	Town Council Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Lake District National Park Authority North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust	153350, 154225	cycling and horse-riders - Cycleway / footpath / bridleway	<p>scheme should provide safe, dedicated routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders alongside roads, as well as maintaining existing paths, and providing crossing points or over bridges. Respondents suggest using the central island on the Kemplay Bank roundabout for pedestrians or having an overbridge to stop pedestrians having to navigate the periphery of the roundabout. Respondents also suggest working with the Council on additional cycle lane projects, specifically between Penrith and Pooley Bridge, and connecting new routes into the existing network.</p> <p>Other suggestions provided by respondents include: accommodating more vulnerable road users through dedicated space, wider paths and highways, and segregating motorised and non-motorised transport.</p>	<p>(PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Further information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>An overbridge will not be constructed at Kemplay Bank. Walkers, cyclists and horse-riders will cross at grade in this location. Full details are provided on the scheme plans (Application Document 5.17).</p> <p>Additional cycle lanes between Penrith and Pooley Bridge are outside of the A66 Project scope.</p>		

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153861, 153907, 153929, 154194, 154460, 154461, 154462						
636		Cumbria County Council	149355	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Do not build cycleway / footpath / bridleway	A respondent and Cumbria County Council suggesting that certain sections of the proposed footpaths will not be used and are therefore not required, specifically at Kemplay Bank roundabout and near Toll Bar cottage.	The proposed footpaths including those mentioned by the respondent at Kemplay Bank and near Toll Bar Cottages, are replacements/re-routing of existing provision. Surveys of pedestrian usage as part of the walking, cycling & horse-riding review have also informed the proposed provision. It is noted that the improved east-west walking and cycling connectivity that the project will introduce, is expected to increase patronage of these particular sections.	No
904	148619, 152946, 153901			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting that the needs of vehicle users should not be prioritised over the needs of other road users, particularly those of cyclists and local residents.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabouts have crossing facilities for walking and cycling.	No
186	152939, 152948, 152987, 153337,	Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of	148586, 151517, 152988, 153350,	Request for further information	Respondents requesting additional information about the scheme, in relation to impacts on local people and roads from works at Kemplay Bank and the road to Eamont Bridge; the	Further information on the traffic impacts of the scheme is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) with detailed proposal on the Scheme drawings. The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153901, 153909	the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council	153883		extent of land take in the area; the proposed drainage ponds and their continued maintenance; operating hours of the workforce during construction; and design of M6 J40.	<p>Transport Assessment shows that a strategic model has been used to generate the proposed traffic demand along the extent of the scheme. Local junction models (operational models) have then been used to check the adequacy of the design (Kemplay Bank / M6 Junction 40/Center Parcs Access) or existing infrastructure (Eamont Bridge) to cope with the additional demand.</p> <p>The Project is designed to minimise land take during construction and operational phases.</p> <p>Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4) is included as appendix to the ES chapter and presents the flood risk assessment for the Project and how Project drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The proposed positions of drainage ponds have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation whilst minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Most construction works will be carried out during standard day working hours of 07:30 until 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 07:30 until 13:00 on Saturdays. In</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>some instances, it may be essential to undertake works at night or on Sundays and Bank Holidays due to traffic management restrictions, with additional traffic management or closures required for works such as road connections or interface points, bridge beam lifts and deck pours. Where work is required outside of the core working hours, the Principal Contractor(s) (PC) will liaise with the relevant Local Authority to agree the procedures for notifying local residents and any site-specific constraints that need to be applied. This process is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) Local access and bus services will be accommodated during the works.</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) During construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant temporary noise and vibration impacts. Measures have been set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) which contains a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NMVP) to reduce noise and vibration impacts, including implementation of Best Practicable Means (BPM) and consultation with Local Authorities.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
206	153901, 153965, 154460		152214	Community impact - People	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on the lives and health of local people.	An assessment of the effect of sScheme on human health is provided the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors. The Health assessment included within ES Chapter 13 concludes that during construction with the application of the measures contained in the Dust Management Plan, the Noise and Vibration Management Plan and the Construction Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) there	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>will be no adverse health effects. During operation health effects arising from air quality and noise due to changes in traffic flows are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>An Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) has also been prepared in parallel to the ES considers the potential effects of the Project on 'protected characteristic groups' (PCGs) defined as having 'protected characteristics' under the Equality Act 2010.</p>	
947			152214, 153350	Community impact - Property	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on domestic property values and their privacy due to proximity to the road, and that proposed environmental mitigation measures, such as tree planting, would reduce natural light in nearby properties</p>	<p>Landscape visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration of the design. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) assesses the visual impact and determines, where required, appropriate mitigation in the form of planting. ES Appendix 10.6 Schedule of Visual Effects (Application Document 3.4) sets out the visual assessment for identified receptors.</p> <p>Mitigation design, including considerations for residential dwellings with regards to privacy has been undertaken in consultation with design engineers, Ecology, Biodiversity, Cultural Heritage, Noise and Lighting disciplines to ensure appropriate responses to design challenges</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>throughout the Project. Potential landscape and ecological mitigation measures are illustrated within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The EMP includes the first iteration of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and provides a framework for achieving the design objectives and mitigation measures outlined in the Environmental Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>. Further iterations of the LEMP will give consideration to the long-term impacts of mitigation, including potential loss of light from planting proposals.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on the National Highway's web site.</p>	
597	148591, 149357, 149384, 149394, 149417, 149784, 149792, 150189,	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Dacre Parish Council Eden	152236, 153350, 153363, 153927	Construction - Disruption	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the potential for traffic to be pushed onto feeder roads during construction, causing congestion and restricting access between local villages and towns, with possible negative impacts on emergency services and on Penrith town centre.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152152, 152220, 153038, 153043, 153334, 153815, 154218, 154462	District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust				<p>stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption. Our traffic model considers an Affected Road Network (ARN) area outwith the A66 Corridor. This confirms that the additional capacity provided by the A66 dualling, reduces congestion in nearby villages and towns., including Penrith.</p> <p>The design team have worked closely with our buildability consultant to ensure that buildability has been considered and that disruption during construction will be kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Regarding the comment about emergency services, the design team have been working closely with Cumbria County Council, Cumbria Police, Cumbria Fire and Rescue and our buildability consultant to ensure access will be retained to emergency services for the duration of the works.</p> <p>Annex B13 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) provides an essay plan and template for the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured by the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works.</p>	
233		Cumbria		Construction	Respondents expressing concern that	As part of the Project, to upgrade the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council Eden District Council Northern Gas Networks		- Infrastructure	the scheme would have a negative impact on infrastructure, including diversions to gas utilities and utilities that supply emergency service properties.	<p>road network and associated new structures, National Highways recognises that the Project may require certain utility infrastructure to be diverted, where it has not been possible to incorporate existing services as part of the design. Where this is the case, it will work with the relevant utility companies to seek to minimise disruption, with a view to ensuring any new diversions are in place prior to existing infrastructure being moved/switched off. This will be governed by the protective provisions for the benefit of utility companies contained in the DCO.</p> <p>For critical emergency services properties and utilities, additional measures will be implemented to ensure essential utilities are not impacted, with dedicated new services supplied where necessary prior to any outages of the old services. This will be governed by the protective provisions for the benefit of utility companies contained in the DCO Statement of Reasons (Application Document 5.8)</p> <p>National Highways, through its Principal Contractor will continue to engage with Blue Light services and other affected stakeholders as the utilities diversion and protection work is designed in detail during the next stage of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1409		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Infrastructure	Respondents have concern that any works required, including A592 junction with Clifford Road and A66 to the west J40, to accommodate the project proposals should be included in the scope of the scheme.	National Highways considers it has included all necessary works to facilitate (and mitigate the impacts of) the Project within the scope of the DCO. Any further works, such as those at A592 junction with Clifford Road and the A66 to the west of junction 40, are therefore beyond the scope of the Project as not directly related but will form part of future improvement considerations.	
1410		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Northern Gas Networks		Construction - Infrastructure	Respondents suggest more information is required about utilities diversions. Suggestions made where utilities need to be diverted outside new highway boundary rights to place them in private land to be acquired as part of the DCO. These suggestions should be included in the scope of the scheme.	As part of the Project, to upgrade the road network and associated new structures, the Project will require certain utility infrastructure to be diverted where it has not been possible to incorporate existing services as part of the design. Where this is the case, the preliminary design process has included assessment of required diversions and the land that will be required to undertake the works. Land for utilities diversions has sought to be included in the DCO order limits National Highways will continue to work with the relevant utility companies to seek to minimise disruption, with a view to ensuring any new diversions are in place prior to existing infrastructure being moved/switched off. This will be governed by the protective provisions	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						for the benefit of utility companies contained in the DCO	
791	149367, 149384, 149792, 151331, 151504, 153833, 154240		148598, 149355	Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme is too expensive or saying that it is a waste of public money, with specific reference to the proposals for an underpass at Kemplay Bank roundabout.	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses..</p> <p>The Project will deliver a number of benefits for local communities with faster journey times, improved accessibility and better local connectivity through utilizing the 'old' A66 and connecting to the local road network. The overarching benefits of the Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety - a consistent standard of dual carriageway will lead to less accidents. • Connectivity – improved for people living and working nearby. • Environmental – minimizing noise levels for people living and working near the route and reducing congestion currently occurring in single carriageway sections. • Economic – improving 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>strategic regional and national connectivity, particularly for hauliers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism – improved access to key tourist destinations. • Community – re-connecting communities and providing better links between settlements along the route as well as improving access to services such as healthcare, employment areas and education. • Capacity – reducing delays and queues during busy periods and improving the performance at key junctions. • Increased reliability – consistent speed limits will lead to fewer accidents which, in turn, makes the road more reliable. <p>The full list and information on the benefits are located in the Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>The cost of the scheme is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rt running traffic. Further information on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						scheme economics is provided in The Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2).	
205	148611, 152152, 153815, 153901, 153929, 153965, 154194			Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern that construction of the scheme would increase traffic congestion in the area, with a resulting negative impact on shops and businesses in Penrith and at Eamont Bridge.</p> <p>Regarding the operational phase of the scheme, respondents express concern that it would reduce traffic through Penrith with a resulting negative impact local shops and businesses.</p>	<p>Details of traffic flows and assessment of congestion during construction are included within section 11 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The document identifies the likely construction phases and how associated roads may be managed as part of the works, including impacts to the A6. Within the ES, assessments have also been made on likely additional construction traffic movements across the scheme, which remain low relative to current traffic flows on the A66. This helps to provide residents and stakeholders with assurances that construction traffic movement have been considered.</p> <p>The impact of construction work on traffic will vary across the local area throughout the scheme construction phases. Works that are considered more disruptive will generally take place outside of peak hours (such as that at Junction 40) so that the change in local traffic conditions and any associated disruption is kept to a minimum.</p> <p>A Construction Traffic Management Plan with detailed construction phasing including traffic management measures are to be developed further</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>in the next stage of design development and construction preparation and will seek to keep construction phase disruption to a minimum In relation to the specific concern about Eamont Bridge, traffic management plans will look to prevent additional traffic in the area, with main routes under TM control being prioritised.</p> <p>Regarding concerns around the impact on businesses during the operational phase, an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the Scheme will support Cumbria's Local Industrial Strategy and provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Scheme. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p> <p>Details of traffic flows and assessment of congestion during operation are also included in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). Dependent on the time of day, the traffic modelling suggests smoother</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						traffic flows and increased throughput of traffic at pinch point locations with should help enable vehicles to transit through the junction faster, helping aid local businesses.	
589	151454, 152911, 153339, 153384, 154459, 162144	Cumbria County Council	149355, 153842	Engineering design and development - General	Respondents expressing general concern about the engineering design of the scheme. These include: the removal of the eastbound embankment and how this may destabilise local flora, safety risks as a result of maintaining the lay-by, the removal of HGV rest areas, the lack of significant alterations and improvements to junctions, and the potential impact on future developments.	Removal of the eastbound embankment – environmental surveys and geotechnical investigations have been carried out across the whole route which helped inform the proposed design and mitigation solutions which will be developed further during the detailed design process. Laybys/rest areas - Existing laybys/rest areas will be retained where possible. New laybys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards. Whilst we are proposing to retain the east bound layby between M6J40 and Kemplay Bank, we are unable to accommodate the westbound layby, due to the proximity of the new merge slip road from the new Kemplay Bank junction. Future developments – as part of our traffic modelling work for A66, future developments are factored into forecast traffic flows and subsequent alignment and junction capacity designs.	No
142		Penrith Town		Land - Agricultural	The councils expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on	Extensive land referencing has been carried out by the Project team to	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council Eden District Council			agricultural land. This respondent states that existing legal easements must be recognised, and that any impacts on agricultural land should be identified.	ensure that we have as much information as possible about land ownership including easements. A full agricultural land holdings impact assessment has been undertaken as part of ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). Figure 13.5: Agricultural land holdings shows those that have been considered within the assessment. (ES Volume 2, Application Document 3.3). The impact on soil quality is reported in Chapter 9: Geology and Soils. Where access arrangements are affected by the Project, alternative access provisions will be proposed wherever access needs to be maintained.	
656		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Land - Other	The councils expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on land, including concerns that the scheme would impact on two sites on or near land owned by the Council	Extensive land referencing has been carried out by the Project team to ensure that we have as much information as possible about land ownership. Our Order Limits represents all the land required for the construction of the road and associated works, including environmental mitigation provision. Discussions are underway with the affected landowners in relation to the Project's requirements for the land. In suitable instances National Highways is open to considering entering into management agreements with landowners in relation to environmental	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigation, however, given the need in many instances for environmental mitigation to be maintained in the long term, not all cases will be suitable for such agreements.</p> <p>Information on proposed land acquisition is included in the Lands Plans (Application Document 5.13) and Book of Reference (Application Document 5.7).</p>	
1389			151517	Land - Other	Respondent questions if land allocated to tree-planting would require the acquisition of land at Kingdom Hall.	<p>Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report), the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received at the PEI Report stage from stakeholders where possible and appropriate. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans, which show how ecological and landscape mitigation could be implemented, are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). All landowners who are impacted by the Project and environmental mitigation land requirements have been written to by the Project team. In suitable instances National Highways is open to considering entering into management agreements with landowners in relation to environmental mitigation, however, given the need in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>many instances for environmental mitigation to be maintained in the long term, not all cases will be suitable for such agreements.</p> <p>If the respondent is referring to the strip of land east of the M6, there are overhead lines that run parallel to the M6 along this section. If so, this strip is only temporary to provide access to carry out the proposed planting at the bottom of the strip. There is no intention to plant anything in this blank strip. Full details of proposed land acquisition are included on the Lands Plans (Application Document 5.13) and Book of Reference (Application Document 5.7).</p>	
1390		Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner		Land - other	The respondent notes the proposal for species rich grassland and woodland planting in the police estate and suggest it will require further discussion as the design progresses, balancing the ecology requirements against that of security of the police estate.	Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report), the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received at the PEI Report stage from stakeholders where possible and appropriate. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans, which show how landscape and ecological mitigation could be implemented, are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The Project team will continue to work with Cumbria Police on the	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						proposals as suggested.	
394	154194, 154218, 154243			Need case	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the case for making these upgrades is questionable, citing favourable personal experience of using this section of road. Respondents say that they commute via Eamont Bridge or the two A66 roundabouts, for example, and have rarely found the traffic to be a problem. Respondents add that any disruption from upgrade construction may therefore not be warranted.</p>	<p>Kemplay Bank Roundabout is a key junction in the Penrith Road network, which suffers from congestion during peak periods on most days, but particularly on Fridays, when queuing can block traffic back to the M6 Junction 40.</p> <p>Table 4.2 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) showed that traffic flows on the A66 between Kemplay Bank and M6 Junction 40 will increase by 34% between 2015 and 2046, and that they will increase by a further 20% when the A66 is dualled. The Project is therefore looking to provide additional capacity at this location to reduce congestion and provide capacity for additional traffic.</p> <p>Full details of traffic flows during construction and operation are included in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7)</p> <p>The outcome from the assessments of other alternatives and options for the A66 Project and the further development of the design for the DCO application demonstrate that:</p> <p>i) the A66 dualling delivers the greatest level of strategic benefits (compared with alternative highway interventions), with particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, see the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>ii) it makes a significant contribution to achieving the specific objectives around economic growth and strategic connectivity in terms of it economic, transport, social and environmental benefits in relation to cost, see the Case for the Project document (Application Document 2.2)</p> <p>iii) the route alignment that has been taken forward into the DCO application is in conformity with policy of the National Networks National Policy Statement, see the Legislation and Policy Compliance document (Application Document 3.9) and is preferred in relation to a range of environmental, economic, cost, transport and social criteria compared with alternative alignments, see the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
181	148563, 152219, 153901, 153909, 153954	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	151517	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact connectivity to minor roads or properties when travelling by vehicle, with specific reference to	The Project seeks to retain connectivity to minor roads and properties throughout the route whilst improving safety along the existing single carriageway sections. Full details of traffic flows during construction and operation are included in the Transport Assessment	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skirsgill Business Park, • A6 southbound, • the M6, • the B6262, • access for emergency services to the Kemplay Bank fire and police station. 	<p>(Application Document 3.7). In reference to Skirsgill Business Park, all existing access will be accommodated in the scheme. The A6 Southbound will see improvements in traffic flow due to the proposed grade separation on the mainline A66 traffic. In respect of concerns regarding the access from Skirsgill depot to the M6 southbound on-slip, we have amended our design to retain the existing access. The current B6262 access/egress to/from both the A66 eastbound and westbound has to change to a left in left out connection to the westbound carriageway only on safety grounds as one of the key objectives of the Project is to remove central reserve crossings. It is acknowledged that this will increase journey times for some road users that current use the central reserve gap to access or leave the A66. There has been significant engagement between the design team and Cumbria Police/Cumbria Fire & Rescue with the view to ensuring that access for emergency vehicles to the existing station will be unaffected by the works.</p>	
207	148563,	Penrith	149355,	Traffic,	Respondents expressing concern that	The Transport Assessment	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
148582, 148617, 148698, 149357, 149364, 149388, 149408, 149417, 149773, 149777, 150182, 150184, 150189, 150429, 150440, 150465, 151331, 151353, 151458, 151504, 152152, 152224, 152230, 152921, 152944, 152948, 153043, 153308,	Town Council Cumbria County Council Dacre Parish Council Eden District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust	151350, 151465, 152262, 152988, 153062, 153376, 153842, 153927, 154232, 154457	transport and junctions - Congestion	increasing road capacity would result in more traffic and therefore increase congestion. Respondents say that the scheme would increase congestion at the A66/M6 junction as well as at the Kemplay Bank and Skirsgill roundabouts. They say that the scheme would also encourage use of local roads as rat runs, leading to more congestion on these roads and in villages such as Eamont Bridge and Clifton.	(Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the Project between Penrith and Temple Sowerby, including the villages of Eamont Bridge and Clifton. Widening of the approaches to and circulatory carriageway of the M6 Junction 40 is planned, together with grade separation of Kemplay Bank Roundabout and the Center Parcs access. These upgrade works provide additional capacity and relieve congestion in the locations noted. The operational assessment for Kemplay Bank and the M6 J40 shows that the proposed junction layouts ensure the junction has an acceptable operational performance in 2046 on an average weekday. An assessment has been carried out to assess the performance of the Scheme on a typical Friday – the busiest day. Full details of traffic flows during construction and operation are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The operation of M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank overall is improved with the Project compared to the scenario without the Project such that most junction approaches show a reduction in delay. The Skirsgill/Ullswater Road roundabout shows a slight increase in traffic with the Project compared to without. The impact of this is an increase in delay of less than 5		

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153316, 153333, 153334, 153809, 153815, 153841, 153861, 153870, 153901, 153909, 153936, 153949, 154213, 154240, 154243, 154264, 154459, 154460, 154468					seconds and the junction continues to operate within capacity (Appendix C of the Transport Assessment). Section 8 of the Transport Assessment shows a forecast reduction in AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) of approximately 300 vehicles.	
185		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - HGVs	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the current lack of parking provision for HGVs, which they say will be exacerbated by anticipated increases in traffic volumes resulting from the scheme. Respondents say that HGVs use Penrith Truck Stop, which they say has insufficient capacity, leading to overspill and illegal parking in Gilwilly Industrial	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% due to the Project. Full details of traffic flows during construction and operation are included in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) Where possible existing laybys will be retained in the new scheme but several may need to be relocated as a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Estate and elsewhere, causing a nuisance for local residents.	<p>result of the proposals. New laybys will be provided along the route in accordance with the latest National Highways standards as far as reasonably practical taking into account existing constraints such as junctions and side roads.</p> <p>A new service area is not within the scope of the Project. All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to work with host local authorities to understand current operational difficulties on the adjoining local road network but improvements to Gilwilly Industrial Estate do not form part of the A66 Scope.</p>	
1137			153927	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondent expressing concern about the safety of the road specifically noting junction from Culgaith (near the Air Ambulance station) and cars pulling out onto the A686 (Hartside Road) as this junction has very poor visibility.	Improvements to the A686 at its junction with Kemplay Bank roundabout are included as part of the A66 upgrade works. Improvements to the A66/ B6412 junction from Culgaith are not included in the A66 upgrade works.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1138	150465			Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondent expressing concern about how to make the entrance to KFC and B&M safer.	Specific alterations to the entrance to KFC and B&M do not form part of the A66 upgrade works.	No
1143	153377			Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondent expressing concern as a cyclist was injured joining from the underpass crossing to turn east on the joint pedestrian/cycle path running along the north side of the A686 which is beyond the scope of the scheme.	We have consulted with all host local authorities on the potential impact of the Project to the local road network as a result of the various options. This feedback was considered as part of the overall assessment and suitable mitigation has been identified where appropriate. The proposed design incorporates improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure at Kemplay Bank and the shared use path on the A686 will be retained.	No
648	149784, 151454, 152944, 153316, 153335, 153815, 153909, 153910, 154459	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Warcop Parish Council	149355, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about road safety, with particular reference to the design of the Kemplay Bank junction and to the queuing of vehicles at M6 J40. Respondents express further concerns about the safety of smart motorway technology, the proposed speed limit, and the risks of HGV parking. Others claim that driver safety could be threatened on the Kemplay Bank roundabout.	The design team have carried out detailed traffic modelling in respect of our proposals. A Road Safety Audit has also been carried out, commensurate with the stage of the Project and recommendations have been incorporated. A 50mph speed limit has been introduced between Kemplay Bank Roundabout and M6 J40 for a number of reasons including to enable existing connections and links to be retained. The safety case for the Project is provided in The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). Full details of queue lengths and journey time reliability at M6 J40 are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) . Smart	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Motorway Technology is not within the A66 Dualling scope. Existing laybys will be retained, and new laybys will be provided in accordance with DMRB standards so that HGV parking provision between Scotch Corner and Penrith is increased as a result of the A66 dualling.</p> <p>The provision of designated laybys in accordance with DMRB standards will increase capacity for HGVs and therefore reduce the risk of overspill and illegal parking elsewhere.</p>	
434	151456, 152150, 152904, 152946, 153335, 153870, 153910, 154459	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Warcop Parish Council	148598, 153363	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents expressing concern about the proposed traffic control measures, including concern about the timing of the traffic lights on M6 J40, the A66, and Kemplay Bank roundabout. Others express concern about road signage and the proposed speed limit.	<p>All traffic signals at M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout will be updated to the latest intelligent traffic signal systems as part of the Project. This will include the use of MOVA (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) at Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank. MOVA responds to traffic conditions using a series of detectors and adapts signal timings to optimise the operation of a junction.</p> <p>The operation of M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank overall is improved with the Project compared to the scenario without the Project such that most junction approaches show a reduction in delay.</p> <p>In addition, new traffic signs will be provided to complement the new road scheme. A 50mph speed limit will be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						implemented between M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout including appropriate signage to ensure the speed limit is enforceable. Following consultation with various stakeholders including the police an area has also been zoned on the eastern side of Kemplay Bank Roundabout for mobile speed enforcement should this be necessary in the future.	
1141		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggestion for further feasibility work required to understand how proposed layout may impact on Eamont Bridge during normal operation, and when it is used as a diversion route.	We have consulted with all host local authorities on the potential impacts to the local road network. This feedback has been considered as part of the overall assessment and suitable mitigation has been identified where appropriate. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) includes details of the proposed A66 Dualling's impact on the local road network, including Eamont Bridge.	No
210	148620, 149408, 149777, 153801	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust	149355, 152261, 152262	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact on safety for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. In particular, respondents express concern that Kemplay Bank roundabout and M6 J40 would be dangerous for pedestrians. Others feel that the high number of crossing points could put pedestrians at risk for longer periods of time.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabouts have crossing facilities for walking and cycling. There is no evidence that the existing shared pedestrian/cycle provision at M6 J40 or at Kemplay Bank is unsafe. There have been no recorded collisions involving WCH users at either of these locations. The provision is the safest that can be provided.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						While the red man is showing all conflicting traffic is stopped so that people can cross safely. The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for this section of the Project has not raised any safety issues.	
99	149773, 151461, 152220, 152969, 153313, 153835, 153860	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152261, 153350	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the scheme would not provide adequate access to routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, in particular at the Kemplay Bank and M6 J40 roundabouts, Carlton village, near to Skirsgill depot and areas south of Penrith. Respondents say that provision and design of cycling and walking routes do not comply with published Government design principles.	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated walking, cycling and horse-riders underpass or bridge.</p> <p>All provision is designed to current design standards – both Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, and Local Transport Network (LTN 1/20) for cycle infrastructure design.</p> <p>The amendments to the M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank roundabout include revisions of the existing shared pedestrian and cycle routes to provide an equivalent safe route in the proposed situation.</p> <p>A path has been proposed into Skirsgill depot as part of the design. Any routes in areas south of Penrith or south of the A66 are out of scope and would need to be raised with Cumbria County Council. It should be noted that the detailed design of the schemes</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						has not yet been carried out. Our scope is to reconnect any severed PRowS only.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Penrith to Temple Sowerby – Environment' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
1023	152905, 152945			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the environment, and that any benefit from the scheme would not outweigh its environmental consequences. Respondents also express concern that the land proposed for mitigation would have more environmental benefits if it was left alone.	National Highways acknowledges those responses received which object to the Project going ahead in principle. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project. A full assessment of the effects of the Project on the receiving environment is detailed within the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4). The ES considers the development of the Project against a 'without development' baseline and where potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been proposed.	No
79		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Air quality	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the PEI Report include more information about air quality assessments, in particular expanding modelling to include Castlegate, Norfolk Road, and County Wildlife Sites to understand the impact of construction pollution and nitrogen levels, which would help local management of air pollution. Respondents also suggested that a construction traffic management plan	ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) presents an assessment of the impact of the Project on air quality. This Chapter considers construction and operational effects of the Project. The assessment has been updated since the preliminary assessment presented in the PEI Report using the latest traffic model and Project design data. The selection of human receptor locations assessed takes a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					<p>may be required to manage HGV movements within areas at high risk of air pollution.</p>	<p>proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in DMRB LA 105 where appropriate. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Castlegate and Norfolk Road in Penrith form part of the ARN. Beyond 200m from the ARN, air quality impacts on receptors are considered to be negligible in accordance with DMRB LA 105. Within the ES, the impact of nutrient nitrogen deposition on sensitive ecological receptors (designated ecological sites) within 200m of the ARN have been assessed following the guidance in DMRB LA 105 and this includes consideration of the impact on County Wildlife Sites. The additional contribution of ammonia (NH₃) emissions from vehicles to deposited nitrogen has also been determined. Where significant impacts on sensitive receptors within 200m of the ARN are identified, mitigation measures to limit</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						the impact of construction vehicle emissions are included in the Project's EMP (Application Document 2.7). The EMP includes an outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) which will be completed on an iterative basis by the Principal Contractor as the Project progresses through detailed design and will set out the proposed Temporary Traffic Management (TTM) measures (including for HGVs) for implementation during the construction of the Project.	
224		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Air quality	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the PEI Report's discussion of air quality, saying that the document should have specific details in regards the addresses of properties within Penrith where road linkages cause NO2 exceedances.	The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). This includes detail on property and road receptors that are potentially sensitive to air quality impacts. Since the reporting of preliminary environmental assessment in the PEI Report, baseline air quality monitoring has been carried out at 16 locations across the Affected Road Network (ARN). One residential monitoring location is situated at the junction of Clifford Road and the A592 in Penrith. Baseline monitoring results are set out within the ES.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, as a result of the Project, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter.	
1051	150189			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	A respondent expressing concern that roundabout traffic lights would have a detrimental impact on air quality and the environment.	The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2), considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project. A set of traffic lights will not significantly increase the impact on air quality.	No
1105		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Historic England expressing support for the overbridge for farm traffic as it has potential to limit impact upon scheduled archaeology.	National Highways welcomes the comments from Historic England in regards their support of the bridge.	No
497		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and Historic England expressing support for the protection and enhancement of cultural heritage sites, in particular Brougham Castle, Countess Pillar, and St Ninian's Church.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. The setting of heritage assets is considered and assessed, and this includes consideration of landscape/visual and noise impacts. Historic landscape character is also considered in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>The assessment identifies there will be no significant effect at Brougham Castle as a result of Project proposals. The Countess Pillar will be protected during construction and protection will be monitored to ensure this is effective. There will be no physical change to the monument. Once construction is complete a path will be arranged from parking which is to be constructed on the site of the former Llama Karma café east of the monument.</p> <p>At St Ninians Church the Project will provide a replacement car parking area enhancing access through a bridleway from the parking area to the church.</p> <p>The proposed improvement for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders, including disabled users will create a better link between these sites of cultural and historical interest, making them easier to access.</p>	
1106		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent stating that the PEI Report identifies a range of heritage assets, both designated and undesignated, which will be impacted by the construction of the new road. Respondents note the Consultation brochure erroneously describes the ring ditches at Brougham and the site	We thank Historic England for bringing this to our attention. We note that these assets were correctly described in the PEI Report and both the ring ditches at Brougham and the site of the Hartshorn Tree are not identified as scheduled assets within the ES.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					of the Hartshorn Tree as scheduled monuments (p31), but in fact neither site is scheduled and this should be rectified within the ES.		
1107		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Historic England suggesting where impacts to Brougham Roman Fort, Brougham Castle cannot first be mitigated by design (for example raising the level of the carriageway) then the footprint of the new road should be fully recorded in advance of construction.	Discussions have been ongoing with the Principal Contractor on the buildability of the route. Within the assessment it is assumed, as a worst case, that everything within the Order Limits will be impacted. To mitigate construction impacts, a preservation by record approach has been taken to document any findings within the footprint of the road made during surveys and is set out in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). The assessment concludes there will be no significant effects on Brougham Castle. A physical impact is identified on Brougham Roman Fort however through design development this impact has been minimised.	No
494		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that cultural heritage sites be maintained by balancing the scheme design with protection of Brougham Castle and the Countess Pillar, and request more information is provided regarding	No significant effect is identified at Brougham Castle. The Countess Pillar will be protected during construction and protection will be monitored to ensure this is effective. There will be no physical change to the monument. Once construction is complete a path will be provided from the east with a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					potential negative impacts on the latter.	parking area to enhance access to the Pillar. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.	
18	150465, 151456, 154243	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on cultural heritage sites. Respondents express concern about the potential impact on the Countess Pillar, saying that insufficient information has been provided. Respondents also query whether access to Countess Pillar will be provided.	As part of the public consultation materials during the Autumn 2021 consultation, National Highways published the PEI Report which provides information to enable the general public and stakeholders to understand the potential environmental effects of the Project, how these affects are proposed to be assessed and potential measures proposed to avoid or reduce such effects. The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are now reported in the ES. The Project design has been refined and seeks to reduce the impact of the A66 on local archaeological sites and historic buildings including the Countess Pillar. Impacts of the Project on the historic environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Countess Pillar will be protected during construction and protection will be monitored to ensure this is effective. There will be no physical change to the monument.</p> <p>The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of a Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Access to the Countess Pillar will be arranged from parking which is to be constructed on the site of the former Llama Karma café east of the monument.</p>	
703	152962	Shell	154003	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside and that the road and proposed tree-planting would negatively impact on the visual appearance of the area. Respondents also express concern about the proximity of trees to the North West Ethylene Pipeline.</p>	<p>The landscape-led approach to this Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the area. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes retaining woodland areas where practicable.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Our landscape architects and ecologists have developed environmental mitigation which considers and mitigates the visual impacts of the new A66 by identifying planting areas and appropriate species to screen intrusive views. This planting maximises biodiversity as well as delivering landscape mitigation. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) show how the mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits.</p> <p>Proposed planting has taken into account proximity to utilities and other constraints such as the North West Ethylene Pipeline (NWEP).</p>	
137		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - PEI Report - Landscape / visual	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that earthworks are designed to integrate into the surrounding landscape. They also suggest including an additional viewpoint north of Center Parks.	<p>ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects. The local landscape character has been considered when defining the appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented for the Project. In some cases, planting is not part of the existing landscape character so subtle and appropriate earth form is used to mitigate effects.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment considers the likely visual effects of the Project on sensitive visual receptors using representative</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						viewpoints. Each viewpoint has been photographed with a 360-degree panoramic allowing the flexibility of focusing the view where needed. Viewpoint 3.6 within the ES Chapter provides a representative view from the Center Parcs access road, north of Center Parcs.	
138		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - PEI Report - Landscape / visual	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the PEI- Report's discussion of landscape and visual effects, including: the photomontages of new viewpoints, the description of mitigation measures, and the identification of the potential negative impacts of additional infrastructure on the landscape.	National Highways welcomes this support for the scope and content of the PEI Report. The landscape-led approach to this Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the area. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting. The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
214		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		Environment - PEI Report - Landscape / visual	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and Natural England expressing concern relating to the PEI Report regarding landscape and visual amenity, including concerns that there would be a detrimental impact on the Lake District and the Yorkshire Dales National Parks.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects. All National Character Areas and local landscape character designations are identified. The assessment considers impacts on the national parks, but it should be noted that the Lake District National Park is 2.7km from the Project and the Yorkshire Dales National Park is 3.2km from the Project and no significant effects are identified.	No
896	152926			Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Light – Landscape and Visual	A respondent expressing concern that there would be an increase in light pollution as a result of the proximity of construction compounds to local properties.	National Highways has produced a EMP (Application Document 2.7) which outlines how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed. Construction lighting will be pointed away from residential receptors and located in such a way as to prevent spill of light onto neighbouring properties. Lighting will be minimised and only used for security or safe working and designed to latest standards to minimise glare and light spill.	No
618	150169, 153337, 153622,			Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents making suggestions pertaining to wildlife and habitats, including creating wildlife corridors	The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
	153901, 154246			Wildlife / habitats	across roads and between woodlands, considering ash dieback, considering biodiversity net gain, hedgerow construction, and avoiding harm to habitats where possible designing wetlands to avoid polluted road run off.	<p>associated mitigation requirements. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where required and practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, wildlife corridors and the creation of new hedgerows (alongside enhancement to existing hedgerows), species-rich grasslands, wetlands and woodland areas have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. Other mitigation measures to avoid fragmentation impacts include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Ash dieback has been a consideration both in the ecological survey design and also within EMP which secures the mitigation set out in the ES.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received from the Autumn 2021 consultation from stakeholders where practicable and appropriate. An indication of how the ecological and landscape mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Potential for pollution/runoff has been considered and implemented as part of the designs to ensure pollution/runoff from the road to adjacent sensitive habitats, including wetlands, is avoided.</p> <p>Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. The design has been informed by the principles of habitat replacement (i.e. replacement rations) set out in Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).	
172	152998, 153337, 153365, 153622, 154246		153628, 154232	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern that there would be a detrimental impact on biodiversity, wildlife and habitats, specifically mentioning Swine Gill Plantation and the River Eden. Respondents also express concern that there is insufficient provision of animal bridges as well as concern about the use of species-rich grassland as environmental mitigation.	The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project including Swinegill Plantation and the River Eden. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where required and practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design through engagement with key stakeholders. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>The response in relation to concerns over the use of species-rich grassland as environmental mitigation presented at the PEI Report stage is noted. Since the PEI Report, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received at the autumn 2021 consultation from stakeholders where practicable and appropriate. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans which show how mitigation could be implemented are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, greening of proposed overbridges, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. The number, frequency, type and design of the proposed crossing points have been carefully assessed and designed using collated baseline data for each species group to ensure all potential fragmentation effects as a result of the Project have been fully mitigated for. These include, but are not limited to,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) provided as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
125		Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	Eden District Council express support for the PEI Report's discussion of road drainage and water environments, saying that the main watercourses affected have been identified.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is welcomed.	No
126		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest that the PEI Report include further information on existing watercourses, ponds, and culverts.	Baseline information on the drainage features associated with the existing road are included within Appendix 14.3: Water Quality Assessment (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4). Details of other surface water features are included in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) this includes consideration of watercourses, ponds, and culverts.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
667	154140			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	One respondent suggesting that flooding and drainage be improved in the scheme design, noting the need for replacement of plastic drains to manage the potential increase in water from balancing ponds and historic flooding and drainage issues at land at Hornby.	Flood modelling has been carried out as part the design process and appropriate mitigation measures included in the proposals, please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). Historic flooding and drainage events have been used to inform the design of the scheme drainage design and structures where information has been available. Water from balancing ponds will be released at a rate agreed with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), and will not result in an increase of flooding downstream or to third party land (land outside the Order Limits) as a result. During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage. Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever possible, should this not be possible alternative solutions will be sought to rectify existing issues within the Order Limits this is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	No
620	152926, 152998, 153365, 153622,	Cumbria County Council	162162	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents expressing concern about flooding and drainage, including concerns that the effects of climate change have not been considered in	Drainage ponds have been sited in areas to avoid the flood plain. The design of all drainage features includes an appropriate uplift to worst	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
	154140, 154246	Shell		Flooding / drainage	<p>the proposed flood mitigation. Respondents also express concern about the proximity of drainage ponds to local properties and the location of construction compounds and balancing ponds on areas susceptible to flooding. Concern is also raised about drainage lines crossing NWEF pipelines. Respondents say that they are concerned about the information provided about balancing ponds and about whether water supplies would be diverted.</p>	<p>case storm events to allow for the effects of climate change. Ponds have been included to provide storage capacity during peak events as well as to provide treatment before water is discharged to any water courses. In the very unlikely event of exceedance of the ponds, the surrounding topography has been considered to ensure that nearby properties will not flood.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Where potential impacts to water supplies are identified alternative sources will be provided. There are no</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>impacts to water supply within this scheme.</p> <p>The proposed positions of drainage ponds have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography areas of flood plain, and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from engagement and consultation whilst minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>As part of the design process National Highways and their design team have been having ongoing discussions with Shell/Penspen to ensure the risk to the NWEF pipeline is minimised. This engagement will be ongoing throughout the detailed design and construction phases of the Project.</p>	
173	150169, 153337, 153622, 153901		148607, 153628	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	<p>Respondents suggesting tree planting and rewilding measures as part of the scheme. These include tree planting by the road for aesthetics and visual mitigation, or to improve drainage. Respondents state that this would contribute positively to biodiversity, and that trees planted should be native species.</p>	<p>Tree and woodland planting areas are identified along sections of the scheme with further details set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). Species selection for new planting would include a diverse mix of native trees of local provenance and characteristic of the local area. This will be secured through principles detailed within the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						Planting also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife.	
271	152643, 152926, 149353	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	154003	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern that there would be an increase in noise pollution as a result of the road congestion and that this would impact local residents, specifically mentioning Skirsgill Close.</p> <p>Concern also that adverse noise would impact local businesses through the removal of existing tree planting.</p>	<p>The concern in regards congestion in this area and potential impacts on noise is noted. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) section 7 states the following regarding Clifford Road which runs parallel and provides direct access to Skirsgill Close:</p> <p>The increase in Annual Average Daily Traffic (ADDT) on Clifford Road in 2044 (identified as the design year used to identify operational traffic levels) is 1990 vehicles per day, which would equate to around 200 vehicles per hour. This is due to an increase in movements accessing the area to the south of Penrith town centre around Sainsburys and Penrith Leisure Centre from the M6 north and south and the A66 west of Junction 40. These local movements currently use the A66 between Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank. However, as the speed has been reduced on the A66 to reflect the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>proposed 50mph speed limit, the model is diverting traffic via Clifford Road. This effect has directly led to reductions on the A6 Bridge Lane north of Kemplay Bank.</p> <p>However, it is considered unlikely that this impact would materialise. This is due to Clifford Road being traffic calmed and the Project improving the capacity of the A66, Kemplay Bank and Junction 40. It is suggested that this impact is monitored, with a view to implementing further traffic calming on Clifford Road should evidence of this rerouting come to fruition. The result of this would be that the traffic would reassign onto the A66 between Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank, and the A6 Bridge Lane / Victoria Road.</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation including those at Skirsgills Close, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). No significant adverse effects during construction or operation are identified at Skirsgills Close.</p> <p>All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable. It should be noted the Project noise assessment does not take account of any potential noise attenuation from trees, as generally</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						woodland is not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation. The removal or provision of trees in this area would therefore not impact upon the result of the operational noise impact assessment, which identifies no significant adverse effects on commercial receptors to the west of Ullswater Road (A592) or residential receptors in the Skirsgill Close area.	
993	153365, 152219			Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase traffic and greenhouse gas emissions, which they say would be contrary to climate change commitments.	The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in Environment Statement Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers traffic impacts of the Project as set out in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). In the context of the UK carbon budget targets, it is concluded in Chapter 7 that, in accordance with relevant policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the NPSNN), the GHG emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets.	No
1153		National Trust		Environment – general (non PEI Report) –	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on Acorn Bank.	The EMP (Application Document 2.7) provides mitigation measures to ensure that access is maintained	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
				Population and health		during construction for employment, community, health and recreational facilities. Given the distance of the Project from Acorn Bank no significant impacts are identified.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Penrith to Temple Sowerby' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1009	153043			Construction	A respondent expressing general support for the design and construction plans for the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme. It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself, as well as the A6 and A686. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders and local communities informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.	No
399	148568, 151331, 152943, 153043, 153809, 153925, 154134, 154213,	Shell	153376	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the engineering design of the project, including support for the additional lanes and the underpass at Center Parcs.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project. A core Project objective for the TP Project is to reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154250						
441	151462, 154134		153321	Land	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it does not impact on existing properties or recreational land, specifically mentioning the Old School House and local playing fields.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme.	No
981	148637, 149352, 149364, 149380, 149388, 150429, 150460, 150462, 152267, 152913, 153335, 153817, 153821		148586, 149776, 152936, 152983, 153321, 153824, 153948	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve safety for local traffic, transport and junctions. Specific areas mentioned include the Center Parcs junction, Culgaith and the B6412. These respondents state that additional capacity for HGVs will improve safety, by enabling more space for vehicles travelling at different speeds. Respondents also state that the route has become more dangerous over recent years, due to increased usage.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme. Core Project objectives for the A66 are to reduce congestion, improve safety and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
979	148582, 150429, 153377, 153954		148586, 151465, 152236	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the proposal on the grounds of improved access relating to traffic, transport and junctions. Respondents particularly cite improved connectivity to Center Parcs, as well as British Gypsum, Countess' Pillar and Ninekirks Church as important tourist and employment destinations which will be easier to access for employees and customers.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme. A new all-movement junction is proposed to connect the new A66 route with Center Parcs, allowing access to the holiday park and local roads. The junction will cater for all movements on and off the new A66 making it easier for users to join the main highway and prevent tailbacks at peak times. This two-level junction will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						provide left-in, left-out access and allow access to a length of the old A66 which is proposed to become a local road.	
272	148621, 149417, 150178, 152224, 152268, 152923, 153037, 153338, 154461	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce congestion, particularly at junctions. Particular areas mentioned include Center Parcs and Temple Sowerby, where the Project proposals would improve junctions.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme. A core Project objective for the A66 Project is to reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
977			153959	Traffic, transport and junctions - Commuting	A respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would be beneficial for commuters.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme.	No
980	151456, 153860, 153907			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing support on the grounds of improved access for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders along the route, particularly at Center Parcs and St Ninian's parking area.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme. National Highways is committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.	No
1032	152230, 152267, 152913			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would result in a safer route for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents state that crossing the road and accessing Center Parcs would be easier and safer.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
689	148550, 148564, 148565, 148569, 148572, 148578, 148583, 148585, 148588, 148590, 148591, 148593, 148600, 148603, 148604, 148613, 148614, 148615, 148626, 149351, 149370, 149394, 150439, 150462, 151331, 152243, 152268, 153327,		150194, 152983, 152988, 154190, 154192, 154199	General / no reason given / Needs Case	Respondents expressing general support for the scheme. These respondents remark that the plans look sensible, that the plan would improve the route, and that the choice of route was straightforward and intuitive.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153909, 153939, 154198, 154218, 162144						
1022	148566, 148585, 152911			Get on with it / overdue / Needs Case	Respondents expressing support for the scheme, stating that it should be completed as soon as possible.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme. The construction for the individual schemes is being developed. Construction is due to commence in 2024 and last for a total of 5 years. Within that period a number of schemes are likely to be worked on at the same time. Construction of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme is expected to take around 2 years. At this stage we are unable to say where it will fit into the 5-year window. Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable.	No
437	149374, 150416, 152943, 152945, 152981,			General / no reason given / Needs Case	Respondents expressing opposition for the proposals in this area, in general terms. These include opposition to the principle of road building, and to the Project in general. Respondents also state that the route	Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity and may threaten the transformational growth	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153365, 154134				should remain as it is.	<p>envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse initiative (Transport for the North, 2019) and the achievement of the Government levelling up agenda. The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives, particularly improving journey time reliability for road users, improving road safety, minimising adverse impacts on the environment and reducing the impact of the route on severance for local communities. The process to develop options and propose a best solution has taken into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the need for the scheme, the problems which it addresses and how it delivers the Project Objectives including support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and Government levelling up agenda.</p> <p>The outcome from the assessments of alternatives and options for the A66 dualling Project and the further development of the design for the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>DCO application demonstrate that:</p> <p>i) the A66 dualling delivers the greatest level of strategic benefits (compared with alternative highway interventions), with particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, see the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>ii) it makes a significant contribution to achieving the specific objectives around economic growth and strategic connectivity in terms of it economic, transport, social and environmental benefits in relation to cost, see the Case for the Project document (Application Document 2.2)</p> <p>iii) the route alignment that has been taken forward into the DCO application is in accordance with policy of the National Networks National Policy Statement, see the Legislation and Policy Compliance document (Application Document 3.9) and is preferred in relation to a range of environmental, economic, cost, transport and social criteria compared with alternative alignments, see the Project Development Overview Report</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(Application Document 4.1)	
631	152268	Cumbria County Council	152910	Construction - Disruption	Respondents including Cumbria County Council suggesting construction disruption to Center Parcs should be minimised as much as possible for bus services and changeover days accessing the Village.	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan, as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP, Application Document 2.7 - compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented. The EMP identifies that following consultation with the relevant local planning authority and relevant bus operators, appropriate mitigation measures must be implemented in respect of bus stops/routes potentially impacted by the works with careful construction</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>planning and alternative provision where reasonably practicable.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that bus services will be able to continue to operate and that any disruption is minimised.</p> <p>The design team have engaged with our buildability consultant to ensure that the junction at Center Parcs can be constructed whilst ensuring adequate access is provided at all times to Center Parcs. To help alleviate some of the disruption caused to traffic within the scheme, diversion roads are likely to be considered as part of the traffic management strategy to help ensure the construction works can be undertaken safely and efficiently, whilst ensuring the throughput of traffic and adequate access to the holiday park.</p> <p>A number of communication measures will be implemented to ensure that all stakeholders are aware well in advance of any works taking place and any potential disruption.</p>	
400		Shell		Construction - Infrastructure	Concern that Shell's infrastructure is at risk from the proposed Project and therefore raises concerns about managing costs associated with	National Highways welcomes further engagement with Shell and notes that engagement has taken place throughout the design phase of the	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					utilities diversions and surveys and the need to work with National Highways.	<p>Project to understand the line and level of the pipeline. The proposed construction works will aim to avoid the pipeline as far as reasonably practicable, to ensure risk to both the Project and pipeline are minimised.</p> <p>Any new carriageway that crosses the pipeline will require the construction of a protective concrete slab.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor is aware of the requirements to manage risk and supervise any works in the vicinity of the pipeline. Further discussions will take place with Shell as the Project progresses.</p>	
397	149380			Construction - Priority of works	Respondents making suggestions to prioritise the construction works for schemes closest to Penrith first.	<p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases. Construction of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme is expected to be split into two stages each taking around 2 years. At this stage, National Highways has programmed for the first stage to start in 2024. This is subject to change however.</p> <p>Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>disruption as far as reasonably practicable and will continue to be developed by the Principal Contractor in line with the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7). Information on the construction timescales is noted within the Environmental Statement Chapter 2, The Project, (Application Document 2.7) (compliance with which is secured in the DCO).</p> <p>With a project of this complexity it is not feasible to undertake works from the west and progress east through each scheme systematically. To help minimise disruption over longer periods, assist with material cut and fill balances and minimise additional land take, works on a number of schemes are required to take place at the same time.</p>	
397		Shell		Construction - Priority of works	Shell suggests the Contractor must undertake the following during works: stakeout the pipeline, erect a secure fence around the pipeline, create suitable crossings of pipeline if required, no lifting of the pipeline, control excavation and backfilling, conduct vibration monitoring as needed, prepare Method Statements and risk assessments, and obtain written agreement from Shell to work near and around the pipeline.	National Highways welcomes further engagement with Shell and notes that engagement has taken place throughout the design phase of the Project to understand the line and level of the pipeline. The proposed construction works will aim to avoid the pipeline as far as reasonably practicable, to ensure risk to both the Project and pipeline are minimised. Any new carriageway that crosses the pipeline will require the	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction of a protective measures to prevent any damage to the asset. The Principal Contractor is aware of the proposed requirements and control measures required to be implemented as part of the PC's standard safe excavation and construction practises near services, when working near or over the Shell pipeline. The PC is aware of the need to manage risk and supervise any works in the vicinity of the pipeline. Due to the sensitivity of the pipeline and the proximity to live traffic on the A66, additional control measures will always look to be implemented that would align with those that Shell would expect. Further discussions will take place with Shell as the Project moves into detailed design.</p>	
1045	150465, 151347			Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	<p>Respondents suggesting alternative spend to the Project on facilities for the Project. These include a museum displaying any artefacts uncovered during construction of the Project, and a new café at the Countess' Pillar.</p>	<p>Provision of museum and café facilities are outside of the scope of the Project. National Highways have opened a 'Project Hub' as a facility open to the local community and apprentices and this is located in the former Llama Karma Kafe, Brougham, Penrith CA10 2AB.</p>	No
438	154134	Penrith Town Council		Engineering design and development	<p>Respondents including Penrith Town Council and Cumbria County Council suggesting that various mitigation</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the feedback received. With regards potential stray balls from</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Cumbria County Council		- Mitigation	measures be included in the engineering design of the scheme, including protecting the road from stray balls from playing fields; ensuring that playing fields are not negatively impacted by the scheme; sound barriers by the road; and general congestion mitigation.	playing fields; boundary treatments will be determined at the detailed design stage to ensure they are fit for purpose taking into account the uses of land outside of the highway. The scheme is only marginally closer to the playing fields and will therefore not directly impact the land or surroundings of the playing fields as shown on the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) and associated Land Plans (Application Document 5.13) Detailed noise modelling has been carried out as part of ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) with noise mitigation interventions proposed at locations where the need has been identified by this assessment and incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).	
146	149357, 151458, 152911, 152929, 152944, 153622	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Shell	152910, 153390, 153623, 154491	Engineering design and development - Modified design	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting modifications to the engineering design of the route. These include: an access road for the B6262; longer slip roads, particularly at Center Parcs; improved signage, particularly in tourist areas; a technical suggestion regarding pipelines and including scenic viewpoints.	The design of all junctions has been carried out fully in accordance with National Highways' latest design standards. This includes the design of all compact grade separated junctions such as that proposed in the vicinity of Center Parcs as well as merge and diverge slip roads at priority junctions such as the junction of the A66 with the B6262. New signage will be provided as part of the proposals including consideration of tourist	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>signs.</p> <p>National Highways has engaged with Shell Oil regarding the pipeline that traverses the A66</p> <p>This engagement has confirmed the line and level of the affected apparatus and identified suitable protection measures that may be required. This engagement will be ongoing throughout the detailed design and construction phases of the Project.</p> <p>Any new carriageway that crosses the pipeline will require the construction of a protective concrete slab. The Principal Contractor is aware of the requirements to manage risk and supervise any works in the vicinity of the pipeline. Further discussions will take place with Shell as the Project progresses.</p>	
1140		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Modified design	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting an opportunity to improve the signal operations at Eamont Bridge should be considered to mitigate the physically constrained site. Alternative junction arrangements could be possible for the A66 at Brougham Castle to alleviate problem by allowing right turns in and out.	<p>The traffic signals at Eamont Bridge are outside of the scope of the Project and would be in the remit of the local authority</p> <p>The A66 upgrade to dual carriageway removes all right turn movements from side roads and accesses and the suggested right turn at Brougham Castle would therefore not align with the Project aims and objectives.</p>	No
984	148616, 152152,			Engineering design and	Respondents suggesting that additional lanes be included in the engineering design of the scheme.	The scope of the Project is to dual the remaining sections of the A66. Analysis of traffic flows and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153802			development - More lanes	These respondents believe that the plans should either include additional lanes, or that bridges and other infrastructure should be designed to facilitate additional lanes in the future.	subsequent traffic modelling is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity and that sufficient measures are in place to ensure safety with the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment. (Application Document 3.7).	
894	148549, 148589, 148592, 152202, 152914, 152923			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting that motorhome or other rest facilities be included in the design of the project. These respondents suggest that motorhome facilities should be of an Aires type, close to local towns, designed specifically for motorhomes rather than HGVs, and include provisions for fresh water as well as waste disposal.	The provision of motorhome rest facilities is not the responsibility of National Highways. However, whilst overnight facilities for HGV users is also not within the scope of the Project our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route (which may also benefit motorhome users) but this will be a separate initiative from the A66 Project.	No
390		Shell		Engineering design and development - Coordinate design	Respondents suggesting that the development of the engineering design be coordinated with other parties, particularly Shell, to ensure that gas infrastructure is not affected by the project.	National Highways and the Project team have been undertaking consultation with Shell/Penspen throughout this phase of the Project with a view to minimising risk to the pipeline and the Project. The design was reviewed in Stage 3 to minimise impact on Shell. A survey of the pipeline in conjunction with Shell took place to confirm the line and level of the pipeline. Consequently,	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						measures have been considered in the design to ensure the Project is buildable in a safe and efficient manner . Discussions have taken place with Shell/Penspen to understand their requirements to work around and protect the pipeline. Options have subsequently have been developed and discussed to ensure a robust solution can be accommodated, The adjacent access to the wastewater treatment plant was amended to minimise the impact on the pipeline and additional protection measures incorporated/allowed for. In addition, during construction the appointed Principal Contractor will liaise with Shell/Penspen to ensure all appropriate measures are considered for this nationally significant piece of infrastructure.	
978	150189, 153888			Engineering design and development - Prioritise other upgrades	Respondents suggesting that other upgrades be prioritised over those of the project, including upgrading the M6 junction and the Kemplay Bank roundabout.	The Project includes upgrade works on both the M6 Junction 40 and the Kemplay Bank roundabout. National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the Preferred Route Announcement at the end of PCF Stage 2 in 2019.	
971	149394, 153874, 153901			Engineering design and development - Visual mitigation	Respondents suggesting that visual mitigation be included in the engineering design of the route, including stone cladding on bridges, additional planting, and mitigations to reduce light pollution.	Landscape visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration of the design. Please refer to the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) which sets out the key guiding principles to be taken forward to the next stage of detailed design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) that presents the potential impacts of the scheme and any required mitigation measures.	No
298	148617, 150189, 152152, 154243			Engineering design and development - Alternative route	Respondents suggesting alternative routes for the design of the scheme. Respondents specifically mention following a disused railway line, adding additional bypasses instead of the main route, and only creating a dual carriageway between Center Parcs and the A6.	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the scheme justification is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). The proposed solution for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby section of the route is the best solution that has been identified from an exhaustive appraisal of options. This section closely follows the alignment of the existing A66 whilst also maintaining access to a number of residential properties. By widening the existing A66 we reduce adverse impacts on the surrounding environment.</p>	
767	149367, 149374, 151469, 153365			Traffic, transport and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting reducing traffic demand, which would therefore make the planned works unnecessary, and alleviate existing safety and congestion issues.	Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the need for the scheme, the problems which it addresses and how it delivers the Project Objectives including supporting the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and Government's levelling up agenda.</p> <p>A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. The model shows that traffic demand increases with the scheme as the route becomes more attractive to vehicles. Traffic growth information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity and that sufficient measures are in place to ensure safety with the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	
731	149374, 153365			Traffic, transport and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents suggesting that sustainable public transport should be prioritised over cars and other road vehicles. These respondents particularly mention trains, which they state should be used to transport construction materials.	Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network, leading to worsening problems on the A66. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith which could be upgraded as an alternative. The Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Strategic Study (at Stage 0) considered a number of different interventions for transport solutions across the Pennines, including non-highway modes, as set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>Regarding the transportation of construction materials, refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Material Assets and waste (Application Document 3.2) that presents the potential impacts of the scheme and any required mitigation measures. Chapter 11 states that where required, aggregate based materials will be sourced from local quarries where possible. Due to the location of the Project and surrounding quarries, transportation of materials by rail is unlikely to be feasible.</p>	
1142		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting the A592 junction with Clifford Road is a junction that will require enhancement to improve safety concerns	We are not proposing to amend the junction of the A592 and Clifford Rd as it falls outside of the scope of works for the A66 upgrade. Minimal works are proposed in this location to tie the upgrade works into the existing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>network.</p> <p>A Road Safety Audit has been carried out that identifies recommendations and the design team has carefully considered the recommendations and accepted where appropriate the items raised in the Audit. Please refer to the Transport Assessment Chapter 9 Road Safety (Application Document 3.7 for further information.</p>	
299	148549, 148582, 149380, 149417, 153384, 154243, 154462	Cumbria County Council	148586, 152910	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council suggesting control measures pertaining to traffic, transport and junctions. These include speed limits, additional signage to redirect certain traffic types during construction and operation, and adaptable access points for emergencies.</p>	<p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs (including signs for local services and places of interest) will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>In the operation stage, a 50mph speed limit has been included between Kemplay Bank and M6 Junction 40 for a number of reasons including retaining existing connections and links. New traffic signs will be provided to allow the speed limit to be enforced and an area for mobile speed enforcement will be incorporated on the new Kemplay Bank Roundabout overbridges to be used as necessary.</p> <p>Further information on the traffic impacts of the Project is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) with the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) also illustrate the proposed design layout and any key</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>features that are associated with the upgrade of the A66. The Construction Traffic Management Plan forming Annex B13 to the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) will provide further details on how traffic will be controlled during construction and will ensure appropriate measures are in place.</p> <p>Traffic management during construction of the Project will be planned to accommodate traffic on the existing A66 and surrounding road network whilst permitting construction works to be carried out safely. As detailed designs are developed on each scheme, bespoke construction traffic management plans will be produced acknowledging current A66 traffic flows, turning requirements and stakeholder access needs. Where local access is required to be maintained, including that for blue light services, construction traffic management plans will look to be adapted, with the construction teams working closely with the stakeholders, local councils and blue light services. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Project for further information (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
187	154140	Cumbria County		Traffic, transport	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District	A traffic model has been developed to support the proposals in addition to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council Eden District Council Shell		and junctions - Access	Council suggesting measures to improve access for traffic in the area. These include access lanes for Center Parcs, Penrith, Brougham and the Shell pipeline in the area.	detailed junction models for Kemplay Bank (Penrith) and Center Parcs. The modelling work undertaken shows that access lanes for Center Parcs, Penrith and Brougham show acceptable levels of performance. This has demonstrated that the Project achieves acceptable levels of performance in terms of journey time, reliability and reducing congestion between Scotch Corner and Penrith, including in the locations noted. All new or improved junctions have been designed in accordance with National Highways' latest standards. Further information on the traffic impacts of the Project is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) in Chapter 8 which show the change in forecast traffic with the Project compared to without the Project in the location of each scheme. Detailed proposals for each project scheme are provided in Chapter 3 – Development proposals. Further detail can also be found in the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) The design team are aware of the existing Shell pipeline and have engaged with Shell/Penspen, National Highways' utility specialist and National Highways' buildability consultant to ensure that risk to the pipeline and Project are appropriately managed.	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
209			152910, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents suggesting additional safety measures pertaining to traffic, transport and junctions, including longer slip roads, more junctions, and additional lighting.	The proposals have been developed in accordance with National Highways latest standards and guidance. A Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been carried out with recommendations incorporated or highlighted for inclusion at detailed design. The RSA did not highlight deficiencies in slip road design/ length. Junctions are located to optimise connections into the local road network and in proximity to where gaps in the central reserve have been removed. The A66 dualling upgrade will not be illuminated with street lighting, in accordance with DMRB standards.	Yes
559		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that farm vehicles be permitted to use walking, cycling and horse-riding routes, provided that this can be done safely.	Some Public Rights of Way that will be shared use for farm accommodation access and walking and cycling. It does not apply to every path, and in discussion with some landowners they do not want all tracks to be used by walkers and cyclists if they don't have to be, due to safety aspects for users. Further detail of farm vehicle use is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals (application Document 2.4).	No
719	151462, 151482, 151484			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	Respondents suggesting measures to promote active travel, including constructing more cycle paths and more generally encouraging the use of active west to east travel.	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the Project extents for the scheme between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. In response to stakeholder	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation process, enhanced east-west walking & cycling connectivity has now been provided on the majority of schemes which will make the route more attractive and accessible from an active travel perspective. These facilities are typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway, or in the verge along the de-trunked A66 (where sections remain).</p> <p>Proposals for PRow are shown in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
97	148620, 149357, 149359, 149369, 149379, 149407, 149773, 149777, 150175,	Penrith Town Council Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Temple Sowerby	148623, 152988, 153381, 154225, 154232	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cycleway/ footpath / bridleway	<p>Respondents suggesting that a dedicated route is constructed for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents specifically request an active travel route adjacent to the route serving Center Parcs for employees, as well as servicing areas such as St Ninians for visitors. Respondents suggest that such a route would bring the Project in line with government climate change commitments and should be an</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRow) will remain. If a PRow is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>The current byway and footpath at the Center Parcs junction currently</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
150460, 151469, 151472, 151482, 151483, 151484, 151486, 151487, 151491, 151493, 152211, 152215, 152218, 152230, 152237, 152238, 152248, 152903, 152906, 152907, 152925, 152930, 152941, 152963, 152964, 152978, 152979, 152997,	Parish Council				essential part of the Project.	<p>terminate at the existing A66. It is proposed to connect both routes to the new grade separated junction to enable onward journeys and connectivity, including St. Ninians. A parallel shared cycleway/footway is proposed to be provided on the north side of the A66 dual carriageway between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. Further details, including a plan of the proposed junction is provided in section 4.3.2 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>The additional sections of proposed shared walking/cycling track will connect into existing signed provision and with future plans within Cumbria County Council Cycling Vision. As such, a connected route from M6 J40 to Brough will be created.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153314, 153362, 153377, 153384, 153799, 153801, 153807, 153809, 153822, 153835, 153861, 153874, 153907, 153911, 153912, 153925, 153929, 154250, 154268, 162154						
973	148619, 152978, 153384, 153799			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting that the needs of motorised users of the route not be prioritised over those of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents for the scheme between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.	
184	154134, 154140, 154243	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Shell	153883, 154232	Consultation	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council requesting further information on potential road closures, further traffic modelling on Center Parcs change over days, further environmental survey details, risk assessments and information about other potential routes.	<p>Analysis within the Transport Assessment (Application Document: 3.7) has been carried out to model the changeover day and specific peak hours at the proposed Center Parcs access.</p> <p>Road closures and diversions will be kept to a minimum through detailed construction design. For example, by building offline sections and then connecting the old and new sections of the A66. For online sections the new carriageways could be constructed alongside the operational A66, and traffic moved onto the new road while the existing road is upgraded. Refer to ES Volume 1 Chapter 2 The Project that outlines the construction approach.</p> <p>Information on the environmental surveys that have been carried out is located in each of the Environmental Statement chapters contained in ES Volume 1 (Application Document 3.2). Further pre-construction surveys and risk assessments for air quality (dust), geology and soils (contamination), groundwater, and foundations are identified in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Reference 2.7).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The EMP also provides a requirement to approve a Construction Traffic Management Plan, including diversionary routes following stakeholder consultation (reference D-GEN-10), based on the draft CTMP within Annex B13 of the EMP.</p> <p>We will continue to work with impacted landowners and other stakeholders as we move through examination of the DCO Application and, if granted, into the construction phase .</p>	
687	152915, 153365, 153901, 154136, 154244			Community impact - People	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact on the local community including on schools, children, open spaces, and people's livelihood. Concern was raised about the impacts of land taken from a primary school and the assessment for this and a request for further information about it.</p>	<p>Regarding comments about schools and school children, it is acknowledged that Hunter Hall School at Penrith and Temple Sowerby Church of England Primary School are located within 500m of the study area of the Project. No land is being acquired from the afore-mentioned schools and they are not directly impacted by the proposals. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) identifies that during construction a temporary indirect moderate adverse impact is identified at Temple Sowerby Church of England Primary School due to the construction phase works including dust, noise and vibration and landscape impacts. However during operation improvements in travel conditions due to improved connectivity resulting from the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>improvements made by the scheme result in a permanent moderate beneficial impact at this location.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the ES and demonstrates compliance with relevant environmental legislation. This will be further developed by the Principal Contractor and will set out measures to control construction traffic including proposed diversion routes, , dust andnoise. It will also set out the requirements for the Principal Contractor to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard.</p> <p>Regarding open spaces, the environmental assessment has accounted for open spaces. Mitigation and enhancement measures have been included in the design including</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>providing any common land which is lost as a result of the Project. Refer to ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) for more detail.</p> <p>Regarding comments about livelihoods, an assessment of the location and number of businesses at risk of demolition, or from which land would be required or have access affected is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). i</p>	
621	149353, 152915, 152926, 153357, 153851, 153923, 154246			Community impact - Property	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on property.</p> <p>Respondents state that the scheme, including power lines, construction sites and the road itself, would infringe on gardens and homes, restrict access to property, and reduce property value.</p>	<p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on property is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). The assessment follows DMRB Guidance LA 112 and concludes that at operation, in relation to private property and housing, the scheme would not differ significantly from the baseline situation with only minor impact arising from a discernible change in amenity.</p> <p>The construction of the scheme will require acquisition of a number of properties. All other properties are recorded as experiencing indirect effects for which with the application of the measures outlined in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) reduces the impacts such that there are no likely significant effects. During</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction, where access to private properties and businesses is affected, temporary alternative access will be provided and agreement will be sought with the landowner and/or tenant(s) as necessary, via the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Annex B13 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) provides an essay plan and template for the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).</p> <p>Landscape visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration of the design. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) assesses the visual impact and determines, where required, appropriate mitigation in the form of planting. ES Appendix 10.6 Schedule of Visual Effects (Application Document 3.4) sets out the visual assessment for identified receptors. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outline the how mitigation planting could be implemented within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that there will be temporary adverse effects during construction experienced by receptors in close proximity such as Whinfell Park Cottages and Ash Hill Cottages along Cliburn Road. These effects will be minimised through application of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and by restricting</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						construction as close to the existing A66 as practicable. Following planting at Year 15 no significant effects are recorded.	
1000	152915, 152943			Community impact - Health	Respondents expressing that the Project would have a detrimental impact on local residents' physical and mental health, with specific reference to noise pollution and the potential loss of employment that would be caused by the Project.	<p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the local population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where practicable.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the Project and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Regarding employment, a range of jobs will be generated during the construction programme. This will include unskilled and skilled</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction jobs as well as engineering, planning and management professionals. The majority of professional and skilled workers are likely to come from outside the local area, with jobs available to the local population likely to comprise mainly low-skilled or unskilled positions. Individuals from within the study area who gain employment on the construction of the Project may experience positive health effects including improved mental health and increased ability to access healthy lifestyle choices through increased income. There is a potential for long-term benefits to health and wellbeing through training and improved future employment prospects. Individuals who are currently unemployed or in low-paid or insecure employment will have the highest potential for health benefits. The total number of construction jobs, and the proportion of jobs likely to be available to the local community are not known at this stage and therefore the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p>	
632	148591, 149353, 152943, 153809	Brougham Parish Council Cumbria County	152910	Construction - Disruption	Respondents including Brougham Parish Council, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the construction of the pProject would	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council Eden District Council			<p>disrupt local residents, including concerns that speed limits, lane closures, and impacts on the 104 bus route would increase journey times. Respondents also express concern that local roads, including the B6262, U3182, and C3056, would become rat-runs.</p>	<p>including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, noting the point about speed limits, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7) considers the potential for rerouting on roads such as the U3182, the B6262, and the C3056 and states that journey times on the A66 (through the roadworks) will be monitored during the construction phase to ensure significant unnecessary delays are avoided, to minimise traffic increases on unsuitable local roads</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), (Application Document 2.7 - compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented. The EMP identifies that following consultation with the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>relevant local planning authority and relevant bus operators, appropriate mitigation measures must be implemented in respect of bus stops potentially impacted by the works with careful construction planning and alternative provision where reasonably practicable.</p> <p>The Project will attempt to limit the number of full carriageway closures to minimise impact and disruption to the travelling public as detailed within EMP Annex B13 and details of speed limits will be provided within the CTMP developed by the Principal Contractor. In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, for example bridge installations, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p>	
632		Brougham Parish Council		Construction - Disruption	Brougham Parish Council expressing concern that the U3182 Station Road is a single tracked road running from Cliburn to the A66 and has become a regular rat run for traffic avoiding the A66 west of Temple Sowerby. Suggesting it will be used during construction and create access and	The point about existing regular rat run on the U3182 Station Road from Cliburn is acknowledged. The Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					increased congestion.	<p>possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7) considers the potential for rerouting on roads such as the U3182 Station Road through Cliburn and states that journey times on the A66 (through the roadworks) will be monitored during the construction phase to ensure significant unnecessary delays are avoided, to minimise traffic increases on unsuitable local roads</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan, as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP, Application Document 2.7 - compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of proposed traffic management measures, 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>including phasing plans, route restrictions and speed limits;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of planned carriageway and local road closures, including proposed stakeholder and community engagement protocols in advance of closures; • Details of proposed diversion routes, durations of use and proposals for encouraging compliance with designated diversion routes (with consideration for potential noise impacts); and • Details of significant events and seasonal traffic and proposals for how these will be managed during the works. <p>. Details will also be provided within the CTMP on proposed engagement with stakeholders, community groups and individual properties, facilities and businesses affected by the proposed traffic management and advice for the public regarding ways to raise complaints or request information.</p>	
408		Health and Safety		Construction	Respondents expressing concern about the impact construction works	As part of the design process National Highways and their design team have	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Executive, NSIP Consultations Shell		- Infrastructure	would have on utilities infrastructure operated by Shell, Esso Oil and National Grid. Respondents state that these operators need to be consulted before construction begins.	<p>been having ongoing discussions with utility providers and Statutory Undertakers (including those cited) to minimise risk from the Project to their apparatus. This engagement has confirmed the line and level of the affected apparatus and identified suitable protection measures that may be required. This engagement will be ongoing throughout the detailed design and construction phases of the Project.</p> <p>The draft DCO also contains protective provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers, dealing with (amongst other things) the protection of existing assets. Please refer to the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) for further information. The protective provisions have been discussed with statutory undertakers, with some ongoing. A set of bespoke protective provisions have been agreed with National Grid and are included in the draft DCO.</p>	
1021	152911			Economics - Cost	A respondent expressing concern about whether Center Parcs is contributing financially to the Project or not, on the grounds that Center Parcs is a cause of congestion locally.	The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the Government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						UK. Center Parcs is not contributing to the Project. For further information in relation to the funding for the Project, please see the Funding Statement (Application Document 5.6).	
688	149350, 153622, 154244		154003	Economics - Local economy / Land	Respondents expressing concern that the Project would negatively impact the local economy, with reference to local agriculture, a wedding business, a hotel and a restaurant.	An overview of the economic assessment of the Project is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). An assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses and agricultural land holdings, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment also provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised. The impact of construction work on traffic will vary across the local area throughout the scheme construction phases. Works that are considered more disruptive will generally take place outside of peak hours (such as that at Junction40) so that the change in local traffic conditions and any associated disruption is kept to a minimum. Detailed construction	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						phasing including traffic management measures are to be developed further in the next stage of design development and construction preparation and will seek to keep construction phase disruption to an absolute minimum. The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan, as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP, Application Document 2.7 - compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented.	
171			153623, 153628, 162162	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents expressing concern about the mitigation aspects of the design, including concern that the Species Rich Grassland (SRG) and hedgerow would negatively impact on agricultural land use and future environmental schemes and that further information about proposed mitigation should be provided.	Since the PEI Report the Project design has been refined and, National Highways has had regard to the need to reduce land take. Since the completion of ecology and ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) the mitigation requirements have been finalised.. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) identify how ecological and landscape mitigation could be implemented within the Order Limits. Maintenance and monitoring measures are outlined in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Annex B1	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						of the EMP, the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, specifies the species to be planted and the management required. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential effect of the Project on agricultural land holdings which was used to help develop mitigation measures within the EMP to ensure no negative impact with the adjacent land uses.	
558		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Shell		Engineering design and development - Infrastructure	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council Respondents expressing concern that the scheme design would have a detrimental impact on existing infrastructure, including concerns that NWEF pipelines would be exposed. Respondents also express concern about the responsibility of maintenance for the proposed underpass at Whinfell Park Cottages.	The team have engaged with Shell/Penspen throughout this phase of the Project to minimise any risk to the Project and pipeline. National Highways is continuing to engage with Shell in relation to its pipeline with a view to agreeing appropriate protections for the apparatus. With regards to Whinfell underpass, National Highways will retain ownership of the bridge including responsibility for inspection and maintenance.	No
1017	149353, 152152, 152943			Engineering design and development - General	Respondents expressing concern about the scheme design, including concerns about the rise in elevation between Eden and Eamont valleys, as well as concerns that the acceleration zone is too short where the speed limit increases to 70mph and that drystone walls, trees and shrubs are not included in the drawings.	The scheme aims to integrate with the surroundings and align as closely as practicable with the existing topography, whilst complying with the appropriate design standards. The new road will be designed to fully comply with National Highways latest design standards, including the design of merge/acceleration facilities. In	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>addition, a Road Safety Audit will be carried out at various stages of the Project, which will aim to ensure that safety implications are fully considered for all road users.</p> <p>A comprehensive package of environmental mitigation measures will be provided as part of the works including planting, acoustic barrier and drystone walling. Please refer to the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) where appropriate boundary treatments such as drystone walling are secured, and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) in relation to mitigation planting and integration.</p>	
686	148605, 148606, 152905, 152915, 152920, 152926, 152962, 152970, 153355, 153622, 154244		148607, 153352, 153373, 153623, 162162	Land - Agricultural	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme will negatively impact agricultural land that is currently in use for conservation, arable crops, shooting and grazing, including for a Pedigree Limousin Herd.</p> <p>Respondents also raise concerns that tree-planting is an insufficient mitigation for the land take of productive agricultural farmland, and concerns about by whom and how this land will be managed if the proposed changes take place. Specific locations mentioned include Whinfell Park Farm and Winderwath Estate.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health includes an assessment, following the methodology set out in DRMB LA 112, on Agricultural Land Holdings. This assessment assigns a high sensitivity and returns a moderate significant effect on the Winderwath Estate and Whinfell Park land holdings as a result of the loss of land.</p> <p>Where possible, the requirements of landowners have been factored into the mitigation design in order to reduce the potential effects. It should be noted that proposed planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme including required mitigation measures. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>We have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. The completed surveys have been used to inform the ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Application Document 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2) sets out the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>Permanent land take is only proposed where necessary. Details of this proposal have been provided to the landowner in the form of land interest plans denoting land required for permanent acquisition, land over which new rights are proposed to be created and acquired, and land which is proposed to be subject to temporary possession to facilitate the construction of the scheme.</p> <p>National Highways continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the Project through our dedicated public liaison officers , to understand the effects of the Project on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis as appropriate.</p>	
440	154134		154003	Land - Other	<p>Respondents expressing concern about wider negative impacts of land take, specifically mentioning reducing the land for redevelopment projects including building plans for new apartments and residential homes. Respondents also express concern about the loss of a playing field.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the concern about valuable land being taken by the Project. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>In May 2020 we announced our preferred route which allowed Local Authorities to inform developers of the proposed route. This is designed to help inform potential development plans.</p> <p>Where public open space is required for the Project (at Kemplay Bank for example) replacement open space has been provided. We have consulted with neighbours and the wider community as well as the local authority about this proposed re-provision. For further details, please refer to the Statement of Reasons (Application Document 5.8).</p>	
269	149357, 151469, 152178, 152926, 153038, 153801, 153936, 154244	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150453, 153842	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about transport connectivity, including concerns that there is a lack of junctions to and from the B6262. Respondents also express concern about connectivity for emergency services and local residents.</p>	<p>The Project aims to reduce crossing manoeuvres of the A66 including right turns into and out of priority junctions with the aim of improving road safety. It is accepted that in some instances this will result in slightly longer routes for some traffic using side roads on the A66. The junction strategy for the Project has ensured that grade separated junctions are provided at suitable intervals to keep journey times to acceptable levels.</p> <p>The Project seeks to retain connectivity to minor roads and properties throughout the route whilst improving safety along the existing single carriageway sections. Full details of traffic flows during construction and operation are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>included in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7)</p> <p>The Project proposes to introduce a new westbound left on/left off junction to the B6262 to facilitate safe access to the local road network. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>There has been significant engagement between the design team and Cumbria Police/Cumbria Fire & Rescue with the view to ensuring that access for emergency vehicles to the existing station will be unaffected by the works.</p>	
247	149353, 149380, 152152, 152911, 152919, 154243	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Shell U.K. Limited	151465, 152910, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that there would be an increase in traffic congestion, specifically mentioning where the A66 meets the M6, Eamont Bridge, the B6262, Culgaith, and concern about congestion on Center Parcs changeover days.</p> <p>Respondents express concern about the effect that this would have on local roads.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment contains the impact of the Project between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. Widening of the approaches to and circulatory carriageway of M6 Junction 40 is planned, together with grade separation of Kemplay Bank Roundabout and the Center Parcs access. The operational assessment for Kemplay Bank, M6 J40, B6262 and Center Parcs junction shows that the proposed junction layouts have an acceptable operational performance in 2046 on an average weekday. An additional assessment has been carried out to assess the performance of the Project on a typical Friday</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(which is the busiest day). Access to Culgaith village is outside of the scope/extents of this project and is accessed from the recently upgraded Temple Sowerby Bypass	
302	148582, 151458, 152178, 152926, 152929, 152943, 152998, 153365, 154243	Brougham Parish Council	148628, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents including Brougham Parish Council expressing concern about traffic safety, including concerns that a higher speed limit and road capacity would increase the number of accidents on the road, and that the slip road would be too short to allow for safe acceleration onto the A66. Respondents also express concern about the B6412/A66 junction and that an insufficient number of junctions have been proposed along this section of the route.	<p>The Project is designed to the latest NationalHighways' standards and guidance. These include new diverges, merges and connector roads. A number of measures have been included to aid road safety including removing crossing manoeuvres of the A66 by ensuring that all junctions are either grade separated, compact grade separated or left-in, left-out. A Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been carried out with recommendations incorporated or highlighted for inclusion at detailed design. The RSA did not highlight deficiencies in slip road design/ length. Junctions are located to optimise connections into the local road network and in proximity to where gaps in the central reserve have been removed.</p> <p>The junction of the B6412 and the A66 is on a currently dualled section of th route and is therefore out of the scope of this project.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the number of accidents saved over the 60-year period by introducing the A66 Project improvements. Over the 60-year appraisal period there is an</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						overall reduction of 6,975 accidents of which 4% involve personal injury and 96% are damage only.	
442	148563, 148619, 148620, 149350, 149357, 151491, 152925, 152930, 152941, 152978, 153860, 153911, 155312		154225, 154232	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing concerns regarding the safety of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. These respondents particularly cite the lack of dedicated routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, and that these users would not be safe using the same road as faster vehicles. Key areas of concern include Center Parcs, Penrith and Kirkby Thore.	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents for Project between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. Therefore non-motorised users will not need to use the carriageway.	No
1081	148620			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Length of journey	One respondent expressing concern that the journey length for cyclists would be increased as a result of the longer route to access the underpass.	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents for the Project between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. The existing underpass between schemes 2 and 3 on the existing dualled section is not being moved/changed and therefore the distance will be the same as it is today.	No
817			153623	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Design	One respondent expressing concern about the design of routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, including suggestions that stiles and appropriate fencing be considered.	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents for Scheme 3 between Penrith and Temple Sowerby.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The use of styles will be considered in the detailed design stage with engagement with the local authority. New shared use paths as part of scheme 3 and 6 will be fenced off from the carriageway.	
96	151456, 151461, 151472, 151483, 151487, 152925, 152969, 152997, 153320, 153807, 153809, 153860, 153861, 153925, 154268, 155312, 162154	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Temple Sowerby Parish Council	154225	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and Temple Sowerby Parish Council expressing concern relating to access to routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, including concerns that plans for such routes are insufficient between Penrith, B6262, Center Parcs, and Ninekirks.</p> <p>Respondents also express concern about the severance of existing routes, and request that these users are prioritised.</p>	<p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 consultation process, enhanced east-west walking & cycling connectivity has now been provided on the majority of schemes which will make the route a lot more attractive and accessible from an active travel perspective.</p> <p>These facilities are typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway or in the verge along the de-trunked A66 and include betterment in sections raised at Penrith, B6262, Center Parcs, and Ninekirks.</p> <p>Proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>In terms of severance, all existing Public Rights of Way (PRow) will</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade-separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.	
622	153901, 154246		152910	Land	<p>Respondents suggesting reducing land take for the project.</p> <p>Respondents request that the least amount of land should be utilised, and that environmental mitigation should be moved to locations that would least affect landowners.</p>	<p>The environmental mitigation design presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has continued to be developed. Outline details of all ecological mitigation are provided in the ES and the Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans and details have been refined up to DCO submission to ensure any mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project and reduce impacts on affected landowners.</p> <p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation we have been working closely with landowners and in many cases have reduced, removed or moved mitigation in line with landowners' wishes. We will continue to liaise with all impacted</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						landowners and further minimise land take if the detailed design allows.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Kirkby Thore – Environment' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
118		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the PEI Report's proposals on cultural heritage, with particular reference to the Roman Road, without providing further details.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
141		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents expressing support for the PEI Report 's references to landscape and visual effects, in particular the Landscape Character Units and National Character Areas, as well as visual mitigation measures, and the potential impacts of additional infrastructure on the landscape.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
623	149356		152236, 152932, 153057, 153321, 154330, 154331	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce noise levels for local residents. Respondents state that the scheme would reduce noise levels for local residents, in particular in Kirkby Thore, by moving traffic further away from houses and because the road would be constructed low in the surrounding landscape.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The noise impacts of the Project on receptors is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).	No
624	149356, 149771		152236, 153051, 153052,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would minimise negative impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The visual impacts of the Project are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
			154330, 154331	Landscape / visual	the area. Respondents state that the scheme would have only minor impact on Trout Beck and express support for the scheme on the grounds that it does not cross the River Eden floodplain. Respondents also state that visual impact would be minimised as the road sits lower than the surrounding landscape and planting schemes would mitigate visual impact.	reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	
643	150429, 154223	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing support for the proposals in relation to the impacts on the landscape and scenery. Respondents support the aesthetic benefits of tree planting on Morland Road, and the lowering of the road in the Eden Valley area.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The landscape and visual impacts of the Project are reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No
745	154240		153051, 153052	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would minimise negative impacts on floodplains, in particular mentioning flooding from the River Eden.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the impact of the Project on the water environment.	No
875			154203	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the preferred blue route (as presented at statutory consultation) on the grounds that it would protect cultural heritage sites, in particular the Roman Road.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. The impacts of the scheme on the historic environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
955	153044, 153858		150421, 153897	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would have a lower impact on the environment, in particular mentioning the River Eden and associated habitats.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. ES chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the impact of the Project on the water environment and Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) also provides details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project.	No
957		Historic England Natural England	153051, 153052, 153897	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the preferred blue route (as presented at statutory consultation) on the grounds that it would minimise impact on scheduled ancient monuments, in particular mentioning Roman archaeological sites near to Kirkby Thore.	National Highways acknowledges the support and confirms that the blue route has been selected for the Development Consent Order application. The blue route was identified to be the optimum design based on a combination of assessments by different environmental disciplines and a balanced view of the potential impacts. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.	No
1006	152901		150428, 153051, 153052, 153057	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve air quality, in particular mentioning lower pollution due to	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. An aim of the scheme is to improve air quality and reduce pollution caused by	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					reduced congestion and from diverting HGVs away from villages.	congestion. The effects of the scheme on air quality are assessed and reported upon in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).	
1083	149795			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General	A respondent expressing support in general terms, without being specific, for the environmental benefits created by the proposals.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the Project on the environment. The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
1108		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General	The preferred blue route and the alternative Red Route (as presented at statutory consultation) follow a similar path except the Red Route has a shorter crossing of the Trout Beck than the blue route. While the main reasons advanced by National Highways for preferring the blue route are ecological, a shorter crossing would also potentially limit impacts on palaeo-environmental deposits on the Trout Beck.	<p>National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate a shorter crossing may have limited impacts on palaeo-environmental deposits, it would have greater ecological impacts related to the crossing of the Trout Beck. The blue route was identified to be the optimum design based on a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>combination of assessments by different environmental disciplines and a balanced view of the impacts.</p> <p>Please refer to ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) for further information on potential palaeo-environmental deposit impacts.</p>	
2	149380, 150169, 150460, 151469, 153337, 153816, 153869, 153870, 154013		152177, 152961, 153065, 153556, 153624, 153842, 153897, 153920, 153953, 153962, 154225, 154232	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding / Landscape and Visual Noise	<p>Respondents raising a range of issues regarding the landscaping proposals, suggesting that</p> <p>i) the scheme should include additional tree and shrub planting and rewilding areas</p> <p>ii) tree planting could act as a visual and acoustic screen for Kirkby Thore</p> <p>iii) locations currently marked for tree planting comprise of sandy soil which would struggle to support woodland</p> <p>iv) that recently planted trees at Sleastonhow Farm and other unnamed locations should be retained, and</p> <p>v) that a proposed grassland mitigation area at Trout Beck should be replaced by woodland.</p>	<p>We address each of the tree planting and rewilding comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) the landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the area. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features and providing additional hedgerows, trees, woodland, and grassland planting where this is best suited to conserve and enhance the landscape. This landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) set out the overall scheme design principles that must be implemented. Ecological mitigation including planting is also outlined with ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>ii) The suggestion to use tree planting as noise mitigation is noted however, given the seasonal nature of leaf cover for trees and the density of vegetation required, tree planting is not generally adopted as a reliable noise mitigation measure and has therefore not been considered as a noise attenuation measure by the Project. Other mitigation measures and design solutions are proposed to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the design of alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks (earthworks are proposed in particular to the north of Kirkby Thore to mitigate noise and visual effects). Mitigation measures have been explored in detail within Kirkby Thore. Further information on Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for this location and others are set out in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) assesses</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the likely visual effects of the scheme. Project design has been developed since the PEI Report and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore. This provides visual and acoustic screening for the residents of Kirkby Thore. The earth bund on the village side has a shallow gradient ensuring the road fits with the surrounding topography.</p> <p>The landscape proposals include that, where appropriate in the landscape, embankments and false cuttings would be planted with woodland and woodland edge to provide landscape and visual integration for road users and nearby residents. In addition, where practicable across the north of Kirkby Thore land would be returned to agriculture, with hedgerows providing locally historic field boundary treatments.</p> <p>iii) Soil surveys have also been carried out and where practicable, used to inform proposed ecological and landscape planting areas, ensuring that the land and soil present can support the proposed mitigation. An outline of how these updated ecological and landscape planting measures could be implemented is illustrated within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). These plans and their</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>subsequent maintenance regimes will continue to develop through detailed design. Ecological and landscaping planting proposals are secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iv) Since the published PEI Report, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail relating to the wider area surrounding Sleastonhow Farm and Trout Beck using detailed survey information and consultation feedback. All existing woodland is intended to be retained where practicable. Alterations have been made to the preliminary design in order to avoid the loss of the Sleastonhow Oak. Where it has not been possible to avoid the loss of small areas of woodland, areas will be reinstated with tree planting. There are no significant effects to woodland identified across the Project. Opportunities have been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable. Please refer to the ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>v) The grassland mitigation area at Trout Beck forms part of the overall</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						design which accommodates future improvements to the area and allowance for potential flooding, as well as providing specific habitat for protected species in some locations. The grassland in this location is in keeping with the existing habitat present and allows the land to be utilised for agricultural purposes in the future. Other areas of woodland have been identified as more suitable for planting and ongoing maintenance. An outline of how planting could be implemented within Order Limits is illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Ecological and landscape planting measures are secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
7	152901, 153619, 153874, 153909, 154013		153033, 153042, 153310, 154491	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should include tree planting and rewilding in various locations to mitigate noise and visual impact, to provide alternative wildlife habitats, and to support increased biodiversity. Locations referred to include the old British Gypsum club site, the area around Sleastonhow Farm and at Dunfell View and Sanderson's Croft in Kirkby Thore.	National Highways acknowledges the suggestion for more tree planting. Preliminary information on construction impacts and mitigation was provided within the PEI Report based on the available information at the time of writing. Details of all ecological and landscape mitigation are provided in the ES and within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Application Document 2.8 Environmental Mitigation Maps, illustrate how mitigation could be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>delivered within the Order Limits. Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each area of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions.</p> <p>The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland, and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking, and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected species and habitats enhancing the biodiversity value of the surrounding area. The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall scheme design principles.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>With regards to these specific areas, the British Gypsum club site falls outside of the Order Limits for the Project and so planting cannot be specified here. The mitigation has been developed to balance the requirements of biodiversity mitigation and impacts to the existing landowner. Woodland planting around Sleastonhow Farm, Dunfell View and Sandersons Croft would have the potential to adversely impact the agricultural viability of this area.</p> <p>The use of trees to act as acoustic screening to minimise noise, is generally not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation. Extensive mitigation and design measures form part of the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the design of alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks. Further information in regards the Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for the scheme can be found in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
60		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Landscape	Respondents suggesting:	We address each of the points raised in turn below.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council		and visual effects	<p>i) additional locations and modifications for views to be assessed (from those shown in the PEI Report) to address any potential impacts from the scheme. Respondents say that further images should be included from a number of areas such as: the western edge of Appleby, the elevated landform to the north-east within North Pennines AONB, the area north-east of the Red Route near the Roman Road, any views that would capture the de-trunking of the A66, and a location along South End Lane.</p> <p>ii) that the orientation of the views that should be assessed should be finalised only once the exact route has been decided.</p> <p>iii) suitable grading of the earthworks would enable better integration into the surrounding landscape at Kirkby Thore, helping to mitigate their visual impact.</p>	<p>i) The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment assesses the likely visual effects of the scheme on sensitive visual receptors using representative viewpoints which were agreed with Local authorities within Technical Working Group meetings. Please refer to ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) for the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. Additional viewpoints (VP) suggested by the consultees are covered by the following viewpoints assessed within the ES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Views from Dufton Pike and Great Fell have been included within the North Pennines AONB. 2. VP 4.13 (PRoW (bridleway) 317012 north-east of Crackenthorpe) and VP4.14 (PRoW (footpath) 317004 near Roman Road (High Street)) cover the local footpath network. 3. VP4.14 cover the area to the west of Appleby-in-Westmoreland. 4. VP 4.19 and 4.22 cover potential de-trunked areas of the A66. 5. VP4.24 is west of South End Lane and is representative of potential scheme views. <p>ii) The ES chapter sets out the landscape and visual assessment of the preferred route. Each viewpoint has been photographed with a 360-</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>degree panoramic allowing the flexibility of focusing the view where needed. Views from the western edge of Appleby-in-Westmoreland are screened by the woodland planting along the River Eden, the railway embankment and a series of hedgerows bounding intervening fields. No significant change to the view has been identified.</p> <p>iii)Project landscape architects and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3). The scheme combines the cutting for the road with a false cutting to give extra height. This provides visual and acoustic screening for the residents of Kirkby Thore. The village side has a shallow gradient ensuring the road fits with the surrounding topography.</p>	
124		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	Issues raised on the approach to assessing the water environment and drainage proposals, as set out in the PEI Report, including suggestions that i) the hydraulic model used for the Flood Risk Assessment and detailed design of the Trout Beck crossing and	The PEI Report provided preliminary information required for the Autumn 2021 Consultation. Since then, the scheme has been further refined as reported in the ES and this document addresses each of the comments	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Agency Natural England			<p>design at Warcop is used to refine the understanding of flood risk in these areas.</p> <p>ii) The ES is amended to ensure that Crowdundle Beck is identified within the study areas and that it is within the River Eden SAC and the SSSI.</p> <p>iii) The ES is amended to confirm that Birk Sike flows into Crowdundle Beck.</p> <p>iv) Engagement is carried out with Technical Working Groups regarding the Natural Flood Management options that are being considered in the upper catchments of the Eden.</p> <p>v) Further assessments of dissolution impacts at Gypsum are carried out.</p> <p>vi) The new junction and River Eden could be included as mitigation / enhancement and planted with trees.</p> <p>vii) Where the scheme involves works to footbridges or works to / across the floodplain, any proposals or designs fully consider the dynamic geomorphic processes and natural flow regime of the SAC.</p> <p>viii) Baseline information should be confirmed and further details included on features such as ponds, structures and culverts and where there are multiple names for the same watercourse, these should be identified in a consistent manner in any</p>	<p>raised by the consultees, as summarised below:</p> <p>i) This comment is noted and the hydraulic model and detailed design of the Trout Beck crossing and design at Warcop has been used to inform the Flood Risk Assessment carried out for the Project.</p> <p>ii) The study area for Road Drainage and Water Environment assessment has remained at 1km from the Order Limits following methodology agreed with the Statutory Environmental bodies responsible for the water environment, though additional watercourses were identified within this study area and are considered within the assessment such as Crowdundle Beck.</p> <p>iii) This is noted and the ES Chapter identifies and considers that Birk Sike flows into Crowdundle Beck.</p> <p>iv) Ongoing engagement has been carried out with the key stakeholders such as Technical Working Groups and has informed the scope of the environmental assessment. Through discussions in the Technical Working Groups, details on Natural Flood Management schemes have been shared with the A66 Project team and will be further considered through the National Highways Designated Funds</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>future ES and / or FRA to avoid confusion.</p> <p>viii) With regards to Troutbeck, within the River Eden SAC, the design of the crossing should have a clear span (with piers) across the whole floodplain i.e., not just set back 5m from the river's edge.</p>	<p>process. It is not within the scope of the Project to consider these schemes.</p> <p>v) A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed and is within the ES Appendices (Application Document 3.4) submitted with the DCO application. Dissolution impacts at Gypsum are considered in the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Appendix 14.8 Desk Study Karst Risk Assessment (Application Document 3.4) and the ES Chapter, where required mitigation is proposed.</p> <p>vi) Ecological mitigation required within the vicinity to the River Eden is illustrated within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>vii) Where the Project involve works to footbridges or works to / across the floodplain the impact on dynamic geomorphic processes and the natural flow regime of the SAC has been considered and is detailed within the Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Application Document 3.6) as well as Environmental Statement Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4), Appendix 14.4: Hydromorphology Assessment (Application Document</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>3.4) and Appendix 14.9: Detailed Geomorphological Modelling (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>viii) Baseline information on the drainage features associated with the existing road are included within Appendix 14.3: Water Quality Assessment (Application Document 3.4). Details on other surface water features (such as proposed water crossing points), appropriate for the assessment are included in the ES within Figure 14.1 Surface water features. Edit changes in relation to labelling of watercourse are now incorporated into the ES. A naming convention has been developed across the Project for watercourses and is referenced in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment and ES Chapter 6 (Application Document 3.2) Biodiversity and their supporting appendices and figures where relevant.</p> <p>viii) The crossing of Trout Beck is proposed to be a clear span with piers, refer to the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) for more information. No significant impacts to the River Eden SAC are identified.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
130	154243	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council (EDC)		PEI Report - Noise and vibration	<p>Detailed comments on the approach to noise and vibration assessments, including respondents suggesting:</p> <p>i) additional consultations should be carried out with EDC on mitigation measures within Kirkby Thore before the final draft of the environmental impact assessment is produced.</p> <p>ii) around Kirkby Thore, especially the primary school, greater detail is required on the expected level of noise increase, as well as mitigation proposed.</p> <p>iv) where the carriageway turns south, west of Trout Beck, an earth bank could be installed to deflect noise.</p>	<p>We address each of these noise and vibration assessment comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out including the noise survey methodology, including the process of identifying monitoring locations. Baseline noise was recorded at these points and compared to modelled noise levels with the scheme in operation in order to identify where there may be requirement for measures to help mitigate noise in order to avoid a significant effect. The Project design has been developed since the PEI Report and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore.</p> <p>Earth bunding/ landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts whilst considering landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>Consultation has been carried out in regards the scope and methodology of the noise assessment. The ES chapter also sets out the baseline noise levels informed by noise monitoring and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>results of noise modelling. A meeting was offered to EDC to discuss noise and vibration assessment and mitigation specifically, but no response was received.</p> <p>Mitigation walkthrough meetings were held with local authorities (including EDC), which included a discussion regarding the proposed earth bunds and false cutting to the north of Kirkby Thore, which provides noise mitigation. Discussions are ongoing to inform the Statements of Common Ground.</p> <p>ii) Additional noise modelling and assessment has been done in the vicinity of Kirkby Thore school. Given the bunding included in the design and the deep cutting of the road itself, no adverse significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore School are identified. For further information on please refer to ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>iv) As part of the assessment mitigation measures in the vicinity of Trout Beck have been considered and no noise barrier is proposed as it is not considered sustainable in this location. Noise barriers in this location would not have a significant effect on noise reduction in the vicinity of Kirkby Thore, additionally they would create a significant feature in the landscape,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						making the structure of the Trout Beck Viaduct and the road itself have a greater impact on visual amenity.	
161	153816, 154179, 154243	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153620, 153628, 153842, 153953	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents suggesting changes and improvements to the plans in relation to flooding and drainage for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme, including:</p> <p>i) further mitigation is needed, including more embankments and culverts to help manage the water load;</p> <p>ii) use of a viaduct to cross the Trout Beck, similar to that proposed in the northern route;</p> <p>iii) combining drainage ponds on the northwest side of the A66 mainline, or reducing the number from three, so as to have two ponds; and</p> <p>iv) use of a pond or sustainable drainage system on Sleastonhow Lane, instead of a culvert.</p>	<p>We address each of the points made in turn below.</p> <p>i) Flood risk modelling has been carried out for the scheme water crossings including Trout Beck and River Eden and Keld Sike. Through modelling, areas of potential mitigation including flood alleviation areas and crossing design of Trout Beck (Piers/open span) have been incorporated and included within the application proposals. No adverse impacts are identified.</p> <p>ii) The scheme being taken forward in the DCO application comprises of a viaduct crossing at Trout Beck.</p> <p>iii) The proposed ponds will be designed in accordance with current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standards which requires separate drainage systems for Local Authority and National Highway roads wherever possible. However, dialog with Local Authorities is ongoing and the DCO does not preclude the combining of ponds at the next design stage if agreement can be reached.</p> <p>iv) National Highways acknowledge the consultees' concerns. The</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						proposed number of drainage ponds and culverts have been rationalised as far as possible within the scheme constraints. The existing culvert/ditch near to Sleastonhow lane has been incorporated into the drainage systems and identified as the location for environmental mitigation for the scheme.	
524	153816	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats	<p>Respondents suggesting additions or amendments to the content of the PEI Report relating to biodiversity, wildlife, and habitat preservation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) relocating a new bridge to preserve Sleastonhow Oak; ii) an impact and mitigation assessment for land take from a County Wildlife Site should be carried out. iii) watercourse crossings designed to facilitate free passage of fish v) Licence No. 2776003009 be considered in the ES and scoped out or included in the mitigation effects table as required. 	<p>We address each of these biodiversity, wildlife, and habitat preservation comments in turn below:</p> <p>i and ii) these comments are addressed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). This chapter provides a full baseline, impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites (including County Wildlife Sites) and receptors (including ancient woodland) potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable, including alterations to the designs to avoid the loss of the Sleastonhow Oak. The retention of this tree is secured through the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11). Where avoidance of impacts has not been possible and potential significant</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design through engagement with key stakeholders. There are no significant effects anticipated on Country Wildlife Sites as a result of Project proposals.</p> <p>iii) All new watercourse crossings have been designed to facilitate the free passage of aquatic and riparian species. Where existing culverts are to be replaced, they too have been designed to facilitate the free passage of these species.</p> <p>iv) Licence No. 2776003009 is considered within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
548	152945, 153617	Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should minimise the environmental impact on Trout Beck floodplain and suggesting changes to drainage provisions in the scheme, with specific reference to provisions near Powis Cottages and drainage ponds northwest of the A66.	The outline drainage design of the scheme has been designed in accordance with the latest guidance and standards as set out in the DMRB. This requires separate systems for National Highways drainage and Local Authority drainage, which has led to the need for separate ponds for each system. The proposed positioning of the ponds is determined by a number of factors including levels of the surrounding land and availability of outfalls.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Following the changes made after the Autumn 2021 Consultation exercise particularly around some of the junctions the position of ponds required has changed following changes to the outline drainage design. The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The location, size and number of ponds will be finalised during the detailed design phase of the Project. Constraints on the design of the ponds are set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) including restrictions on location, shape and size.</p>	
583	149771, 150169, 150460, 153337,		152177, 153376	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents suggesting in relation to biodiversity, wildlife, and habitat preservation that:	We address each of these biodiversity, wildlife, and habitat preservation comments in turn below:	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154194, 154469			Wildlife / habitats	<p>i) the scheme should include provision for both retention of existing and the creation of new wildlife habitats providing overall biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>ii) fences and road crossing points should be included in the scheme, specifically mentioning deer.</p> <p>iii) ponds and water courses should be designed with the needs of wildlife in mind.</p>	<p>i) retention of habitats is a key intention of the design, working closely with the design team to ensure habitats are retained where practicable. Where not practicable, areas of land have been identified for habitat creation to offset what is lost and to protect species utilising these habitats. Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2).</p> <p>ii) Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting, and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. It is acknowledged that deer are present along the Project, but current</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessments have concluded that there is no significant effect on deer throughout the Project.</p> <p>iii) An illustration of how the ecological mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Detailed design of features such as ponds and watercourse will be carried out with engagement with key stakeholders at the next stage in accordance with a set of design principles (as set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
779	152952, 153870, 154366			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents suggesting that the Applicant should choose the route that would have the lowest level of greenhouse gas emissions, without providing further detail.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Greenhouse gas emissions of the Project.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>In selecting the preferred route alignment, an important criteria for the selected route option taken forward into the DCO application was</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>performance in relation to a wide range of environmental criteria, including legislation and policy, including policy relating to climate change. The Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement (Application Document 3.9) sets out how the Project accords with the policies of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) including climate change policies.</p> <p>National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations. Following this assessment, it is not considered that there are any significant effects in relation to carbon emissions.</p>	
787	153851		153920	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	<p>Respondents suggesting in relation to cultural heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) protection and enhancement of local cultural heritage around Temple Sowerby to Appleby is required. ii) the need to protect the veteran oak tree on Sleastonhow Lane. iii) making more of the Roman remains, suggesting the possibility of 	<p>We address each of the points made in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets, detailing measures to protect and enhance local heritage assets 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					developing a walk similar to that along Hadrian's Wall – suggesting a route could be installed at Kirkby Thore to Long Marton, as well as round Penrith.	<p>including those around Temple Sowerby to Appleby.</p> <p>ii) the design has undergone significant refining and reworking to avoid impacts on adjacent sensitive receptors including areas of ancient woodland and veteran trees. The DCO application includes a preliminary design which avoids the loss of Sleastonhow Oak (refer to Application Document 2.8 for further information). The retention of this tree is secured through the Project Design Principles (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>iii) Full consideration of and proposals for existing and new routes with public access are set out within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) and within the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
833	153617, 153619		153574	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Land take	Respondents suggesting measures the scheme's land take, including minimising land take for drainage and environmental mitigation measures and locating these measures on less valuable agricultural land.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme. Since PEI Report all ecological field surveys have been completed and the ecological mitigation designs have undergone significant refining and reworking. The potential impact of ecological mitigation and drainage on land use has been a key consideration in the design, however it is also essential that the proposed mitigation achieves	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>its required objective, which in many cases defines the location it must be implemented. All field survey results and a full assessment of the potential impacts of the scheme on species and habitats is reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). The proposed outline ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail and an illustration of how they could be implemented within Order Limits is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 6.2) considers the potential effect of the scheme on agricultural holdings.</p>	
954	153874		150453	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents suggesting measures to mitigate the noise impacts of the scheme, including use of sound barriers, banking, and tree planting, without reference to specific locations.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced an EMP	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. This document is considered a live document that will be updated through the detailed design and construction phase by the Principal Contractor.	
1053	151349			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	One respondent suggesting that the scheme should ensure that environmental impact is minimised, without providing further detail.	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the Project on the environment. The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
1	153816, 154013	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England	153953	PEI Report - Cultural heritage, biodiversity and other environmental issues	Respondents expressing concern relating to the PEI Report and the impact of the scheme on cultural heritage, including concerns; i) that there is not a full environmental assessment for all the route options that were presented at statutory consultation; ii) the impacts associated with sections constructed offline have not been fully identified; iii) that there would be major adverse impact of the scheme on cultural heritage, which is not reported in the PEI Report;	We address each of these comments in turn below: i) The preferred route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria. A full EIA was not carried out of each route however the potential environmental impacts of each route were considered during the optioneering process. National Highways considers that the preferred route for this scheme (which forms part of the DCO application) meets all of the key objectives of the Project and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>iv) that no assessment has been completed on the cumulative impact of all schemes on cultural heritage;</p> <p>v) the effects on the Roman forts have not been fully considered;</p> <p>vi) the ancient Sleastonhow Oak has not been identified in the PEI Report; and</p> <p>vii) that the scheme requires land take within an SAC as well as functionally linked land.</p>	<p>has adequately considered impacts on the historic environment. Please refer to ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>ii) The PEI Report provided a robust assessment of the potential impacts of construction and operation of the Project based on a reasonable worst case scenario and information available at the time. The ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) provides a detailed assessment of the potential construction impacts of the Project including the construction of offline sections.</p> <p>iii) The PEI Report presented a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme on the historic environment. The PEI Report was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to submission of the DCO application. Since the PEI Report the scheme design has been refined and further surveys and assessment have been carried out and are fully reported in the ES. The ES includes further historic environment surveys including setting</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>surveys and trial trenching. Where required, the type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of an Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP, Application Document 2.7.</p> <p>iv) The PEI Report set out the methodology and indicative results of the cumulative assessment. The consideration of cumulative effects of the schemes and surrounding schemes and projects is set out in the ES Chapter 15 Assessment of Cumulative Effects (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>v) A detailed assessment of the impacts on heritage assets including Roman Forts, is set out within the ES, refer to ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>vi) Existing woodland is intended to be retained where practicable through design or environmental management as set out in the EMP (Document Reference 2.7). The Sleastonhow Oak was not specifically identified at the time of publication of the PEI Report, however it has since been identified and the design of Sleastonhow Lane has been amended to avoid this</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>location. There is therefore no significant effect arising from impact on that receptor. Please refer to the Project Design Principles (Application Document 2.3) and ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>vii) In order to construct the scheme, land take is required in vicinity of the SAC and functionally linked habitats. In order to avoid impact to the SAC, specific working methods and restrictions will be in place as set out in the EMP (Application Document (2.7) Annex C1 Working in and Near SACs and Annex C2 Working in and Near Watercourses). Any habitat impacted will be restored or mitigated for in such a way that will maintain its functionality. Potential impacts on all European designated sites, including the River Eden SAC and associated functionally linked land, as a result of the Project has been fully assessed in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Document 3.5 and 3.6) and within the ES (refer to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). These conclude that there will be no significant effect on the SAC as a result of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
4	153815, 153816, 154013, 154223		153897, 153920, 153953, 154457	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding / Land take	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the tree planting and rewilding plans, including:</p> <p>i) a suggestion to consider the area bounded by Priest Lane and areas of severed fields which will no longer be viable for agricultural use for tree planting/ rewilding;</p> <p>ii) concern that proposed use of grassland for mitigation at Trout Beck is not suitable for the soil type in this area.</p> <p>iii) concern about planting trees along the drive of a private residence,</p> <p>iv) concerns that planting on The Great Mine and The Snout would lead to loss of habitat and agricultural land.</p>	<p>We have refined our mitigation plans since those presented within the PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats and species at the locations referred to by the respondent. In response to the concerns raised:</p> <p>i) Within outline mitigation plans shown in Application Document 2.8 Environmental Mitigation Maps, it is proposed that Priest Lane will have species rich grassland along both sides of the re-alignment.</p> <p>ii) A soil survey has been carried out as part of the subsequent assessment work following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, and this will feed into the detailed design stage to ensure mitigation proposals are suitable for soil types.</p> <p>iii) Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>function and, in most cases, secondary functions. Where areas of planting are proposed on private land this has been discussed where possible with landowners.</p> <p>iv) Habitat planting has been designed to ensure that no important habitats are lost as a result, rather they are enhanced by mitigation works. It is acknowledged that agricultural land is lost as a result of planting. We have worked closely with landowners through this process and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land holdings.</p>	
12	148635, 152901, 153838, 153888, 153949, 153960, 154363, 154366		149785, 151473, 152216, 152961, 152999, 153897, 154260	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concerns about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular the potential for reduced air quality in the local area. Respondents specifically mention areas of Kirkby Thore and local schools.	<p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations assessed takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in DMRB LA 105 where appropriate. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria.</p> <p>Beyond 200m from the ARN, air quality impacts on receptors are considered to be negligible in accordance with DMRB LA 105.</p> <p>No exceedances of the Air Quality Objectives for NO₂, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} are predicted and no likely significant effects are concluded at any modelled location within 200m of the ARN.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has also been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Properties (including residents at the north of Kirkby Thore and Kirkby Thore School) and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
24	153816, 154366	Environment Agency Natural England	152216, 153953	PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the findings of the PEI Report and the impact of the scheme on biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats:</p> <p>i) the PEI Report highlights a number of biodiversity concerns but does not explain how the risks associated with these concerns are justified.</p> <p>ii) failure to identify all significant effects, including at Moor Beck;</p> <p>iii) the PEI Report is incomplete, specifically mentioning lack of survey data for all route alternatives considered;</p> <p>iv) that recent tree planting at Sleastonhow Farm has not been mapped;</p> <p>v) that the ancient Sleastonhow Oak has been omitted from the PEI Report.</p> <p>vi) proposed mitigation measures at Trout Beck are not appropriate for the local soil type</p> <p>vii) sites of national importance for invertebrate species within the River Eden and Tributaries SSSI have not been identified in the PEI Report.</p> <p>viii) the crossing at Moor Beck and concerns there is significant habitat upstream of the A66 and potential mitigation is required for connectivity for fish passage, otters and potentially</p>	<p>We address each of these biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) and ii) The PEI Report sets out the findings of a preliminary environmental assessment of the effects of the scheme based on the available information known at the time of preparing the PEI Report. Since the publication of the PEI Report, field surveys have been completed and the scheme design has undergone refinement, this includes changes to the crossings of Moor Beck to open span structures to reduce potential adverse impacts. ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of significant impacts on ecological receptors and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. No significant effect as a result of Project proposals is identified at Moor Beck.</p> <p>iii) The Preferred Route as shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation (which is promoted by this DCO application) was selected following extensive investigation of possible route options and assessed against the scheme's vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria. National Highways considers</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					water voles to prevent any harm to the aquatic environment.	<p>that the route chosen, now part of the DCO application, meets all of the key objectives of the scheme and adequately considered the potential impact of the Project on biodiversity.</p> <p>iv) All ancient woodland, known veteran tree sites and Country Wildlife Sites are mapped and included within the ES. Phase 1 Habitat Mapping (ES Volume 3 Figure 6.3) identifies the habitats present within Order Limits including those identified at Sleastonhowe Farm. Limitations in land access or the timing of the planting may however result in some planting areas being omitted from this mapping. Habitats identified will be updated and mitigation developed through the detailed design process during the detailed design stage, in accordance with the mitigation objectives set out in ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity and secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>v) Existing woodland is intended to be retained where practicable through design or environmental management as set out in the EMP (Document Reference 2.7). The Sleastonhow Oak was not identified within the PEI Report, however since the PEI Report further surveys have been undertaken and the design of Sleastonhow Lane has been amended to avoid</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Sleastonhow Oak and therefore ensure there is no significant effect on this receptor. Refer to the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) for further details.</p> <p>vi) The grassland mitigation area at Trout Beck forms part of the overall design which accommodates future improvements to the area and allowance for potential flooding. Soil surveys have been carried out as part of assessment work subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation for the Project and, where practicable, have informed the development of proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>vii) and viii) Within the ES, the invertebrate County Wildlife Site river shingle sites within the River Eden and Tributaries SSSI are considered of National Value. The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail following the finalisation of surveys and consultation with landowners and an indication of how they could be implemented within Order Limits is shown within ES</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>In the updated scheme design Moor Beck (or Crooks Beck) is now to be crossed with a wide, open-span structure, designed such that the watercourse can be maintained in its current location, minimising construction impacts and allowing natural river process to continue in operation, in what is a dynamic section or river. Electric fishing and eDNA surveys have confirmed the presence of the fish species noted by consultees, however no evidence of water vole has been recorded during surveys and water vole eDNA was not recorded in any of the riverine eDNA samples. Based on discussion with the Environment Agency and Natural England the introduction of water vole in the area is considered likely to have failed.</p>	
145		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Natural England</p>	153953	<p>PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects</p>	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the findings in the PEI Report and the impact of the scheme on the landscape and visual aesthetic of the area, including concerns that:</p> <p>i) the Lake District and North Yorkshire Dales National Parks authorities have not been consulted about the scheme;</p>	<p>The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB and other important landscapes. In response to the detailed comments made:</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>ii) the North Pennines National Character Area has not been listed in the PEI Report;</p> <p>iii) that no mitigation measures have been listed for drystone walling impacted by the scheme; and</p> <p>iv) that areas of recently planted trees at Sleastonhow Farm have not been identified in the PEI Report.</p>	<p>i) Consultation was carried out with National Parks authorities and is detailed within Chapter 5 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>ii) The PEI Report refers to NCA10 North Pennines within Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) in the sections referring to the Appleby to Brough scheme and the Bowes Bypass scheme. The ES Chapter identifies all National Character Areas (NCA) where there is the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>iii) Specific mitigation measures were not yet developed at the time of the PEI Report, however proposed landscape mitigation included that boundary treatments were to reflect the characteristics of the landscape with stone walls to be reinstated where practicable to reduce landscape impacts. The Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) provides further information on the schemes design principles and how the scheme has had consideration to the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials including the use of dry-stone walling.</p> <p>iv) Since the publication of the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						planting have been developed in more detail relating to the wider area surrounding Sleastonhow Farm and Trout Beck using detailed survey information and consultation feedback. Soil surveys have also been carried out and where practicable, used to inform proposed ecological and landscape planting areas. Phase 1 Habitat Mapping (ES Volume 3 Figure 6.3) has been carried out, noting the habitats present at that snapshot in time. Limitations in land access or the timing of the planting may have resulted in this being omitted from this mapping. However, habitats identified will be updated and mitigation developed through the detailed design process. An indication of how updated ecological and landscape planting could be implemented within Order Limits is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable.	
162	154179, 154363		152177, 153556, 153620, 153628, 153842, 153953,	Environment – general (non PEI Report) – Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern about the potential impact of the scheme on flooding and drainage. This includes concerns about: the location of drainage ponds within agricultural farmland;	Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the outline Project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). In response to the comments raised:	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
			154266, 154457		<p>ii) the discharge of the balance ponds; and</p> <p>iii) potential impacts of proposed planting on drainage.</p>	<p>i) National Highways has assessed the design in areas of potential flooding, whether that is from groundwater, river water, surface water or from sewer sources. Local people have helped guide flood modelling by providing their insight into flooding hotspots. National Highways has mapped all these sources in the surrounding area and identified flood issues that the design might cause. This work has informed the location of balancing ponds near to the Project.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed drainage ponds and culverts have been rationalised as far as possible within the scheme</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>constraints. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>ii) Balancing ponds have been designed in accordance with DMRB and local authority guidance regarding the rate of discharge. The rate discharge is limited to either the Greenfield Runoff rate, or an agreed rate with the local authority, based on existing ground conditions. There is no increased flood risk as a result of the Project as shown in ES Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>iii) Any planting around drainage systems will be subject to maintenance regimes that ensure the drainage is not compromised as set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
215	152954, 153560, 153614, 153816, 153870, 153945, 154194, 154363,	Eden District Council	148694, 152216, 153310, 153376, 153920, 153953,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have detrimental impacts on the landscape and visual amenity of the area. These include concerns:</p> <p>i) generally about the impact on the landscape;</p>	<p>We address each of the comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) The scheme design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154366, 162145 149388, 151487, 152951, 152956, 152957, 152976, 152982, 153325, 153364, 153564, 153565, 153797, 153812, 153852, 153888, 153919, 153926, 154013,		154191, 154226 149785, 152177, 152961, 153897, 153962, 154127,		<p>ii) that the road is too close to the North Pennines AONB;</p> <p>iii) that the elevation of sections of the road and removal of existing trees would negatively impact the landscape; and</p> <p>iv) about the visual impact of the bridge at Trout Beck and the visual impact of the scheme when viewed from Kirkby Thore; Priest Lane; Sleastonhow Lane; and Dufton.</p> <p>v) that Friends of the Lake District have sought to engage with National Highways in regards the landscape impact caused by several sections along the route, but particularly the situation at Kirkby Thore.</p>	<p>effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. Details on the landscape and visual assessment and the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors such as residents within Kirby Thore can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>ii) The landscape-led approach to this scheme design has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB and local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating the new improved A66 and any local road or accommodation routes that are located within or effect the setting of the AONB in a sensitive way that respects the character and landscape value of the AONB.</p> <p>iii and iv) The landscape planting design includes a range of measures designed to complement the local landscape character using species of local provenance with appropriate consideration of climate change</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>resilient species. All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable and mitigation planting seeks to replace any significant tree belts lost through construction. Through the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme the road has been kept in cutting or at ground level with some elevation needed to span the Trout Beck floodplain. It is acknowledged that this would affect the landscape and visual amenity of the area, this was considered on balance with the potential for impacts on the watercourse and the SAC designation to be the preferred route. An assessment of the potential landscape and visual impacts is set out in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Public rights of way have been retained or diverted where reasonably practical throughout the Project and boundary fencing and hedges, appropriate to the landscape character, have been proposed to restore visual amenity. The landscape character of Sleastonhow Lane will change due to the Project however the connection will remain, and mitigation will ameliorate the impacts, but the character will change in parts.</p> <p>v) Concerns are noted in regards the impact to the lake district from works at</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Kirkby Thore however impacts as a result of the Project in this location are not considered to be significant.	
335	150465, 152955, 152958, 152981, 153564, 153565, 154363, 154366		151473, 152983	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	<p>Respondents expressing concern about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular cultural heritage sites, including Roman archaeological sites in the area; ii) the assessment of alternative route options and that the potential negative impacts of alternative routes on Roman archaeological sites in the area should not be a reason for selecting the preferred blue route (as presented at statutory consultation) and iii) in respect to cultural heritage the scheme needs to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. 	<p>We address each of the comments in turn below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The design of the Project seeks to avoid impacts on Roman heritage sites with the preference for the blue route at the Autumn 2021 Consultation and the adjustment of the alignment of the A66 in preliminary design to avoid the Roman Camp of Redlands Bank Scheduled Monument. The design has also avoided the existing Roman road where practicable, and its presence has been taken into account in the landscape mitigation plans. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Mitigation required to minimise the impacts is included in the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as an appendix to the EMP (Application Document 2.7) ii) National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance. National Highways' 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information. One of the key factors in the orange route being discounted was unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and this approach would be unlikely to be granted a DCO. Whilst the preferred blue route (which is part of the DCO application) potentially affects the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the orange route also affects this heritage asset as well as impacting on the Kirkby Thore Roman Fort and Vicus scheduled monument. The blue route does not impact on the Kirkby Thore Roman Fort and Vicus scheduled monument.</p> <p>On the balance it was concluded that the blue route was preferred in relation to heritage criteria as well as many other environmental criteria that formed part of the assessment.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>iii) The policy tests are clearly understood by National Highways, including the policy within the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS), which is the primary policy for consideration of nationally significant highway projects, such as the Project.</p> <p>In accordance with the NPPS we have sought to minimise or avoid harm to heritage assets, where practicable and having regard to other factors.</p>	
343	149358, 149367, 152931, 152951, 152952, 152953, 152954, 152955, 152957, 152958, 152960, 152967, 152976, 152982, 153325, 153358, 153365, 153560, 153564, 153565, 153797,		152216, 152983	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	<p>Respondents expressing concern with:</p> <p>i) that the scheme would increase traffic and greenhouse gas emissions, which is contrary to climate change commitments.</p> <p>ii) that the proposed blue route would lead to higher emissions than the alternative orange route.</p>	<p>We respond to each summary comment in turn below:</p> <p>i) National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the NPSNN as well as other applicable law, policy and guidance including the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153812, 153817, 153821, 153869, 153870, 153874, 153879, 153881, 153882, 153965, 154363, 154366					<p>future available for comparison). As per the NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on Climate in terms of GHG emissions.</p> <p>ii) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions was considered alongside other environmental criteria in the assessment of different route alignments. It was important that the route chosen and taken forward into the DCO application was preferred in relation to a wide range of environmental criteria and that it would accord with policy, including policy relating to climate change (in the NNNPS). While it is acknowledged that the blue route would generate greater GHG emissions than orange, when considered on balance with other environmental and engineering factors, it was considered that blue was more preferable. Key factors included avoidance of impact to heritage features, impact local population and community as a result of direct impacts to property and noise and air quality impacts. An assessment of the potential impact of the Project on climate is set out in the ES Chapter 7: Climate (Application Document 3.2).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
373	152931, 152951, 152952, 152976, 152982, 153325, 153365, 153560, 153564, 153565, 153619, 153797, 153812, 153821, 153838, 153874, 153919, 153926, 153944, 154194, 154363, 154366		152177, 152216, 153897, 154266	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on wildlife, specifically mentioning impacts on otters, deer, brown hares, red squirrels, barn owls, lapwings, and other rare birds. Various locations are mentioned across the scheme, including Sleastonhow Farm and Lane, Trout Beck Valley and near to Kirkby Thore.	Since consultation we have carried out further environmental studies, reviewed consultation feedback and completed protected species surveys. ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors (including otters, deer, brown hares, red squirrels, barn owls, lapwings, and other bird species) potentially impacted by the Project across its length, including in and around Kirkby Thore. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.	No
393	149388, 153816, 153838, 153919, 153949, 153960,		149783, 149785, 152177, 152216, 152936, 152961, 152999,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels for residents in local villages including Kirkby Thore and Long Marton. Respondents specifically mention the	The potential impact of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The assessment considers sensitive receptors such as schools. The study	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153975, 154013 153816		153310, 153897, 153914, 153927, 154200, 154260, 154266		route's proximity to Kirkby Thore School.	<p>area has been defined in line with DMRB guidance and by engagement with relevant stakeholders. For educational buildings reference is made to Building Bulletin 93 (BB93), Acoustic design of schools: performance standards, as appropriate. The potential impact of the Project on Kirkby Thore School have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). In order to reduce noise effects for receptors in Kirkby Thore and Long Marton, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. In particular, in the vicinity of the Kirkby Thore school, the mainline is in a deep cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore and earth bunds have been embedded into the design to screen noise emissions from the new road. No adverse significant noise effects are identified at Kirkby Thore School.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						environment, such as noise, will be managed.	
407	153365, 153372, 153617, 153975, 154363		152177, 153033, 153042, 154266	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) increase risk of flooding or negatively impact existing drainage systems, specifically mentioning drainage at High Barn and Sleastonhow Lane; ii) impact on water supply boreholes; and iii) impact the floodplain south of Kirkby Thore. 	<p>We address each of the comments in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) National Highways notes concerns about flooding at High Barn and Sleastonhow Lane and these areas have been considered in the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and within the Project drainage design, as reported in the ES Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). The assessment concludes there will be no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme. ii) Impacts of the scheme on groundwater receptors are considered within ES chapter on Road Drainage and the Water Environment 14 (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). The identified abstraction boreholes have been included as a potential receptor within the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (Appendix 14.6, Application Document 3.4) and conservative assumptions used to complete the assessment. Further assessments will be carried out in detailed design to determine the exact source and nature of the supplies. 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Should the works result in disturbance of the supply, appropriate mitigation will be implemented, or an alternative source supplied, this is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iii) Appropriate risk assessments (e.g., piling risk assessment) will be carried out prior to works commencing, to ensure appropriate measures are implemented to prevent impacts to local receptors and are set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and its Annexes. In floodplains, the level of the road will be lifted, and alternative flood storage will be included to replace any that is lost due to the increased footprint of the road.</p> <p>From the construction assessment, it is anticipated there are no likely significant effects on flood plain to the south of Kirkby Thore the basis that the Project construction design and EMP (Application Document 2.7) will incorporate the recommendations for mitigation that will be based on detailed modelling where relevant. Similarly, from our operational assessment, there are no likely significant effects on flood risk on the flood plain to the south of Kirkby Thore anticipated on the basis that the Project design will incorporate the recommendations for mitigation that</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						will be based on detailed modelling where relevant.	
460		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Noise and vibration	One respondent expressing concern about the impact of noise and vibration as a result of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme, with a specific concern that the scheme could raise ambient noise levels in classrooms at Kirby Thore Primary School.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. For educational buildings reference is made to Building Bulletin 93 (BB93), Acoustic design of schools: performance standards, as appropriate. This is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). In order to reduce noise effects, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. In particular, the route is in deep cutting where it comes close to Kirkby Thore school which will act as mitigation for noise. No adverse significant noise effects are identified at Kirkby Thore School.	No
482	154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - Public Rights of Way	Respondents expressing concern in respect of the findings of the PEI Report regarding impact of the scheme on Public Rights of Way, specifically mentioning that the possible impacts on footpaths and bridleways to the northeast of the route and from the North Pennines AONB have not been considered and that there is no	The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation provided a summary of environmental information assessed at time of writing. Construction information was not sufficiently developed to be able to provide a detailed assessment of impacts to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) at the time.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					mention in the PEI Report that the blue route would cross the Lady Ann Way, which is a National Long-Distance route.	Full consideration of and proposals for existing and new routes with public access and consideration of construction impacts are set out within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) and detailed within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. For indirect effects the assessment includes existing and proposed routes located within 500m of the Order Limits. For direct effects the assessment includes existing and proposed routes passing within the Order Limits, both during construction and operation. The ES Chapter considers potential impacts to Lady Ann Way and the scheme design includes provision of a crossing on Sleastonhow Lane to provide continued connectivity on this PRow during operation.	
508	153560, 153816	Cumbria County Council	153953	PEI Report - Details / findings	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the details and findings in the PEI Report. These include concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) poor general quality of data; ii) the selection of sources of aerial photography for the cultural heritage assessment; 	<p>We address each of these comments on the findings of the PEI Report in turn below.</p> <p>i) The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme based on the available information known at the time of writing. Since the drafting of the PEI Report further field survey work has</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>iii) the PEI Report does not identify or map all significant environmental assets, including the Sleastonhow Oak and recent tree and hedge planting near to Sleastonhow Farm and Trout Beck;</p> <p>iv) shows some existing assets as proposed new mitigation measures. and</p> <p>v) the PEI Report does not clearly state which is the preferred route.</p>	<p>been carried out to inform potential significant environmental effects. The assessment of these significant is described in full within the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4), submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>ii) ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) has been updated to include refreshed Aerial Photography and Lidar following the reopening of the archives in Swindon, which were closed due to the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>iii and iv) Since the drafting of the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail, including more detailed measures for the wider area surrounding Sleastonhow Farm and Trout Beck. An indication of how mitigation could be implemented is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). All existing woodland is intended to be retained where practicable. At the August 2021 Consultation, the Sleastonhow Oak was not identified, it has since been identified and the design of Sleastonhow Lane has been amended to avoid this area and therefore there is no significant effect on this receptor.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>This is detailed within the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). Where it has not been practicable to avoid the loss of small areas of woodland, areas will be reinstated with tree planting. Opportunities have been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable. The EMP secures the proposed ecological and landscape planting (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>v) The PEI Report outlined the preferred route for the scheme with full reasons for this selection outlined in more detail in the Route Development Report (RDR) also provided at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p>	
520	153337, 153359, 153365, 153559, 153560, 153817,	Cumbria County Council	150453, 152216, 152984, 153927,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on wildlife, specifically mentioning impacts on otters, invertebrates, deer, badgers, bats, brown hares, red squirrels, barn owls, lapwings, and other rare birds.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites including the River Eden SAC and SSSI and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153838, 153982, 154179, 154194, 154363, 154366, 154461	Eden District Council	154232, 154457		<p>Various locations are mentioned across the scheme, including Sleastonhow Farm and Lane, River Eden SAC and SSSI, Pennine Moors SAC, Trout Beck, Chapel Wood Ancient Woodland, Roman Road bridleway and areas near to Kirkby Thore.</p>	<p>North Pennine Moors SAC, and ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project including otters, invertebrates, deer, badgers, bats, brown hares, red squirrels, barn owls, lapwings, and other rare birds. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>All ancient woodland and known veteran tree sites are included within the ES and the impact of the scheme assessed. We have also refined scheme design to enable us to preserve significant and ancient trees. Following feedback and survey work, we have moved the proposed route to avoid the ancient Sleastonhow Oak – which dates from 1600 – in Kirkby Thore. Our latest proposal bypasses the oak and its root protection area, and we have also relocated drainage ponds and access routes to accommodate the tree. This is secured through the Project Design Principles</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(Application Document 5.11) Impacts related to the named locations have been assessed and identified in the ES Chapter.	
531	153359, 153614, 153851, 153870, 153945, 154194, 154363, 154366	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	148694, 150452, 150453, 150464, 152216, 152984, 153310, 153376, 153625, 153824, 153825, 153827, 153897, 153920, 153927, 153953, 154225, 154269	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular:</p> <p>i) that the scheme would increase noise levels for local residents, specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore and areas close to Sleastonhow Farm, Priest Lane, Dufton Pike and Trout Beck.</p> <p>ii) the proposed noise mitigation measures either do not cover the whole route or would be ineffective and</p> <p>iii) that the higher-than-expected elevation of sections of the road within this scheme would increase noise.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). This chapter addresses each of the comments as follows:</p> <p>i) The ES identifies where there would be adverse noise effects, including assessments of the residential areas that the respondents have identified as a concern . The ES also identifies proposed mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. In Kirkby Thore embedded mitigation includes earthworks (combination of cutting and earth bund) and the use of low-noise surfacing. The assessment identifies that following these measures 280 dwellings within Kirkby Thore, near or within Crackenthorpe, near to Long Marton Road and along the existing A66 are expected to experience a significant permanent beneficial effect. One Noise Impact Area is also predicted to experience a significant permanent beneficial effect.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>67 dwellings within Kirkby Thore at Sandersons Croft, Spitals Farm, Halefield, Sleastonhow, Powis House, Castrigg Hill and Roger Head are expected to experience a significant permanent adverse effect. 12 non-residential receptors, including Kirkby Thore primary school, are expected to experience a significant permanent beneficial effect. One non-residential property at Spitals is expected to experience a significant permanent adverse effect.</p> <p>ii) Where a likely significant effect has been identified, an assessment of the viability of providing additional mitigation measures has been undertaken where appropriate. Additional environmental noise mitigation measures which are assessed to be practicable and sustainable are presented within the ES Chapter. Examples of these measures include a lower noise road surface and design features, such as the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>environment, such as noise, will be managed.</p> <p>As per DMRB LA 111, for operational noise, monitoring measures should ensure embedded mitigation measures are included (or an equivalent performance is achieved with an alternative design), and any noise mitigation measures are verified to ensure they meet the design specifications. This would be completed as part of national Highways Project Evaluation procedures which is provided as part of the EMP (Application Document: 2.7).</p> <p>iii) The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out and how the assessment uses noise modelling which considers the speed of traffic and road elevation. Where elevated road may affect noise levels at nearby receptors, mitigation has been identified and incorporated into the scheme.</p>	
534	153359, 153816, 153945, 154363, 154366, 152901, 153838,		152216, 153376, 153625, 153842, 153927, 154227	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Light	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of light pollution as part of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby Scheme. In particular, respondents are concerned that light pollution from the scheme could impact negatively on homes, the caravan site, and local amenities. Locations mentioned by the	Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153919, 153926,		153927, 154260, 154266		respondents are Dunfell View, Kirkby Thore school, Kirkby Thore, Long Marton, Bolton, Colby, Temple Sowerby and Crackenthorpe.	Throughout design development light pollution from headlights has been considered and where practicable the design has been refined to reduced impacts, for example the junction on Main Street in Kirkby Thore has been relocated to reduce the potential for headlight glare into properties on Main Street. Other mitigation such as bunding or fencing is also proposed to be used where required to eliminate potential glare to any affected properties. Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme and proposed lighting including effects of lighting from car users can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	
540	154013			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified / PHH	Respondents raising concern in regards the lack of consideration of impacts on recreation of the scheme during sifting.	National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare route options. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users (including recreation). A full assessment of the impact of the scheme on recreation, in line with DMRB LA112 guidance, is set out in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).	
572	153359, 153614, 153945, 154363, 154366		152216, 152983, 153030, 153376, 153825, 153827, 154269	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern about the impact the proposals will have on air pollution and air quality for the surrounding villages, including concerns that the proposed road is close to a primary school and villages which could put children and residents at a higher risk of exposure to nitrogen dioxide.	<p>Within the ES, the selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in DMRB LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Air quality impacts on receptors beyond this distance are considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Kirkby Thore School is located approximately more than 200m from proposed scheme alignment. The air quality assessment carried out has therefore identified that it will not be subject to significant air quality impacts, including any changes to NO₂.</p> <p>Further details on the Air Quality impact assessment for the Project can be found within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
593	153359, 153817, 153945, 154363, 154366		153897	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact / Alternatives	<p>Respondents expressing concerns about the climate impact of the proposed route, including:</p> <p>i) the orange route (an alternative route considered and presented at Statutory consultation) has a lower carbon impact than the blue route (the preferred route at statutory consultation which is now part of this DCO application). Reference is made to the blue route would have 3.5 times more carbon emissions than the alternatives considered (the orange route).</p> <p>ii) concerns that increasing traffic speed will increase GHG emissions and harmful pollution.</p>	<p>We address each of these climate impact comments in turn below</p> <p>i) National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. The climate impact arising from different route options formed one element of the route selection process. Please refer to ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>The orange route was discounted, post the Autumn 2021 Consultation, primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy.</p> <p>iii) National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>requirements in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (the EIA Regulations). The modelling used within the greenhouse gas assessment within the ES uses the Project traffic model which incorporates traffic speed.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per the NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on Climate in terms of GHG emissions. ,</p>	
758	154363		154457	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Geology and Soils	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on peat within Temple Sowerby Moss.	An assessment of agricultural and soil resource within the Order Limits has been carried out and is detailed within ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). The assessment is based on desk study information and a soil survey which has taken place within the Order Limits. The soil survey does not identify any impact to peat resource as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						a result of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme.	
1054			152216	PEI Report - Climate change	A respondent expressing concern about the PEI Report, in particular that statements in the PEI Report about climate change impacts contradict figures from National Highways that state the scheme would increase carbon emissions. The respondent states that this is contrary to climate change commitments.	<p>National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of Government carbon reduction plan targets. This assessment is reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2), and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the scheme.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per the NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on Climate in terms of GHG emissions.</p>	No
1058		Environment Agency		PEI Report - Road drainage	Respondents expressing concern relating to the PEI Report and the	The feedback on the scope and content of the PEI Report is welcomed	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				and water environment	<p>impact of the scheme on the water environment, including concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) risk of flooding at Kirkby Thore from a combination of both the River Eden and Trout Beck has not been considered and that changes to bridges and footpaths at Trout Beck need to consider impacts on the River Eden SAC. ii) Crowdundle Beck has not been identified in relevant sections of the PEI Report although it is within the River Eden SAC and SSSI. iii) Birk Sike flows into the River Eden. iv) lack of consideration of these issues could lead to inaccurate assessments of impacts on water courses. 	<p>and noted. An updated assessment is presented within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A detailed flood risk assessment has been completed and is within the ES Appendices (Application Document 3.4) submitted with the DCO application. This considers the risk of flooding at Kirkby Thore from a combination of both the River Eden and Trout Beck as a result of the Project. The potential for adverse effects associated with Project components interacting with the River Eden SAC (and Trout Beck crossing) are also fully assessed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Application Document 3.6). This includes fluvial geomorphological modelling to demonstrate no adverse effect to river processes associated with the proposed Trout Beck crossing and construction activities. No significant effects on the River Eden SAC are identified as a result of the Project. ii) All water environment receptors within 1 km of DCO are included and considered within ES Chapter, Crowdundle Beck was scoped out of the assessment as there is no 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>hydrological connectivity interaction with the scheme.</p> <p>iii) Impacts of the Project on Birk Sike have been considered and no adverse impact is identified.</p> <p>Iv) ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment is in accordance with DMRB guidance and presents a robust assessment of the potential impact of the Project on the water environment.</p>	
1218	154366			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Geology and soils	<p>Respondents raise concerns:</p> <p>i) about impact of heavy plant and storage of materials during construction on soils and</p> <p>ii) impacts of runoff on nearby SAC/SSSI/watercourses.</p>	<p>We address each of these geology and soil comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) A Soil Management Plan is required to be produced by the has been produced as an Annex to the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and sets out the requirements of soil handling, storage, and treatment. These requirements have been taken into account in the assessment of impacts to soil as a result of heavy plant and storage as set out in ES Chapter 9: Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) and no significant effect is identified.</p> <p>ii) The highway drainage system is designed and assessed to DMRB guidance. This includes the Highways England Water Risk Assessment Tool (HEWRAT) assessment (Appendix 14.3: Water Quality Assessment</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Application Document 3.4) process taking in account the sensitivity of receiving watercourses which ensures that potential impacts on surface water quality and spillage risk are mitigated in the design and compliant with statutory requirements. This links in with ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Application Document 3.6) which identify risks to SACs and SSSIs from various factors, including the risk of run-off pollution. These assessments conclude there is no significant effect on these designations.	
1219	154366			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern about the potential impact of the scheme on groundwater and water supplies noting that piling for the bridge will damage the aquifer around the borehole, polluting it and rendering the borehole inoperable..	Impacts of the scheme (e.g., from cuttings) on groundwater receptors are considered within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). Existing water abstractions are considered as potential receptors within the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (Appendix 14.6: Hydrogeological Impact Assessment, Application Document 3.4). Where the assessment identifies a receptor as potentially being impacted by the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>works, appropriate surveying will be carried out to confirm that the receptors have not been disturbed during construction. Should the works result in disturbance of the supply, appropriate mitigation will be implemented, or an alternative source supplied. This is secured through measures within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The design and construction methodology of the embankment and viaduct over Trout Beck has not been finalised. Appropriate risk assessments (e.g., piling risk assessment) will be carried out prior to works commencing, to ensure appropriate measures are implemented and to prevent impacts to local receptors.</p>	
1220	154363			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the consideration of housing committed development, Planning ref - 19-0272 in proximity to the scheme and noise impacts on this development.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed and are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). This assessment feeds into ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects (Application Document 3.2) which considers the effects of noise impacts of the Project on committed development and potential in-combination effects. This assessment has considered development 19-0272	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and no significant effect is identified arising to the development or as a result of the development.	
1221			153962	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels within Kirkby Thore as a result of introducing a new road and retaining the existing road.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) at Kirkby Thore have been assessed. The assessment is underpinned by traffic modelling which considers the surrounding transport network. This is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The design has been developed since the drafting of the PEI Report and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore, which will reduce operational noise levels.</p> <p>Noise reduction measures have been embedded within the Project such as the selection of the vertical and horizontal alignment and the use of road surfacing (where appropriate) with lower noise generating characteristics than standard hot rolled asphalt road surfacing.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that 280 dwellings within Kirkby Thore, near or within Crackenthorpe, near to Long Marton Road and along the existing A66 are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. 67 dwellings within Kirkby Thore at</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Sandersons Croft, Spitals Farm, Halefield, Sleastonhow, Powis House, Castrigg Hill and Roger Head are expected to experience a significant adverse effect. 12 non-residential receptors, including Kirkby Thore primary school, are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. One non-residential property at Spitals is expected to experience a significant adverse effect.	
1222	153560, 153852 162145			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels within the AONB and impact upon tranquillity and impact upon tourism.	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers noise impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The assessment concludes there are no significant noise effects in AONB as a result of the Project. Consideration of the impact of the Project on tourism is reported within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) and no significant effect on tourism is identified within this area.	No
1223	153870, 154363, 154366		154330	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the noise impact of the preferred route stating alternative routes such as the orange route would have fewer noise impacts.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including noise and vibration.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>The orange route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and this approach would be unlikely to be granted a DCO.</p> <p>Assessment of environmental criteria identified that both the blue and red routes were broadly similar. However, the red route performed better in terms of noise and vibration as it moved the route further away from Kirkby Thore; although closer to Long Marton, fewer receptors were affected.</p> <p>However, the red route also required moving further to the east with a number of additional landowners affected and the effects of the route on Long Marton increased. Additionally, whilst the crossing of Trout Beck would be shorter for the red route, it would result in a structure which would be</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>much more visible within the landscape due to its increased height and the way the land falls in this area.</p> <p>The blue route was subsequently identified as the preference to be taken forward for the Project.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts of the Project. Within the ES Chapter there are noise change maps which show both adverse and beneficial impacts due to the proposed Project.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that 280 dwellings within Kirkby Thore, near or within Crackenthorpe, near to Long Marton Road and along the existing A66 are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. 67 dwellings within Kirkby Thore at Sandersons Croft, Spitals Farm, Halefield, Sleastonhow, Powis House, Castrigg Hill and Roger Head are expected to experience a significant adverse effect. 12 non-residential receptors, including Kirkby Thore primary school, are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. One non-residential property at Spitals is expected to experience a significant adverse effect.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1224	153044, 153816, 162145		152177, 154266	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the noise impact of the scheme on the environment and whether the impact of wind funnelling on noise levels has been considered.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) has been assessed. The assessment is underpinned by modelling which considers aspects such as topography, traffic speed and other elements such as wind. The assessment is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). In order to reduce noise effects, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.	No
1225	154363			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the consultation carried out for the scheme and lack of detail in regards the noise assessment carried out.	The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation provided a preliminary assessment of the Project's potential significant environmental effects. The PEI Report provided an appropriate and robust assessment of the Project to inform statutory engagement. The PEI Report noise chapter identified potential noise sensitive receptors (residential and non-residential) and where receptors would potentially experience a significant effect with mitigation required to reduce the potential effects of noise change.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts of the Project. The ES Chapter identifies the methodology used to identify sensitive receptors and how modelling has been used to predict potential project effects, including their significance. The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors, which are discussed within the ES Chapter and presented in tabulated form as part of the associated ES Appendix (Application Document 3.4).	
1226			154227	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular that the scheme would impact on older buildings through vibration from HGV movements.	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The predicted noise impacts of the Project reflect changes in traffic speed, flow and percentage of HGVs. A construction vibration assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), has been carried out in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 guidance within a study area of 100m from the closest construction activity (as a worst-case this is assumed to be at the Order	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Limits). Receptors located beyond these distances are unlikely to be significantly impacted by construction noise and vibration. No significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of Project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.</p>	
1229	153817			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels for local residents, specifically mentioning concerns regarding noise baseline surveys being carried out during lockdown.</p>	<p>Baseline noise surveys were carried out in June 2021 at several locations across the proposed route of the Project. Whilst surveying was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, surveying was not conducted during periods of national or local lock-down. Measured noise levels are believed to be representative of normal conditions as traffic flows on the major trunk roads were close to pre-Covid-19 levels. Survey results were used to help validate the acoustic road noise model used for the predictive noise calculations as per DMRB LA 111 section 3.45 – 3.48.</p> <p>Full details of the surveys are presented within ES Chapter 12 Noise</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The assessment concludes that 280 dwellings within Kirkby Thore, near or within Crackenthorpe, near to Long Marton Road and along the existing A66 are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. 67 dwellings within Kirkby Thore at Sandersons Croft, Spitals Farm, Halefield, Sleastonhow, Powis House, Castrigg Hill and Roger Head are expected to experience a significant adverse effect. 12 non-residential receptors, including Kirkby Thore primary school, are expected to experience a significant beneficial effect. One non-residential property at Spitals is expected to experience a significant adverse effect.</p>	
1230	153816			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels for local residents, specifically mentioning Dunfell View.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The scheme design has been developed since the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore. As a result of the Project, we no adverse significant noise effects are identified at Dunfell View.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1232	154363	Cumbria County Council	152177, 153842, 153845, 154226, 152984	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular that the scheme would increase noise levels for local residents during construction, specifically mentioning the querying whether noise mitigation measures will be implemented pre work commencing.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). During construction, the Project has the potential to cause temporary noise and vibration impacts on the closest receptors to the development. The potential for temporary construction noise and vibration impacts is dependent on the construction activities being carried out.</p> <p>The Project has been designed, where practicable, to avoid and minimise potential adverse noise and vibration effects through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles. Measures have been set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) which contains a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NMVP) to reduce noise and vibration impacts, including implementation of Best Practicable Means (BPM) and consultation and agreement with Local Authorities. BPM includes the selection of quiet and low vibration equipment, optimal location of equipment on site to minimise noise disturbance, the use of enclosures for stationary equipment, no start-up or shut down of vibratory equipment</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>within 50m of close receptors, and the use of less intrusive vehicle reversing warnings.</p> <p>Monitoring of noise and vibration during construction, will include physical and observational checks/audits at locations to be determined in consultation with relevant Local Planning Authorities as secured through measures in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
1233	154363			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and query why a 3D model was not provided at PEI Report stage to understand the proximity of residents to the scheme.</p>	<p>The PEI Report provided information to enable the general public and stakeholders to understand the potential environmental effects of the Project, how these affects are proposed to be assessed and potential measures proposed to avoid or reduce such effects. The PEI Report also outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are now reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).</p> <p>The PEI Report noise chapter identified potential noise sensitive receptors (residential and non-residential) and where receptors would potentially experience a significant effect with mitigation required to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>reduce the potential effects of noise change.</p> <p>Alongside the PEI Report, visual fly throughs of our preliminary designs were provided via our consultation web page.</p> <p>The ES Chapter identifies the methodology used to identify sensitive receptors and how modelling has been used to predict potential project effects, including their significance. The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors, which are discussed within the ES Chapter and presented in tabulated form as part of the associated ES Appendix (Application Document 3.4).</p>	
1234	154363			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the use of the Sound Lab during consultation and how it presents an unrealistic representation of noise levels.	The sound demonstrations presented at public engagement and public consultation events were representations of the sound levels presented in the PEI Report for the scenarios a) without the scheme and b) with the scheme at a particular location. The demonstrations were rigorously developed combining recorded sound, traffic prediction modelling (following the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) methodology as required by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)) and digital techniques to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>produce the road traffic sound simulation at the correctly calculated level (within 5dB bands). The demonstrations present calibrated sound levels that are representative of the average sound level during a 16-hour weekday (0700-2300hrs) as presented in the PEI Report.</p> <p>Sound demonstrations are not a requirement for public engagement or consultation, but National Highways considered that sound demonstrations were an accessible way to present predicted sound level changes to the public.</p>	
1235			153556	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	Respondents requesting clarification on what 'ecological mitigation' means in practical terms.	<p>Industry ecological Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management guidance defines mitigation as 'measures taken to avoid or reduce negative impacts and effects'.</p> <p>In regards this scheme, since the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEI Report) the proposed ecological mitigation measures have been developed in more detail. The required mitigation is set out in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2), the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11). An indication of how the ecological mitigation could be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	
1237	148591, 152206, 153559, 153870, 154363, 154366		153842	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on cultural heritage sites, specifically archaeological sites such as roman roads and the impact on Sleastonhow Lane, Brough Castle and the Eden Valley Railway.	<p>Since the PEI Report further trenching has been done to understand the presence of Roman remains such as Roman roads. A Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy forms part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and details the type and location of mitigation required for cultural heritage resources.</p> <p>Consultation has also been carried out with bodies such as the Roman Roads Research Association, the Milestone Society, and the Churches Conservation Trust.</p> <p>The impacts of the Project on the historic environment and proposed mitigation measures are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>Brough Castle will not be impacted by the Project and no significant impacts are identified along the Eden Valley Branch Railway.</p> <p>Historic landscape character is also considered in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). Cultural assets such as Brough Castle are features of each landscape character</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						area and landscape character type. Viewpoints from the Eden Valley Railway and Sleastonhow Lane, have been selected for the landscape and visual assessment and the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of these receptors can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The landscape character of Sleastonhow Lane will change due to the Project however the connection will remain, and mitigation will ameliorate the impacts, but the character will change in parts.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Kirkby Thore' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
226	148565, 148578, 148588, 148612, 148615, 148630, 148637, 149370, 149394, 150412, 152224, 153037, 153859, 153909, 154013, 154218	Cumbria County Council	148622, 150438, 153065, 153948, 154192, 154199, 154203	General / no reason given	Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing support in general terms, without being specific, for the preferred route in the proposals. Respondents state that the plans are well considered and support the impact that the road would have on local residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
231	149795, 154194	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	148703, 149800, 154203	Land	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the amended land take put forward in the proposals. Respondents state that the reduced land take would allow them to resume normal farming activities. Others state the land take preserves biodiverse land, and that the land take on productive agricultural plots has been minimised.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the amended land take. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 13 Population and Human Health for further information on the impacts and proposed mitigation and within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). Where temporary land take can be returned for agricultural use upon completion of the construction phase it will be.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
535	149356, 150182, 150460, 151346, 153335, 153386, 153851, 153911, 153950, 153975, 154013, 154218, 154240, 154251		149800, 151350, 152936, 153051, 153057, 153321, 153376, 153824, 153845, 153867, 153897, 153948, 154192, 154457	Community Impact	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would have a positive impact on local residents, in particular mentioning reduced HGV traffic through local villages including Kirkby Thore and Long Marton.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. Refer to Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 13 Population and Human Health for further information on the impacts and proposed mitigation.	No
599	149350, 149380, 149417, 151462, 152224, 153335, 153815, 153817, 153911, 153975, 154223		148599, 148623, 149355, 149800, 152236, 153051, 153052, 153321, 153933, 154192, 154330, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve connectivity for local residents and businesses, particularly mentioning improved access to Kirkby Thore and for HGV traffic to the British Gypsum site. Respondents also express support for retaining the existing A66 for local access and for removing a dangerous junction at Long Marton.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. A new junction at the British Gypsum access to the north of Kirkby Thore will pass over the proposed A66 alignment on a bridge structure. This junction will maintain the key local connection onto the A66 and has the additional benefit of providing access to businesses and hauliers to the north of the village. This will contribute to a reduction in the number of HGV movements through Kirkby Thore.	No
608	149417, 149793, 152901,	Cumbria County Council	149355, 150428, 150454, 152936,	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153386, 153975	Eden District Council	152988, 153321, 153920, 153948, 154203, 154330		reduce traffic levels through villages, particularly HGV traffic, and specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore. Support is also expressed for removing or upgrading dangerous junctions in Kirkby Thore and at other non-specified locations, and for reducing the number of horse-drawn vehicles on the A66.		
609	151462, 153617, 153799, 153911, 153912	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150452, 150453, 152936	Walking, cycling and horse-riders	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that existing bridleways and footpaths would be retained and that the scheme would improve access to routes for walking, cycling and horse-riding.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Refer to the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	No
610	148621, 149350, 149417, 149771, 149795, 149797, 150462, 151346, 152173, 152224, 152901, 154250	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	149355, 149770, 149776, 150421, 150452, 152932, 152983, 153029, 153052, 154330	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce congestion in local villages, in particular Kirkby Thore, Crackenthorpe and surrounding villages. Respondents specifically mention support for the scheme because it would divert HGV traffic travelling to the British Gypsum site and businesses in Knock away from Kirkby Thore. Support is also expressed for the scheme on the	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme. A core Project Objective for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project is to reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys between the M6 at Penrith and the A1(M) Scotch Corner.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					grounds that it would reduce congestion caused by horse-drawn vehicles as these could use local roads instead and it would be easier for vehicles to overtake them on the new dual carriageway road.		
613	149795, 151472, 153861, 153912, 154240		150452, 154331	Walking, cycling and horse-riders	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that existing walking routes will be maintained, and safety improved for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. In particular, respondents support the proposals for footpaths and feel that the scheme would improve cycle access to Penrith.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme extents along the de-trunked old A66. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	No
619	149350, 149397, 149797, 152923, 152945, 153338, 154363		150166, 153029, 153376	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the basis that it would reduce congestion. In particular, respondents support the potential reduction in HGV traffic heading to British Gypsum via Kirkby Thore. Others support the possible reduction of traffic in Kirkby Thore. Respondents support the increased access and reduced disturbance that a possible reduction in congestion could bring.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
625	153377		153065, 154331	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the provision of vehicular access to local settlements. Respondents state that great care has been taken within the plans to preserve existing access routes into Kirkby Thore. Others support the potential reductions in journey times and feel that Kirkby Thore would be more accessible due to a reduction in HGV traffic.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme.	No
626	149797, 152945		150421, 154331	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the basis that it would improve safety. Respondents specifically support a possible reduction in accidents and near misses on the Kirkby Thore junction.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
627	149397, 149795, 153377		148586, 150166, 152236, 153376, 154266	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the proposed design of the scheme. Respondents specifically mention that the scheme would divert traffic, including HGVs, from small villages such as Kirkby Thore and that proposals to use the existing A66 for local traffic would improve safety.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the proposed design of the Scheme, including reduction of HGV traffic in villages.	No
735	148564, 148568, 148616, 149352, 149356, 149371, 149773,		150421, 150464, 152933, 152983, 152984, 152999, 153321,	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing general support for the scheme, in particular mentioning Kirkby Thore and Crackenthorpe, without providing further details	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	149796, 150429, 151472, 152230, 152243, 152267, 153037, 153043, 153377, 153617, 153821, 153852, 153912, 153975, 154469, 162144		153556, 153825, 154203				
743	148615, 151331	Historic England	150438, 152984, 153030, 153042, 153321, 153897, 154190, 154232	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the design of the scheme on the grounds that it makes best use of land and has been well planned with suitable mitigation measures identified. Respondents also support the design on the grounds that it would provide improved access to British Gypsum site and that the junctions at Priest Lane and at Main Street, Kirkby Thore have been well designed.	We thank you for your comments and wish to confirm that the Blue Route has been selected to be put forward to DCO. The Blue Route was identified to be the optimum design based on a combination of assessments by different environmental disciplines and a balanced view of the impacts.	No
744	154240		152983, 153065, 154190	Land - Land take	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would have least impact on their land, specifically mentioning land at Bridge End Farm. Respondents also believe	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					the scheme makes best use of land and express support for any properties to be demolished as part of the scheme to receive compensation at full market value.	Any property acquired by the Project will be compensated in line with the compensation code.	
764			153959, 154330	Traffic, transport and junctions - Commuting	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce journey times for commuters by providing more direct routes, in particular mentioning travel from Penrith or Appleby to Kirkby Thore, Long Marton and other local villages such as Milburn, Knock and Dufton.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme..	No
831			153620	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	One respondent expressing support for the scheme's mitigation measures, including the installation of hedgerows, without further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme mitigation measures.	No
1004			153065	Economics - Local economy	A respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds of the potential benefit to the local economy, in particular that the provision of local roads would support tourism.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
1007			153051	Economics - Local economy	One respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve access to the British Gypsum site.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Temple Sowerby to Appleby the route will include a new junction at Main Street to the northeast of Kirkby Thore. Main Street will pass over the proposed A66 alignment on a bridge	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						structure. This junction will maintain the key local connection onto the A66 and has the additional benefit of providing access to businesses and hauliers to the north of the village. This will contribute to a reduction in the number of HGV movements through Kirkby Thore.	
1008	149771, 153043		152236	Construction	Respondents expressing support for the preferred scheme on the grounds that construction of the scheme would be less disruptive to local residents and users of the existing A66 than other scheme options.	National Highways welcomes support for the scheme.	No
1084	149795			Construction	A respondent expressing general support for construction of the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways welcomes support for the construction of the Scheme	No
1099	148613			Get on with it / overdue	Respondent expressing support for the scheme and urging the Applicant to complete it as soon as possible.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme and the urge to complete it as soon as possible.	No
542	149358, 149374, 150416, 152219, 152951, 152958, 152982, 153359,		151473, 152216, 152961, 153847, 153927, 153953, 154266	Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the preferred Blue Route, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the Blue Route. Following Autumn 2021 Consultation design development continued. The design was developed having regard to feedback received throughout the consultation and ongoing engagement, to address environmental and traffic	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153364, 153365, 153879, 153881, 153965, 154363, 154366					issues that arose following completion of surveys and to incorporate mitigation for impacts that had been identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). This work has led to a number of opportunities to revise the design to improve aspects such as community connectivity, minimising or mitigating environmental impacts and optimising the use of land. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further details.	
3	148617, 148627, 148630, 149371, 149384, 149389, 149787, 150412, 150413, 150436, 152911, 153337, 153560, 153815, 153816, 153870, 153960, 154013, 154243, 154366,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	148622, 150180, 150194, 152177, 153376, 153381, 153620, 153624, 153625, 153628, 153842, 153920, 153933, 153953, 153962, 154225, 154227, 154232,	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting changes to the engineering design of the scheme. Suggestions include that</p> <p>The junction at Kirkby Thore should be redesigned or relocated in order to retain the storage facility and improve safety.</p> <p>A westbound junction should be installed at west end of Appleby bypass to reduce congestion.</p> <p>A new junction should be installed close to Powis Cottage.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that the road near to Kirkby Thore should be placed in a deep cutting to reduce impacts on local residents.</p>	<p>The following elements were addressed with regard to the engineering design of the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Junction at Kirkby Thore (Gypsum Junction): this has been relocated, so that the storage facility is not affected. - West end junction at the end of Appleby bypass: new junction features at Appleby (as shown at the public consultation) have been removed, and a new junction catering for all vehicle movements has been located at Powis House, approximately 4 km to the west of Appleby. For westbound vehicles at Appleby wishing to access the new A66, it will mean a journey on the existing A66 (with significantly reduced traffic) to access this new junction 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	154367, 154468		154266, 154331		<p>Respondents make further design suggestions related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bridge and underpass design. • Traffic control measures. • Lay-bys. • access to agricultural land, mentioning various locations across the scheme. 	<p>- New junction at Powis House: this has been implemented.</p> <p>- Cutting depth: The proposed road, as it passes around Kirkby Thore, has been placed in cutting which achieves a depth of up to 12m.</p> <p>- Sleastonhow Lane: The realigned Sleastonhow Lane optimises the amount to which the land both sides of the proposed road are affected, and misses the important trees (including the Sleastonhow Oak)</p> <p>- Lay-by design: the lay-by locations associated with the proposed design are as per the spacing requirements of adopted design guidance, and do not afford scope for movement without a reduction in the number of lay-bys.</p> <p>- Underpasses and overbridges have been provided where necessary to supplement the main grade separated junction strategy. The choice between underbridge or overbridge is driven by a number of factors including environmental considerations such as visual impact, and engineering considerations such as balancing earthworks cut & fill volumes. If a PRow is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. - Access to land. Maintaining suitable access to all private land plots has been a key focus during the design development. Throughout the design process landowners have been consulted with designs evolved and amended to balance the requirements of all landowners. Particular consideration has been given to agricultural land and operations to reduce or minimise adverse effects.	
6	148625, 149358, 149387, 150182, 150189, 151347, 153560, 153617, 153619, 153851, 153909, 153944, 154013, 154194, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152177, 152216, 153033, 153041, 153042, 153310, 153847, 153920, 154260, 154330, 154491	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting various changes to design of the scheme, including:</p> <p>A modified or relocated junction at Kirkby Thore to improve connectivity for HGVs and to allow retention of the storage facility and relocating the junction near to Powis Cottages.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest provision of parking at Ashton Leigh Cottages, considering alternatives to diverting Priest Lane, modifying the route to move the road further away from Kirkby Thore and relocating drainage ponds and construction compounds.</p> <p>Further suggestions include improving provision for horse-drawn vehicles and the travelling community.</p>	<p>The following elements were addressed with regard to the various changes of the scheme design:</p> <p>- Priest Lane: The line of Priest Lane is followed as far as is practicable – incorporating access under the proposed new alignment represents a small diversion, the line of which is necessary to achieve the optimal point of crossing.</p> <p>- Relocated junctions at Kirkby Thore (Gypsum Junction), and Powis House: the Gypsum junction has been relocated, so that the storage facility is not affected and facilitates Gypsum HGV movements to avoid the village; further, a junction facility has been incorporated at Long Marton (adjacent to Powis House).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					<p>Designing Trout Beck bridge to make it a design feature.</p> <p>Considering alternatives to dualling the road near to Kirkby Thore.</p> <p>Placing the road in a cutting to reduce noise and visual impact.</p> <p>Providing improved access for local traffic to the existing lane from Kirkby Thore to Temple Sowerby.</p>	<p>- Ashton Leigh Cottages: owing to the relocation of the Kirkby Thore junction (see above), Main Street will be stopped up, with correspondingly minimal traffic and without the need to address a parking facility.</p> <p>- Priest Lane (the existing lane from Kirkby Thore to Temple Sowerby), is being improved for vehicle access at its eastern end for a significant distance, where it terminates at the junction with Station Road.</p> <p>- Moving the route further from Kirkby Thore: the line of the adopted proposed route is constrained by geometric requirements, although it was sought to maximise the distance of the route from the village.</p> <p>- Ponds and construction compounds: these have been altered and optimised, in line with the locations of junctions being altered.</p> <p>- Horse-drawn vehicles: these will be facilitated along the length of the route, care of a markedly reduced flow of vehicles on the existing A66.</p> <p>- Placing the road in a cutting: The proposed road, as it passes around Kirkby Thore, has been placed in cutting which achieves a depth of up to 12m.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>- In terms of alternative design solutions at Kirkby Thore - National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project (from 2018-20) and has continued the evaluation of alternative route alignments for Kirkby Thore more recently in 2021 (the findings of which were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation). The preferred solution achieves the objectives for the Project in terms of safety, travel time savings and also removing HGV traffic from the village - it is also preferred in terms of a range of environmental considerations. See Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further details on the need for this Scheme and our assessment of alternatives.</p> <p>Comments regarding the design of the Trout Beck crossing to make it a design feature are noted. The final structure design will be balanced between the required engineering function and aesthetic form full regard to the setting and visual impact taking into regard the design principles – that good road design fits in context, and is restrained, and environmentally</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						sustainable. Refer to the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) for the design principles.	
8	152956, 154363		149770, 154491	Engineering design and development - Retain existing route	Respondents suggesting that the existing A66 should be retained or upgraded as an alternative to the preferred Blue Route, or that it should be retained and used for local traffic. A respondent also suggests that the existing route from Kirkby Thore to Newbiggin should be retained.	<p>The selected route represents a balanced approach considering the user, the landowner and the environment. A series of options have been considered for the route of the A66 during this Project, the merits of each option have been discussed by specialist teams consisting specific disciplines such as Highway Engineering, Environmental, Traffic Modellers/Engineers. These teams have agreed the best route based on the needs/interests that each team represents.</p> <p>Between Temple Sowerby and Appleby these options (and some additional options) were reconsidered at the preliminary design stage and the public were presented with the three highest scoring options (Red, Blue and Orange). National Highways expressed a preference for the Blue Route. We have now reviewed all feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation and the decision has now been made to progress the Blue Route through the DCO process.</p> <p>Not included in this round of optioneering was consideration for a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>tunnel as this would involve risks associated with the mines, generate an enormous quantity of waste material, may create problems with groundwater/geology, would have a comparable carbon footprint (due to the build) and would create avoidable risks to the user (such as fire and flooding). Also not included in the optioneering was the 'do nothing' option, as the scheme's objective is to improve journey reliability and safety and the existing road performs badly against these aspects.</p> <p>Between Temple Sowerby and Appleby, the existing A66 is being maintained between the railway bridge and Low Moor (Caravan Park). At the east end the existing A66 will be joined with the existing slip road from Appleby and the slip road will be made two-way along its whole length. At the west end a new length of road will run between Low Moor and Morland Road (existing road running between Skygarth Farm and Temple Sowerby under the A66 dual carriageway). The existing A66 will be transferred to the Local Highway Authority (Cumbria County Council) and will be for use by local residents with an emphasis on walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
14	152953, 152967, 153325, 153351, 153812, 153817, 153838, 153870, 153879, 154363, 154366		152983	Alternative route - Orange - Climate impact	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would generate a lower level of greenhouse gas emissions than the preferred Blue Route and would therefore have less of an impact on the climate.	National Highways is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). The Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement (Application Document 3.9) sets out how the Project accords with the policies of the NPSNN. ES Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2) presents a breakdown of the emissions calculated for the Project, and a comparison against UK Government carbon budgets, to determine the significance of emissions. It is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets and no likely significant effects are predicted. Greenhouse gas emissions were considered alongside other factors in the assessment of different route alignments. It was important that the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>route chosen and taken forward into the DCO application was preferred in relation to a wide range of environmental criteria and that it would accord with policy, including policy relating to climate change (in the NPSNN).</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the harm that could be caused to the site by the Orange Route could not be preferred and would be likely to conflict with national planning policy. Further information on the optioneering process can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement Chapter3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
92	148620, 149369, 149407, 150175, 151469, 151472, 151484, 152215, 152238,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152177, 152988, 153032, 153376, 153620, 153824, 153842, 153867, 153897,	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the scheme should include additional provision for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents suggest that segregated routes be included in the scheme to improve connectivity and safety. Other respondents suggest that additional	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	152911, 152913, 152930, 152941, 152979, 153335, 153815, 153816, 153817, 153835, 153860, 153870, 153912, 153960, 153975, 154002		153927, 153962, 154266, 154491		routes be provided to mitigate negative impact of the scheme on existing routes and provide detailed route suggestions. Various locations across the scheme are mentioned including Kirkby Thore; Temple Sowerby; Crackenthorpe; Appleby; Center Parcs; Penrith; Priest Lane; Long Marton; Spittals Farm; and Lady Ann Way.	overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. The de-trunked section of the A66 as it passes Kirkby Thore and Crackenthorpe provides the opportunity for a new WCH route on this stretch. A shared cycle/footway in the verge of the de-trunked A66 is proposed, running the entire length of the scheme extent. The shared cycle/footway would run on the south side of the de-trunked A66 through Kirkby Thore and would then run on the north side of the de-trunked A66 from the east end of Kirkby Thore village to the western extent of Appleby. This new route ties into existing provision at each end of the scheme. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	
93	153337, 153815, 153885, 153929, 154179, 154363, 162145	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153381, 153556, 153620, 153625, 153845, 153867, 153883, 153920, 154227,	Request for further information	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council requesting further information on a variety of subjects pertaining to the scheme at Temple Sowerby to Appleby, including: 1. how connectivity in the area will be improved as a result of the scheme, especially through	Information relating the numbered requests for information is given below: 1. Connectivity in the area will be improved through a series of measures as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), the Transport Assessment	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
			154232, 162153		<p>footpaths, cycle paths, and bridleways.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. how the scheme will interact with planning for, and traffic management during, Appleby Horse Fair. 3. what journey time comparisons have been conducted to compare all proposed routes; whether footways will be provided to cross new junctions. 4. whether rail has been considered for regional freight. 5. who has responsibility for maintaining access tracks and managing new hedgerows and wetlands? 6. information on the drainage plan, 7. details of the environmental impact mitigation. 8. details of the DCO boundaries, 9. information on the re-routing of traffic. 10. whether school land is to be used for Newbiggin Road 11. whether Cumbria County Council will take on additional maintenance duties as a result of the scheme. 	<p>(Application Document 3.7), and the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding proposals report (Application Document 2.4) The existing A66 will be de-trunked, and a walking and cycling shared facility provided immediately adjacent to it along the entire length of the scheme. In addition to the marked reduction of traffic using the existing A66, the de-trunking will also enable a speed limit reduction to be introduced along specific lengths, and this will further augment the conditions by which WCHs negotiate this section of highway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Details on how the Appleby Horse Fair have been accommodated within our proposals can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), section 5.4. Further consultation was carried out as part of the Supplementary Consultation. Refer to Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) 3. Details of journey time consideration in assessing routes can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>section 5.4, with details of footway provisions also shown in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding proposals report (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>4. Rail considerations are detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), section 3.3</p> <p>5. Maintenance of access tracks and the management of hedgerows and wetlands will fall under National Highways' maintenance and response contract..</p> <p>6. Details relating to drainage can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment</p> <p>7. Environmental impact mitigation information can be found within the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), including chapter 4 'Environmental Assessment Methodology' which details the approach taken to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), also the Project's Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>8. Details of the DCO boundaries per scheme can be found within the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5)</p> <p>9. Information on the re-routing of traffic during construction will be produced by the Principal Contractors during the details design phase as required by the Environmental Management Plan (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO) (Application Document 2.7) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible</p> <p>10. The design presented to the public during the consultation event in the autumn of 2021 has seen minor and major amendments before being submitted for DCO. One of the minor amendments has been to move Newbiggin Road away from Kirkby Thore Primary School and to alter the earthwork embankment so that it does not encroach into the school grounds, and there should be a minimum of 3m between the toe of the embankment and the boundary fence. Note: the existing hedgerow and wall will remain in place and should be unaffected by the works, any additional noise barrier</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>required can be discussed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>11. Some additional maintenance duties will fall to Cumbria County Council, for example the management of the de-trunked sections of the A66. National Highways are engaging with the local authorities and will continue to discuss the details of issues such as this.</p>	
198	151472, 152248, 152906, 153314, 153817, 153907, 153975, 154013, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153033, 153042, 153824, 153847	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the scheme should make provisions for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Suggestions include connecting existing routes to avoid multiple crossings of the dual carriageway; using the existing A66 and Roman roads for routes; and providing routes to Penrith and from Appleby to Temple Sowerby and Kirkby Thore. Respondents also make suggestions for modifications and diversions to existing routes and for segregating walkers, cyclists and horse-riders from livestock when using shared routes.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated walking, cycling and horse-riders underpass or bridge.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Kirkby Thore extents along the de-trunked old A66, where it will remain. The shared cycle/footway proposed for Scheme 3 would run on the north side of the proposed dual carriageway. The shared path connects into existing provision at both ends of the scheme. This route would allow pedestrians and cyclists to walk and ride from Penrith</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>to Temple Sowerby on a safe route, separated from traffic.</p> <p>In terms of additional diversions, several potential additional WCH features, situated on or around the A66 within the existing dualled sections have been identified by the public and Local Authorities. While these are out of scope for the proposed A66 NTP Project, they are eligible for consideration for Designated Funding. Designated Funding is a funding stream controlled by National Highways which can be applied for by Delivery Partners, for example Local Authorities, for monies to undertake feasibility work, with the potential to also apply for construction costs to implement the new features or improvements to the trunk road network. On scheme 0405 an application for Designated Funding has been submitted for traffic calming measures at Trout Beck Bridge to allow three-way signals on Main Street and the de-trunked A66, in Kirkby Thore. Reducing the carriageway cross-section on Trout Beck Bridge would allow the shared cycle/footway to continue on the existing bridge deck.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	
221	153815, 153816, 153869, 153870, 153960	Eden District Council	153920, 153953	Engineering design and development - Visual mitigation	<p>Respondents including Eden District Council suggesting that the road should be screened as part of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme to prevent it having a large visual impact.</p> <p>Respondents say that mitigation is required to protect residents as well as the character of the landscape and villages.</p> <p>Mitigation methods suggested including raising embankments, installing hedgerows and bunds, planting trees, and choosing materials to reflect the local character of the villages.</p> <p>Respondents emphasise that they believe that existing woodland should be kept where possible rather than removed.</p> <p>They suggest that any new planting should be focused on the side between villages and the road. Areas highlighted for additional visual impact mitigation include Sanderson Croft to British Gypsum, Sleastonhow Lane, Sanderson's Croft, Dunfell view, and Kirkby Thore Primary School.</p>	<p>The proposed road, as it passes around Kirkby Thore, has been placed in cutting which achieves a depth of up to 12m (including the bunding at the top of the cutting on the village side).</p> <p>The proposed alignment choice of route has minimised the impact on existing areas of woodland.</p> <p>Suggestions relating to environmental mitigation (planting etc.) have been noted, all respondent feedback regarding additional visual impact mitigation to Sanderson Croft to British Gypsum, Sleastonhow Lane, Sanderson's Croft, Dunfell view, and Kirkby Thore Primary School has been considered.</p> <p>Regarding comments about privacy, landscape visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration of the design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. Further information about design</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>principles can be found in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). Mitigation methods including raising embankments, installing hedgerows and bunds, planting trees are covered in these figures</p> <p>These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall scheme design principles, including use of local materials to reflect the character of the villages along the route.</p>	
227		Cumbria County Council		Engineering design and development - Futureproofing	<p>Cumbria County Council suggesting future proofing of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme.</p> <p>Respondents say that detailed management plans and funding should be produced to ensure that the scheme is appropriately managed and maintained in the future.</p> <p>This suggestion expends to areas of de-trunked highway in addition to any new sections built.</p>	<p>Suggestions relating to futureproofing have been noted.</p> <p>The National Highways owned elements of the final scheme will be operated and maintained by National Highways.</p> <p>The future operation and maintenance of the local road network (including the de-trunked section of old A66) will be considered further and agreed with stakeholders as the Project progresses through subsequent development stages. The Project team will continue</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						to engage with all Local Authorities on a de-trunking and local road strategy.	
232		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that safety measures for the existing parts of the A66 still need to be assessed. In particular, some respondents query whether the existing safety assessments are suitable for older junctions which may be built to different design standards; an example given is the existing junction for the A66 with the C3065 Main Street in Kirkby Thore.	As part of the consideration to implement a new alignment for the A66, use of the remaining section of the existing A66 has been assessed. In particular, the C3065 Main Street junction at Kirkby Thore with the existing A66 has been subject to a redesign, given the marked change in vehicle numbers which will occur with the opening of the new road. Where the existing A66 passes through Kirkby Thore the speed limit will be reduced to 30mph over a length roughly between the filling station and Piper Lane. This will be accompanied with improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, and traffic calming (ideally the traffic calming will not include any speed humps). The short length of the existing 40mph speed limit from Piper Lane heading west will be removed, and the existing speed cameras will be discussed with Cumbria County Council. Findings from our assessments into how the 'old' A66 continues to operate safely are presented on our Works Plans drawings (Application Document 5.16).	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
246	153044, 153815, 153816, 153869, 153870, 154363, 154366, 162145	Cumbria County Council	148694, 150464, 152961, 153030, 153376, 153556, 153620, 153625, 153824, 153842, 153897, 153920, 153953, 153962, 154266	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council suggesting that the proposed engineering mitigation measures could be redesigned to increase their effectiveness.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that more could be done to mitigate impacts of air, noise and light pollution, particularly on the side of the road facing residential properties and schools.</p> <p>In particular, respondents suggest the following measures be used to mitigate potential negative impacts on local residents: placing the road in deeper cuttings; use of low noise road surfaces; acoustic barriers; and planting vegetation for screening.</p> <p>Various locations across the scheme are mentioned including Kirkby Thore; Appleby; Sleastonhow Lane; Trout Beck; and Sanderson's Croft.</p>	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 5 Air Quality considers the impact of the scheme on air quality, Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual considers the impact of the scheme on visual receptors and landscape character including light pollution from headlights of car users.</p> <p>Where adverse environmental impacts are identified mitigation is proposed. Our landscape architects and ecologists have developed environmental mitigation which considers visual impacts of the scheme, identifying planting areas and appropriate species to screen intrusive views and light pollution. Planting aims to maximise biodiversity as well as delivering landscape mitigation. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) provide an indication of how the mitigation could be implemented and the detail of the mitigation required is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Mitigation measures have also been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>including the alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.</p> <p>The Project design has been developed since the statutory consultation in Autumn 2021 and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore. No adverse significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore School or Dunfell View are identified.</p> <p>At Sleastonhow, there are predicted to be noise increases, however, it is not sustainable to provide additional mitigation in the form of a noise barrier at this location, further details are provided within the ES Chapter.</p> <p>There is now a proposed junction with the Project to the north of Sanderson's Croft, however, the earth bunding/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts and potential landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>As a result of the Project, we expect a reduction in noise levels along Main Street. At Powis House, there are predicted to be noise increases, however, it is not sustainable to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>provide additional mitigation in the form of a noise barrier at this location. As a result of the Project, we expect a reduction in road traffic noise levels along the existing A66 in the vicinity of New Bungalow.</p> <p>Further details in regards proposed mitigation measures is reported within the ES Chapter. It should be noted provision of noise barriers has taken account of benefit compared to cost, engineering practicability, other environmental impacts caused by the barriers including those on ecological receptors and stakeholder consultation. Where noise barriers are not appropriate other mitigation measures have been considered. Significantly affected properties may also qualify for noise insulation works, which would reduce noise impacts.</p>	
249	153816	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Mitigate construction	<p>Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting ways to mitigate the impacts of the construction of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. Suggestions include working with local authorities to create plans for Traffic Regulation Orders and Traffic Management Plans for Appleby Horse Fair; limiting work hours so that night work does not take place; regularly</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns raised by the consultees. It is noted that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					cleaning the roads and gullies; and signing up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme to help ensure that community and environmental impacts are kept to a minimum.	<p>reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption, with liaison taking place throughout the works to ensure concerns are dealt with</p> <p>The Principal Contractor (PC) carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as committed to in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO) (Application Document 2.7) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout most of the works, minimising the need for diversions to be established. In addition, the construction team will also ensure that construction activities do not impact the highway where material or plant are required to move, with additional road sweeping services. Where gullies are identified to be blocked on routes that are required to be used by the construction team or road users,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>additional works will look to be carried out.</p> <p>The purpose of the EMP is to set out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the ES. The PC(s) for the Project are required to be accredited to <i>ISO 14001 Certification Environmental Management</i> (Quality Management Systems, 2015). This signifies an understanding of implementation of an Environmental Management System (EMS) for recording, monitoring and managing the Project and the EMS will be maintained throughout the Project.</p> <p>The Project construction works will be carried out in accordance with the EMS.</p> <p>Environmental management will be monitored to establish compliance with the contract and environmental standards through regular inspections and audits. The responsibility for maintaining correspondence relating to the EMS and day-to-day records will rest with the PC, subject to contractual arrangements. The PC will produce a second iteration of the EMP (prior to construction starting) to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full details of monitoring and reviewing compliance with the 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>EMP. For example, daily/weekly/monthly inspection/audit reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment criteria to identify success • Procedures for rectification of breaching or failings of EMP or EMS measures <p>Further information can be found in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Whilst National Highways will look to minimise the impacts on residents, stakeholders and road users during the works, it is essential that some works are carried out at night or at weekends when traffic levels are lower, and it is safer to undertake works that are close to live traffic. Where possible as much construction works will take place during the day where it is safe so and in isolation to road users. Where night or weekend works are required, affected resident will be liaised with and works will look to be controlled to mitigate any detrimental effect such as noise or vibration.</p> <p>During construction, the Appleby Horse Fair Multi-Agency Strategic Coordinating Group (MASCg) will be liaised with around the timing of works, adequate diversions, and routing of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Fair traffic away from the A66 to minimise impacts on journeys to and from the Fair and on the surrounding road network. This principle is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
251		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Community impact - People	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that National Highways should consider ways in which it could contribute to the Traffic Management Plan for Appleby Horse Fair during the construction work, as the plan is needed to support the Fair's continued operation.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee about access for the Appleby Horse Fair during the construction of the Project. National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself, and is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management is important and National Highways will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of traffic management plans as the Project progresses, in order to help minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as required by the EMP (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO) (Application Document 2.7) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. This will include requirements to retain two</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>lanes on the A66 throughout most of the works, which it is considered should minimise the need for the use of diversion route.</p> <p>During construction, the Appleby Horse Fair Multi-Agency Strategic Coordinating Group (MASCG) will be liaised with around the timing of works, adequate diversions, and routing of Fair traffic away from the A66 to minimise impacts on journeys to and from the Fair and on the surrounding road network. This principle is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and will be incorporated into Construction Method and Management Statement (Application Document 2.6). Refer to the Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) for further information about how National Highways has considered the Appleby Horse Fair.</p>	
303	154243		153556, 153962	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents suggesting that access to farms as well as the local restaurant should be maintained around Temple Sowerby to Appleby. Respondents say that the farm access crossing Trout Beck should be retained and suggest the possibility of improving existing right of way provision.	In providing a bypass, the existing 'old A66' alignment will be retained. Farm and other business accesses as well as residential property accesses will be retained, however, the significant reduction in traffic along this road will result in far easier traffic movements for occupiers and workers accessing these locations improving access to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>services and jobs for the local community.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise with affected parties along the route as the scheme develops and will develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works as part of the detailed design phase.</p> <p>An application for Designated Funding has been submitted for traffic calming measures at Trout Beck Bridge to allow three-way signals on Main Street and the de-trunked A66, in Kirkby Thore. Reducing the carriageway cross-section on Trout Beck Bridge would allow the shared cycle/footway to continue on the existing bridge deck. Designated Funding is a funding stream controlled by National Highways which can be applied for by Delivery Partners, for example Local Authorities, for monies to undertake feasibility work, with the potential to also apply for construction costs to implement the new features or improvements to the trunk road network. Further information can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
304	151458, 154243		153897	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents suggesting methods to help avoid congestion as part of the scheme at Temple Sowerby to Appleby. Respondents say that provision of parking around Upton House and Ashton Leigh Cottages could aid with the flow of increased traffic in the area and help prevent congestion. They also say that the Bridge End bottle neck should be avoided when routing traffic, and that the existing A66 should have the capacity to support works vehicles without causing any additional congestion. A respondent claims that traffic for the Gypsum works can either travel through the village or be directed along improved local roads, with the Temple Sowerby junction being put forward as the most suitable option.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the consultees' comments on the proposed design of the project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. Following review of comments received at the Autumn 2021 Consultation together with the completion of further design and surveys the decision has been made to take the Blue Route through the DCO process. It should be noted that the position of the Main St junction has now been altered so that it is further west at the British Gypsum Access this should help alleviate any problems with increased traffic on the narrow section of Main St at the northern end of the village. Traffic at Bridge End will reduce significantly as a result of the proposed new alignment to the north of Kirkby Thore.</p> <p>The new route removes traffic from the existing A66. In terms of impact on other parts of the local road network there is a decrease in flows on all of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						the roads except Long Marton as the decreased journey time on the A66 relieves traffic on local roads. The existing Long Marton Road is realigned to the south to tie in with the proposed new A66 junction. Flows are expected to increase by 13% on Long Marton although the ratio of flow to capacity remains very low so the change will not impact the operation of this road. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
305	149787, 151469, 154243			Engineering design and development - Upgrade existing route	<p>Respondents suggesting that the original A66 route should be upgraded to reduce the costs of the scheme.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that any de-trunked sections of the A66 which would be used as local roads should have the width of the verges reduced to prevent illegal camping.</p>	<p>We have looked a number of options to try and utilise the existing A66 as much as possible however there are a number of reasons why we have not taken this forward. These include the fact the alignment of the current route is poor and does not meet current design standards; the proximity to the River Eden which is a special area of conservation; the need to demolish property including a major dairy farm; the requirement for a substantial crossing to cross the River Eden and its flood plain and the effects on known scheduled ancient monuments along the existing corridor</p> <p>The verges have a number of functions, the main function to provide forward visibility around corners and this means that the verges cannot be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						narrowed or populated with trees or other camping deterrents. Tried measures such as bollards and fencing has been unsuccessful in the past, but proposals can be discussed with the adopting authority at the detailed design stage.	
306	148635, 148696, 149787, 150439, 151487, 151504, 152248, 153600, 153913, 154013, 154243, 154363		153032, 153033, 153065, 153381, 153917, 153927, 154453	Alternative route - Other	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Applicant should consider alternative routes with less environmental impact: Proposed routes to the west of Kirkby Thore;</p> <p>Following the existing road To the south of the existing road To the north of the Blue Route Via a new junction at Fell Lane.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed route which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies and other interested parties.</p> <p>Following a review of the design and feedback received as part of the autumn 2021 Consultation it has been decided to relocate the proposed main street junction further west to the British Gypsum Access at Fell Lane.</p> <p>We have looked a number of options to try and utilise the existing A66 as much as possible which subsequently led us to presenting the Orange Route. However, there are a number of reasons why we have not taken this forward. These include the alignment of the current route is poor and does not meet current standards; the proximity to the River Eden which is a special area of conservation; the need to demolish property including a major</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>dairy farm; the requirement for a substantial crossing to cross the River Eden and its flood plain and the effects on known scheduled ancient monuments along the existing corridor. Further information can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>We have a clear remit from the Department for Transport to dual the A66 as it forms an important strategic link across the country. For this reason, we are not considering the retention of any single carriageway sections or reducing speed limits from national standards. Further information about the Project Objectives can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>The autumn 2021 Consultation material presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along with details for drainage ponds and a number of these items raised concerns from landowners and local residents.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans and details have been refined up to Development Consent</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Order submission to ensure any mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project and reduce impacts on affected landowners.</p> <p>As part of the environmental design consideration has been given to any properties experiencing adverse impacts and mitigation measures will be provided.</p>	
329	149388, 153838, 153870, 153945, 153960, 154363, 154366, 154461		151473, 152961, 153033, 153310, 153953, 153962, 154225, 154266	Alternative route - Orange - Community impact	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would have less of an impact on local communities than the preferred Blue Route, with particular reference to impacts on residential property and the lives and health of local residents.	National Highways carried out a detailed sifting and appraisal exercise to compare the route options. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including impacts on cultural heritage. Further information about the Project's development can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>The assessment found that in terms of land take, the Orange Route affects more landowners than the blue route. In terms of Recreation and Leisure and Wider Community Issues criteria, the assessment resulted in a 'Neutral' assessment for both, meaning that neither route option had benefits or disbenefits over the other. Further information about the route development and the sifting criteria used can be found in the PDOR.</p> <p>The traffic assessment indicated that the Orange Route would have marginal benefits in terms of traffic flow on the A66 mainline at Kirkby Thore and journey time savings. However, there were no significant differences for safety or accessibility. Disruption during construction is likely to be greater for the Orange Route given increased traffic management requirements of construction close to the existing A66.</p> <p>Most environmental impacts during construction and operation were assessed as either Neutral or Better for the Orange Route (compared to Blue), however there are significant impacts to cultural heritage and population and human health for the Orange Route as more designated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>sites would be affected and greater land take required.</p> <p>It has been assessed that there would be larger negative effects on a number of businesses along the Orange Route. Local traffic will be able to use the de-trunked A66 to access these businesses as part of the Blue Route. Further information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
341	153816, 153852, 153870, 153874, 153944, 154363		153033, 153042, 153310, 153897, 154266	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents suggesting design changes to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the scheme, with specific reference to Kirkby Thore and Halefield Farm. These include suggestions for noise mitigation measures such as use of low noise road surfaces, measures such as screening to reduce visual and light pollution and other environmental impacts, and measures to mitigate possible impacts on archaeological sites.</p>	<p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation material presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along and a number of these items raised concerns from landowners and local residents.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans and details are being refined up to DCO submission and the final details will be resolved during the detailed design of the Project.</p> <p>The final scheme will provide replacement lighting at the M1 and M6 junctions and will include lighting at the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>divergence at the A67 at Bowes for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. As part of the DCO application, National Highways has produced an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, including lighting, will be managed.</p> <p>The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area and minimise environmental impact. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall scheme design principles.</p> <p>Where required, mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise. Further information in regards the Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for this location are discussed within Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The Environmental Management Plan (EMP (Application document 2.7) requires the Principal Contractor to incorporate these measures in construction and also prior to the relevant scheme opening for public use, undertake updated operational noise modelling based on the final carriageway alignments of the new A66 to determine the requirement for further noise mitigation.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. This has been informed through further archaeological</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						trenching works and consultation with key stakeholders.	
342	153564, 153565, 153617, 153926, 154363, 154366	Cumbria County Council	153847, 154226, 154266	Request for further information	Respondents including Cumbria County Council requesting that the Applicant provide further information on the scheme. These include: the cost of all routes; use of land for construction compounds; footpaths and environmental mitigation; landscaping for visual mitigation; design of junctions and bridges; and transport options for British Gypsum.	Further information on the respective items is contained in the DCO application in the following documents: Cost of the route: The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). An overview of the economic assessment of the Project is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). Construction compounds: Details of construction compounds can be found in ES Chapter 2 The Project (Application Document 3.2, Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) Annex B15 Site Establishment Plan.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Footpaths: The Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-riders design has been produced in consultation with local authorities and stakeholders to ensure a collaborative approach that meets the demands of the local population Further information can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation: Environment Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) determines the likely visual effects and associated mitigation requirements. The mitigation is secured through the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Table 3-2 of the EMP, Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Document Reference 2) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>Design of junctions and bridges: Please see information on the design of junctions and bridges in the Project Design Principles (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Document 5.11), which incorporates the overall scheme design principles. As part of the consultation process with affected landowners, National Highways has engaged with British Gypsum on the proposed design at Kirby Thore and the access arrangements in proximity to their site.	
344	150462, 153560, 153600, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153033, 153042	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the scheme should include measures for the existing A66: traffic control measures such as reduced speed limits and average speed cameras on single carriageway roads and near to Kirkby Thore. Suggestions also include improved direction signs to local businesses, and management of parking and signage for the travelling community visiting Appleby Horse Fair.	Relocating the A66 to a dual carriageway passing around the north of Kirkby Thore and Crackenthorpe will significantly reduce traffic flow on the existing A66. This length of the existing A66 will be connected to the local road network at the east and west ends for use by local traffic that does not wish to use the proposed dual carriageway. Some alterations to this road will be necessary to make it suitable for local traffic and to satisfy the adopting Highway Authority (Cumbria County Council). Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs including signs for local services and places of interest will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detail in future Project stages. National highways will continue to engage with host Local Authorities to agree content. Where the existing A66 passes through Kirkby Thore the speed limit	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>will be reduced to 30mph over a length roughly between the filling station and Piper Lane. This will be accompanied with improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, and traffic calming (ideally the traffic calming will not include any speed humps). The short length of the existing 40mph speed limit from Piper Lane heading west will be removed, and the existing speed cameras will be discussed with Cumbria County Council. Outside of the proposed 30mph speed limit the speed limit will be national.</p> <p>The introduction of a lower speed limit on substantial lengths of (or the entire length of) the existing A66 would need to be discussed with and endorsed by Cumbria Constabulary and Cumbria County Council and be installed through the appropriate mechanisms. On completion of the scheme the speed limits will be managed by Cumbria County Council.</p> <p>On Main Street, Piper Lane, Cross Street, Part of Station Road, and the existing length of Fell Lane (all roads in Kirkby Thore) a weight restriction order will be placed, subject to agreement with CCC, restricting the use of those roads by vehicles weighing more than 7.5tn unless use is for access. Access must be to a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>property or business within the weight restriction, meaning that heavy goods vehicles will not be able to use Kirkby Thore as a through route.</p> <p>Traffic management will continue to be applied on the A66 during the Appleby Horse Fair, to manage horse-drawn traffic.</p>	
345	149374, 153365, 153797, 153885, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting sustainable transport modes as an alternative to upgrading road infrastructure, including suggestions for investment in public transport and increased use of bus and rail services.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the views suggesting that sustainable transport should be part of the Project. However, this is a national issue which rests with Central Government Policy. Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network, leading to worsening problems on the A66. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. For further information please see the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4). We have developed a WCH design strategy to integrate WCH proposals into the scheme and encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. The project objectives (set out below) have informed the highway design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A low-speed, low-traffic route parallel to the A66 for pedestrians and cyclists should be created where possible, in order to replace and connect existing routes affected by the A66 improvements. This could mean utilising the de-trunked sections of single carriageway, where they remain open to traffic; • All facilities for WCH users should be a betterment, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement project; • Re-establish any WCH routes severed by the proposed works; and • Where public rights of way (PRoWs) converge at the upgraded A66 carriageway, then a grade- 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>separated crossing facility is required to cross. Designers should divert PRowS to the nearest grade separated crossing. Additional distance of the alternative route should always be minimised.</p> <p>We have engaged with bus operators to understand the frequency of use of existing bus stops on or close to the A66 (as set out in Section 10.5 of the Transport Assessment, Application Document: 3.7) and we understand that bus stops in the vicinity are very lightly used. We continue to discuss with Cumbria County Council the need for re-provision of the Whinfell Park bus stop.</p>	
379	153351, 153812, 153838, 153869, 153870, 153879, 153888, 153919, 154363, 154366		153310, 153953, 153962, 154225	Alternative route - Orange – Engineering - design	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would be shorter than the preferred Blue Route, as well as easier to construct since fewer junctions would be required and the route more closely follows the current route. Respondents also suggest design changes to the Orange Route that they believe would mitigate some of the negative impacts it might have, including modifications to the route to</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies and other interested parties.</p> <p>We have looked a number of options to try and utilise the existing A66 as much as possible which subsequently led us to presenting the Orange Route, however. There are a number of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					avoid Roman archaeological sites and changes to reduce possible impacts on the floodplain.	<p>reasons why we have not taken this forward.</p> <p>These include the alignment of the current route is poor and does not meet current standards; the proximity to the River Eden which is a special area of conservation; the need to demolish property including a major dairy farm; the requirement for a substantial crossing to cross the River Eden and its flood plain and the effects on known scheduled ancient monuments along the existing corridor.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
380	149388, 153337, 153560, 153564, 153565, 153812, 153821, 153881, 153945, 154363, 154366	Natural England	151473, 153962, 154225	Alternative route - Orange - Environment - general	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would have less of an environmental impact than the preferred Blue Route. Respondents believe the Orange Route would have less of an impact on the local landscape, as well as a lower impact on Trout Beck floodplain and biodiversity. Respondents also say that construction of the Orange Route would have a lower environmental impact than other routes and that	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies and other interested parties.</p> <p>We have looked at a number of options to try and utilise the existing A66 as much as possible which subsequently led us to presenting the Orange Route, however, there are a number of reasons why we have not taken this forward. These include the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					Orange Route would not have a worse impact on drainage and hydrology than the preferred Blue Route.	<p>alignment of the current route is poor and does not meet current standards; the proximity to the River Eden and its floodplain which are a special area of conservation; the need to demolish property including a major dairy farm; the requirement for a substantial crossing to cross the River Eden and its flood plain and the effects on known scheduled ancient monuments along the existing corridor.</p> <p>The sifting exercise found that the Orange Route would have lesser impact on landscape. The assessment was 'neutral' between the Orange and Blue Routes for road drainage and water environment as well as for biodiversity. Further information can be found in Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
383	152982, 154363			Alternative route - Orange - Access	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would deliver improved connectivity for local residents, in particular those in the Temple Sowerby area.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in May 2020. National Highways carried	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies and other interested parties.</p> <p>We have worked closely with the community liaison groups and other stakeholder groups to ensure that connectivity of footpaths is maintained for all routes presented. We have also identified areas in the village where footpath improvements may be beneficial as well as identifying areas for additional crossing points. The sifting exercise carried out to compare routes found that the accessibility is not a material factor in determining the preferred alignment for the scheme.</p> <p>In terms of WCH connectivity – as all severed rights of way have been retained for all potential routes (Blue, Orange, Red), then it is not considered that the Orange Route possesses improved connectivity for WCHs along the route as a whole, including the Temple Sowerby area. The traffic assessment indicated that the Orange Route would have marginal benefits in terms of traffic flow on the A66</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						mainline at Kirkby Thore and journey time savings. However, there were no significant differences for safety or accessibility.	
510	153816	Natural England	153556, 153620, 153847, 153953	Engineering design and development - Compound location	<p>Respondents suggesting that the proposed construction compound and spoil storage areas should be reshaped or relocated to reduce land take and negative impact on the environment and local residents.</p> <p>Respondents make various suggestions, including relocating to south of the proposed haul road; moving the compound either away from or closer to Kirkby Thore; and locating the compound on land away from River Eden and Trout Beck floodplains.</p>	National Highways have worked with our specialist construction partners and designers to identify areas required. This is to ensure that adequate land is included within our DCO application at this stage. The general approach we have taken is to identify an area for the main site compound together with areas for smaller satellite compounds typically close to where larger structures will be required e.g., at junctions and the crossing of Trout Beck. It is likely that these areas may change and develop over time as the detailed design progresses. We will look to work with landowners to minimise any temporary possession of land and operational disruption which may be caused.	No
511	151462, 153816		153897, 153927	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	Respondents suggesting that safe active travel routes should be an essential part of the scheme, in line with government commitments. In particular, respondents suggest that a cycle network is necessary to help increase active travel for both work and leisure activities. It is suggested that such a route could be constructed	<p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked old A66, where it will remain.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					either along the current route, or a new route built. It is noted that if a safe route were available, it would be possible to cycle from Kirkby Thore to Appleby or Penrith.		
512	148619, 149350, 153816			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting that providing for the needs of motorised vehicles should not be at the detriment of other road users such as cyclists and walkers.	A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked old A66, where it will remain. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	Yes
516	149353, 152152, 153337, 153364, 154218	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150180	Alternative route - Other	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the Red Route or an unconsidered option would be favourable over National Highways preferred route. Respondents say that the Red Route has a reduced area of northern construction compared to the Blue Route, creating less disruption. It is also believed that it would disturb less wildlife. Other alternatives suggested including: to move the end of the A66 to the south of Penrith so it joins the M6 south of J40, to construct a new road from Crackenthorpe to Hackenthorpe instead, and that the upgrade should follow the already existing A66 route.	National Highways acknowledges your comments with regard to the red option and other possible route alternatives. The development of this scheme has taken place over a number of years and extensive work has been carried out previously to look at alternatives which subsequently led to the announcement of the preferred route in May 2020. The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives within the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>In terms of the red route this was identified as a possible alternative as it provided a shorter crossing of the Trout Beck. Following further design work and feedback from the autumn 2021 Consultation it has been decided that the Blue Route is preferred over the red. The main drivers for this relate to the fact that the crossing of Trout Beck would need a structure approximately 18m above ground level which would have detrimental effects on the landscape. Additionally, the red route moves the A66 closer to the gypsum mineworkings and Long Marton.</p>	
517	153815, 153816, 154366		153897, 153953	Construction - Access during construction	Respondents making suggestions on access, movements for construction traffic, and suitability of construction traffic on local roads. These include restrictions on construction vehicles using Main Street and Fell Street in Kirkby Thore and Sleastonhow Lane;	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. Traffic management will be important, and the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					<p>provision of control measures for construction traffic such as reduced speed limits and visibility aids; and constructing local access roads first to allow these to be used for diversion of traffic while new road is built.</p>	<p>Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>As part of the traffic management strategy construction and road user vehicle movements will be closely considered with traffic management strategies being developed based on the suitability of local roads and wider strategic routes. This will help inform how traffic is controlled, with additional measures implemented to ensure oversized vehicles are not encouraged onto small local roads. Where key streets or lanes are identified (Main Street, Fell Street and Sleastonhow Lane etc), the construction teams will look to work with concerned residents and the local council to ensure such routes are managed and restrictions are appropriately implemented, in the form of height, width or weight limits during the course of the construction works. In addition, changes may be carried out to the road layout or applicable speed limits taking note of safety concerns.</p> <p>Where possible during the construction works, the existing A66 will remain operational to mitigate the need for any diversions to be implemented.</p> <p>Where construction works will require</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>changes to the A66 or local access roads, such diversions will look to be established in advance to reduce any disruption to road users and local residents.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, for example bridge installations, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p> <p>Where there are concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>The identification of diversion routes where required, will be carefully considered, and National Highways will discuss these identified diversion routes with Cumbria County Council, as the local highways authority.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works.	
518		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Alternative route - Orange - Wildlife / habitats	Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the Orange Route would be the preferred alternative for wildlife and habitats. Respondents say that although the Orange Route would cross mixed arable and improved grassland habitats, it would cross fewer important habitats than the Blue or Red alternative routes.	<p>We thank you for your comments with regard to the Orange Route. Although it is likely that the orange route may have a lesser effect on wildlife and habitats this is not the only area that we need to consider when selecting a preferred route option. The overall assessment in terms of biodiversity was 'neutral' between the orange and the Blue Route. The results of our optioneering work have led us to select the Blue Route as our preference. One of the key drivers in making this selection is the effect that the Orange Route would have on Cultural Heritage assets which could not be mitigated.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).	
519	153815, 153816		153376	Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents suggesting that locals should be listened to during the consultation phase and throughout any construction works for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. In particular, respondents are interested in having a process for raising any issues with the contractor and National Highways during the scheme. Suggestions include having the scheme registered with the Considerate Constructor's Scheme to help ensure that the community's wishes are respected throughout.	During pre-application, consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. National Highways representatives were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) submitted with the DCO covers the entire Project. The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project. The EMP states the Principal Contractor shall sign up to and adhere to the Considerate Constructors Scheme (Reference: D-GEN-13 of Table 0-1: Register of environmental actions and commitments).</p> <p>The second iteration of the EMP would also set out the requirements for the Principal Contractor to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team. A dedicated Community Relations Manager will keep local residents informed throughout construction of activities planned and progress being made. Community Liaison Groups will continue to also share information with local representatives.</p>	
536	154013	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153847	Construction - Mitigate construction	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council suggesting construction mitigation including: a Construction Management Plan to coordinate with the Appleby Horse Fair; a Dust Management Plan and Agricultural Liaison Officer to mitigate the impacts	National Highways is working with its Delivery Integration Partners (Contractors building the Project) to look at how the scheme can be built and to ensure that any disruption during the construction phase is kept to an absolute minimum. The Construction Management Plan will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					of dust on agricultural land; registration with the Considerate Constructor's Scheme; communication to local residents of the level of HGV traffic; regular cleaning of roads; quiet construction during the night.	<p>take note of key events within the area and will look to ensure that works are programmed to minimise any disruption and key mitigation strategies are implemented where required for events like the Appleby Horse Fair.</p> <p>As part of this planning, Construction Traffic Management Plans will be developed to ensure traffic is controlled and where diversions are required, measures are put in place to prevent oversized vehicles from using non prescribed and unsuitable routes. This will ensure local residents are not adversely affected by construction activities. Where possible independent haul routes will be established to remove additional large construction plant movements away from the A66 and surrounding villages. Construction Traffic Management Plans will look to be communicated to stakeholders, local councils and interested parties on a monthly basis to ensure everyone is well informed and further plans are adapted to reflect issues identified.</p> <p>National Highways is aware that due to the size of the project and the amount of material to be excavated and placed, dust and air quality will need to be controlled and monitored at all times for the safety of residents, road users and the workforce. In addition,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>dust will also be managed and monitored for impacts to agricultural land. Where possible works will be programmed and coordinated to minimise construction plant movements and undertake works during suitable weather periods. Additional dust suppression measures will also be implemented where required. For further information, refer to the Air Quality and Dust Management Plan within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>When programming works, the construction teams will look to ensure minimal disturbance and noise is generated outside of regular working hours as identified within the ES. The impacts of construction on the road network will look to be mitigated where possible, but where unavoidable, additional measures such as road sweeping will always be implemented where required to ensure the highway remains safe to use.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to work with community liaison groups and other affected parties to ensure that information is shared in a timely manner and feedback can be received and acted upon.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) submitted with the DCO covers the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						entire Project. The purpose of the EMP is to set out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the ES. In accordance with table 3-2 of the EMP it dictates that the Principal Contractor responsible for construction will be part of the Considerate Constructors Scheme, to which most of National Highways approved Principal Contractors are already members. The EMP sets out measures to control lighting, dust, noise, spillage and the movement of construction traffic on road. It will also set out the requirements for the Principal Contractor to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team.	
543	153858	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152984, 153556, 153624, 153625	Land - Land take	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council making suggestions to reduce land take for the scheme and to use lower quality land. Respondents state that too much productive agricultural land would be taken by the construction compound, access tracks and drainage ponds. Respondents make suggestions to reduce land take and suggest that less productive land	We have refined our plans since our autumn consultation. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and more up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. In addition, we have been talking to landowners about some of the environmental measures they have already	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					should be used. A respondent suggests that land north of the existing sewage works could be used.	introduced. We have amended our plans to ensure our proposals compliment these valuable, local initiatives. Refer to the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) for further information about how mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land. Land to the north of the sewerage works is not in the Order Limits we are proposing for DCO and will not be used.	
544	149394, 153560, 153816, 154366		152177, 153897, 153927, 153953, 154227, 154266	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting measures to improve traffic control around the scheme area, in particular to address speeding both on the A66 and coming into villages. Suggestions include physical traffic calming measures to slow vehicles entering and leaving Kirkby Thore; Speed limits of 30mph being extended with speed cameras for enforcement; and extending the 40mph average speed section on the A66 to Long Marton Road and Temple Sowerby.	National Highways thanks you for your comments with regard to safety issues within Kirkby Thore once the new road is constructed. As part of the development of our Projects we work closely with the affected local authorities to ensure that the local roads which we subsequently hand over to them are safe and appropriate measures are included to address potential safety issues. This work is ongoing at the moment and will continue through the detailed design phase. We have already decided to move the proposed junction with Main Street onto the British Gypsum access	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						road. In part this was done as a response to the concerns raised over the suitability of Main Street to deal with the expected increase in traffic that may occur. We are also looking to make minor improvements to footways and adding suitable pedestrian crossing points to ensure pedestrians and other non-motorised users' needs are adequately addressed. Traffic calming measures, speed limits and enforcement will be considered during the Detailed Design phase.	
595			152961, 153625, 153897	Land - Compensation	Respondents suggesting that financial compensation should be provided to mitigate the impacts of the scheme. These respondents include farmers who state that they would incur a financial loss as a result of moving to alternative locations.	The environmental assessment that has been carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase on air quality, noise and the safety of both users and residents. Where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team has proposed mitigation measures to reduce the effects where practicable.	No
607	152914	Cumbria County Council Eden		Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the scheme should provide facilities for HGV traffic, including rest areas.	New service/rest areas for HGV's or motorhomes are not within the scope of the Project. However, whilst overnight facilities for HGV users is not within the scope of the Project our Users and Communities Designated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
		District Council				Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route but this will be a separate initiative from the A66 Project.	
736	149353, 149388, 152267, 152954, 152976, 153337, 153359, 153880, 153882, 154363		151473, 153917	Alternative route - Orange - General / reason not specified	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected instead of the preferred Blue Route, without providing further details.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the comments with regard to the Orange Route. As part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation, comments have been received on all route options, and these have been reviewed through additional optioneering work. This work has resulted in the confirmation that the Blue Route is to be taken forward to Development Consent Order submission.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66, and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
544	151472, 152945, 153038, 153912, 154213		153321	Alternative route - Red	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Red Route should be selected. Respondents believe that this would minimise environmental impact on Trout Beck flood plain, would be simpler to construct, and would have a reduced impact on footpaths and cycle paths and on a farm near to Trout Beck. Respondents also say that they have no preference between the Blue and Red Routes.</p>	<p>We thank you for your comments relating to the Blue and the Red Routes which were presented as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. It is acknowledged that they are both similar routes. The Red Route passes closer to the British Gypsum mine workings and features a shorter crossing of Trout Beck than the blue route. Additionally, the Trout Beck crossing on the red route would have a height of approximately 18m above ground level. The structure would stand out due to its elevation and would have a detrimental effect on views and the surrounding landscape compared to the crossing associated with the blue Route. Where any footpaths or cycle paths are affected by the proposals, they will either be reconnected or diverted to appropriate safe crossing points.</p> <p>Further assessment work together with feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation has now resulted in the decision to take the Blue Route through the Development Consent Order process.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
741	152268, 152951, 153888, 153894, 154363		151473, 153842	Alternative route - Orange - Traffic / congestion	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would deliver traffic improvements compared to the preferred Blue Route. Respondents say that the Orange Route would be shorter, would still allow truck access to the British Gypsum site without vehicles passing through Kirkby Thore, and would remove a tight bend at Kirkby Thore. Respondents also suggest that in the event of an accident on the A66, the Orange Route would allow traffic to be diverted onto the old road, without the need to pass through Kirkby Thore.	<p>We have now had a chance to complete further surveys in area and review feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation as a result of this work the decision has been taken to take the Blue Route through the DCO process.</p> <p>An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>The Blue Route would allow truck access directly to the Gypsum plant from the new A66 alignment, without the need to pass through the village. This is in contrast to the Orange Route, which requires trucks to negotiate of the order of 3km of access road from the A66. With regard to an incident on the A66 requiring diversion: this need not require diversionary passage through Kirkby Thore, as traffic could be diverted from the existing Temple Sowerby junction along the old A66 to the new Powis House junction.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
747	154363, 154366		150421, 152236, 153065	Construction - Priority of works	Respondents suggesting that the proposed works in Kirkby Thore, including dualling, junction improvements and a bypass, should be carried out as early into the project as possible. These respondents feel that the population density of Kirkby Thore, and the current frequency of vehicular accidents, mean that work there should be a priority.	Construction works on the Project are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will have staggered start times to optimise traffic management, construction works and to minimise disruption. In addition, start dates for each scheme will be different along the A66 route to ensure current accident blackspots and areas of concerns are not exacerbated by the undertaking of too many schemes at the same time, leading to challenging traffic management and logistic movements. Construction of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme is expected to take around 3 years. At this stage, National Highways has programmed to start this scheme in 2025, this may be subject to change. Whilst this scheme remains of high priority, it must be carried out at the correct time to allow for the detailed design to be finalised, service diversions carried out where required and appropriate traffic management implement to safely undertake the works, whilst ensuring the public's safety. National Highways	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						is committed to carry out works in the most appropriate timeframes to reduce disruption, thus it will only allow schemes to be implemented once all provisions and measures are in place to control the works and ensure mitigation measures are in place for stakeholders and local residents.	
750	154363			Alternative route - Orange - Engineering - mitigation	Respondents suggesting design changes to the Orange Route to mitigate its potential negative impacts, including sound barriers near to Kirkby Thore and tree planting.	<p>National Highways thanks you for your response and acknowledges your support for the Orange Route. As a result of feedback received as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation together with the completion of further survey work and optioneering exercises the decision has been taken to promote the Blue Route through the DCO process.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted based on a number of issues including the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore and the impact on a number of landowners including the acquisition and demolition of some or all of the farm buildings at Bridge Farm. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and so would not gain</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>planning consent. Unfortunately, the mitigation proposed in relation to noise barriers and tree planting would not sufficiently mitigate the effects caused by the orange route.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
761	149388, 153325, 153817, 153838, 153879, 153894, 154363, 154366		151473, 153310, 153962	Alternative route - Orange - Economics	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would be cheaper to construct than the preferred Blue Route and would deliver an increased economic benefit, due to improved traffic flow.	National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Statement including impacts on cultural heritage.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>In the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) it can be seen that the assessment of costs between the orange and the blue route resulted in a "Neutral" assessment meaning that neither option was noticeably cheaper or more expensive than the other. The mainline of the Orange Route would be cheaper to construct than the Blue Route as it requires significantly less earthworks. However, any savings are likely to be offset by costs associated with constructing a more extensive network of side roads to provide local connectivity, and the costs associated with additional land take required – particularly the acquisition and demolition of Bridge End Farm, which has been noted in the Project Development Overview Report as a significant cost to the scheme. In addition, the Orange Route has a potential requirement for land take from a housing allocation.</p> <p>The traffic assessment indicated that the Orange Route would have marginal benefits in terms of traffic flow on the A66 mainline at Kirkby Thore and journey time savings. However, there were no significant differences for safety or accessibility. There are no significant differences in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>impact from a safety perspective between routes. Disruption during construction is likely to be greater for the Orange Route given increased traffic management requirements of construction close to the existing A66.</p> <p>It has been assessed that there will be larger negative effects on a number of businesses along the Orange Route. Local traffic will be able to use the de-trunked A66 to access these businesses as part of the Blue Route.</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
763	148549, 148580, 148589, 149361, 152914, 152923			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting design changes to the scheme to include provision of basic rest facilities and overnight parking for motorhomes and HGVs. Respondents suggest that an Aire style motorhome site could be included as part of the design.	<p>A new service area for HGV's or motorhomes with electric and hydrogen re-charging points is not within the scope of the Project.</p> <p>All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries.</p> <p>Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
765	149367, 149374, 152931, 153365, 153797			Traffic, transport and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting that demand for road journeys should be reduced rather than making upgrades to road infrastructure.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your views with regard to the need to reduce road journeys. Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network, leading to worsening problems on the A66. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) and within the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free and reduce the environmental impact of road journeys. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
807	153325, 153359, 153851, 153926		151473, 152177, 153927, 154266	Alternative route - Orange - Community impact	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected as it would have a lower impact on local communities than the preferred Blue Route, specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore village and school.	<p>As the new alignment passes the village and school, it will be housed within a cutting which will be of the order of between 8m and 12m deep: this will screen off the road significantly.</p> <p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in May 2020. National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.	
808	153325, 153337, 153560, 153919, 153926		151473, 152177, 152999, 153927, 154266	Alternative route - Orange - Environment - General	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would have a lower environmental impact than the preferred Blue Route. Respondents suggest that the Orange Route would have less of an impact on the local landscape, as well as a lower impact on the River Eden SAC/SSSI. Respondents also suggest that the Orange Route would reduce air, noise and light pollution for local residents and use less farmland.	National Highways carried out a sifting exercise prior to statutory consultation in Autumn 2021 to compare the route options which were presented at the consultation. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Statement including impacts on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Our three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>Landscape construction effects for the Orange Route would be similar to the Blue Route. During operation, the Orange Route would have a lesser impact on landscape and less visual intrusion than the Blue Route.</p> <p>Both the Orange and Blue Route have the potential to impact aquatic species during construction, including the qualifying species of the River Eden SAC/SSSI as both crossing locations provide optimal habitat and a migration route. Habitat loss/disturbance through shading of the river is consistent across both routes. During operation, the Orange Route has the potential for a lower impact on the River Eden SAC/SSSI, than the Blue Route, due to the existing A66 already posing a constraint on the watercourse.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>However, preliminary flood modelling demonstrated that a crossing of Trout Beck at this location could be designed without impact on the SAC designation or its floodplain.</p> <p>For air quality it is considered that there would be no material difference between the Blue and Orange Route at construction and operation.</p> <p>Noise impacts during construction for the Orange Route are considered to be similar to the Blue Route. At operation, the Orange Route would result in overall fewer significant effects than the Blue Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route would however result in an unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and so would not gain planning consent. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>On the balance of impacts, it is our conclusion that the Blue Route is our preference. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
820	153325, 153919, 153926		151473, 154266	Alternative route - Orange - Traffic/ congestion	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it is shorter and would reduce journey times.	National Highways thanks you for your response and acknowledges your support for the Orange Route. As a result of feedback received as part of the autumn 2021 Consultation together with the completion of further survey work and optioneering exercises the decision has been taken to promote the Blue Route through the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Development Consent Order (DCO) process.</p> <p>Although the orange route is slightly shorter than the Blue and Red Route and would also reduce journey times there are a number of other factors which all need to be considered and assessed in order for a preference to be selected.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
821	153325, 153919, 153926		151473, 152177, 154266	Alternative route - Orange - Cost	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would be cheaper to construct.	National Highways thanks you for your response and acknowledges your support for the Orange Route. As a result of feedback received as part of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>the autumn 2021 Consultation together with the completion of further survey work and optioneering exercises the decision has been taken to promote the Blue Route through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.</p> <p>Although cost is an important factor in choosing the route to be taken to DCO there are a number of other factors which all need to be considered and assessed in order for a preference to be selected. The mainline of the Orange Route would be cheaper to construct than the Blue Route as it requires significantly less earthworks. However, any savings are likely to be offset by costs associated with constructing a more extensive network of side roads to provide local connectivity, and the costs associated with additional land take required – particularly the acquisition and demolition of Bridge End Farm, which has been noted in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) as a significant cost to the scheme. In addition, the Orange Route has a potential requirement for land take from a housing allocation.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
824	152953, 153869, 153878, 153879, 153880, 153882		151473, 152177, 152999, 153310	Alternative route - Orange - General / not specified	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected instead of the preferred Blue Route, without providing further details.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in May 2020. National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	
860	152954, 153325,			Alternative route - Orange	Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route should be selected on the grounds that it would generate a	National Highways is required by the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) to assess the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153560, 153881			- Carbon impact	lower level of greenhouse gas emissions than the preferred Blue Route and would therefore have less of an impact on the climate.	<p>effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations. The Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement (Application Document 3.9) sets out how the Project accords with the policies of the NPSNN. This includes climate change policies, which is just one of many environmental policies that the Project would need to be in accordance with.</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions was considered alongside other environmental criteria in the assessment of different route alignments. It was important that the route chosen and taken forward into the DCO application was preferred in relation to a wide range of environmental criteria and that it would accord with policy, including policy relating to climate change (in the NNNPS).</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and so would not gain development consent.	
863	148617, 148627, 148630, 148639, 149389, 150462, 151331, 152200, 153817	Warcop Parish Council	148622, 148628, 150194, 152983, 153032	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	<p>Respondents suggesting that the scheme should provide alternative storage facilities if the existing facility in Kirkby Thore is to be closed.</p> <p>Respondents also suggesting that the scheme should include provision for a service station with electric vehicle charging points. A respondent suggests that the scheme should construct a new school further away from the new road to mitigate impact of emissions on local children.</p>	<p>A new service area with electric and hydrogen re-charging points is not within the scope of the Project. All existing lay-bys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. We are exploring opportunities to incorporate EV charging in the community.</p> <p>The new junction on the new alignment of the A66 is being relocated from main Street further west to Fell Lane, and as a result the Fell Lane storage area will not be impacted.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations assessed in the ES Chapter 5 takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in DMRB LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria.</p> <p>Beyond 200m from the ARN, Air quality impacts on receptors are considered to be negligible in accordance with DMRB LA 105. This is because emissions from vehicles have been demonstrated to disperse and air quality returns to background levels by this distance.</p> <p>No exceedances of the Air Quality Objectives for NO₂, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} are predicted, and no likely significant effects are concluded at any modelled location within 200m of the ARN.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has also been carried out,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes an air quality and dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.	
868	152953, 153359			Alternative route - Orange - Cultural heritage	Respondents suggesting that protection of cultural heritage sites is not a valid reason for not selecting the Orange Route on the grounds that part of the Roman site has already been built on and that construction over the Roman Vicus could be avoided by exploring minor route amendments.	<p>National Highways carried out a comprehensive sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. The sifting exercise compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>The sifting process considered the possible environmental impacts (including both heritage and ecological constraints) and design requirements. The design team considered alternative alignments which would change the type and extents of structure required to carry the A66 through, over, or around, the SAC.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>These alternative alignments focused on the Kirkby Thore section of the route and that alternative alignments for the Crackenthorpe section of the route were not considered at this point as they did not have a direct impact on the SAC.</p> <p>As part of this review, a total of 15 principal alternative routes or combinations of routes were identified, considering potential environmental impacts, Project design principles, impacts on landowners, buildability, and design safety.</p> <p>These alternatives were subject to a multi-stage assessment, which led to the development of the three Routes taken forward for further assessment. Further detail on the development of the schemes and choosing of options is available in the Project Development Overview Report. (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>National Highways' three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>with the online Orange Route. The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore, though other differentials included flood risk to the south of the existing A66 crossing and the impact on businesses and properties (of all routes). It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the scheduled monument at Kirkby Thore could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy and so would not gain planning consent. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both potentially affect the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route would unavoidably impact the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. Further detail on the development of the schemes and choosing of options is available in the Project Development Overview Report. (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>On the balance of impacts, it is the conclusion that the Blue Route is the preferred option. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Mitigation required to minimise the impacts identified is included in the Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy, submitted as an appendix to the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
872	149408		152216	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should consider improving existing junctions and providing underpasses for farm traffic instead of dualling the road.	The Project will replace the existing, low-capacity single carriageway sections of the A66 with a new high performing two lane dual carriageway road. The dualled road will significantly increase capacity and lead to improved journey times, less congestion and fewer delays. Traffic flows across the A66 corridor are forecast to increase if the Project is delivered, with users who would have otherwise taken longer distance journeys to avoid using the A66, drawn to the route due to improved reliability. Journey time savings between M6 J40 and A1(M) Scotch Corner with the delivery of the Project, will save between 10 and 13 minutes (19-22%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2)	
891	151349, 152238, 153858, 153901, 153926			Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents suggesting that the Applicant should select the route that local communities prefer, with particular reference to residents and businesses in Kirkby Thore.	<p>Engagement has been ongoing through the relevant Community Liaison Group and with relevant stakeholders such as Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council. Throughout preliminary design, proposals for each scheme have continued to develop to reflect further engagement with landowners, Statutory Environmental Bodies, Local Authorities and community focus groups.</p> <p>In addition to these developments, a detailed review of feedback received throughout Statutory Consultation was carried out to further inform preliminary design and ensure the views of affected parties, including the residents and businesses of Kirby</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>There were accommodated where possible.</p> <p>Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. Members of the project team were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the Development Consent Order application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals. Further detail is presented in the application for development consent.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
963	153351		152961, 153310	Alternative route - Orange - Land take	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Orange Route would require less land than the preferred Blue Route and have less of an impact on agricultural land. Respondents say that the only reason for not selecting the Orange Route is that the cost of acquiring land would be higher than alternative routes.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the comments with regard to the Orange Route. As part of the autumn 2021 Consultation comments have been received on all route options these have been reviewed together with the completion of further surveys and optioneering work. This work has resulted in the confirmation that the Blue Route is to be taken forward to Development Consent Order submission.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). Comparing land take requirements between the preferred route and the Orange Route showed that the potential requirement for land take from a housing allocation makes the Orange Route the less preferable of the alternatives. The assessment of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>the two routes demonstrated that the preferred alignment performs better in a number of different areas most notably with regard to drainage and hydrology, cultural heritage and effects on stakeholders.</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
1020			153033	Economics - Support local economy	One respondent suggesting that the scheme should support and encourage local businesses in the area such as workshops and storage units.	<p>The work we will deliver through this Project will bring far-reaching benefits to those that use and live near the route including small businesses. It will also provide improved connections to the wider region between Cumbria, Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear, but also routes between Scotland and the major towns and cities across the north. By providing better links, we will unlock access to businesses, tourism, jobs, essential services and new opportunities. We also support local tourism, connecting the millions of holidaymakers who travel across the country to visit hotspots like the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales every year. The proposed road upgrades in this scheme facilitate improved vehicles movements to the A66 route network and the journey time savings this results in. This has particular economic implications for freight and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						other business connectivity, removal of traffic along this road is likely to improve amenity for the occupiers of the Low Moor Caravan Park and may make it a more attractive environment, increasing patronage, thereby increasing tourism opportunities for the area. In providing a bypass, the existing 'old A66' alignment will be retained. Farm and other business accesses as well as residential property accesses will be retained, however, the significant reduction in traffic along this road will result in far easier traffic movements for occupiers and workers accessing these locations improving access to services and jobs for the local community. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).	
13	151487, 152982, 153560, 153617, 153821, 153888, 153926, 153945, 154013	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	149783, 149789, 151465, 153033, 153310, 154260	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact connectivity to other roads, villages or properties. Respondents specifically mention that access to Sleastonhow Farm will become challenging, that widening Roman Road into the Fair Hill showground will affect capacity of the showground, that there is no	The following elements were addressed with regard to concerns raised over connectivity to roads, villages and properties: - Sleastonhow Farm: approximately 800m of Sleastonhow Lane is being improved under the new alignment. - Fair Hill: The amendment to the junction (provision of an on-slip road)	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					<p>proposed junction at Long Marton requiring drivers to route via Kirkby Thore or Appleby, that the junction opposite Powis Cottages will result in the loss of access to a landowners retained land, that residents of Murton will be cut off by the new A66 and the junction at Kirkby Thore causing congestion if an accident happens.</p>	<p>has been removed as part of the new design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long Marton: A junction facility with the proposed A66 has been incorporated at Long Marton as part of the new design. - The overbridge at Long Marton is being replaced by a junction facility at Long Marton as part of the new design: this is approximately 400m to the east. Accesses to affected land adjacent to Powis Cottages will be provided to current design standard. - Kirkby Thore will remain accessible from Murton under the new design: public rights of way are being replaced, with the option to access Kirkby Thore from the Proposed A66 or the Existing A66. - In the event of an incident on the proposed A66 in the vicinity of Kirkby Thore, the proposed carriageway has more capacity to absorb incidents that the existing A66. 	
25	151461, 151486, 152248, 152951, 153325, 153817,		153033, 153953	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the accessibility of routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, including concerns that the scheme includes insufficient provision of routes and would negatively impact several</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153838, 153860, 153888, 153960, 153975, 154013, 154194, 154363				existing routes. Various locations are mentioned, including Bolton to Long Marton, Sleastonhow Lane, Priest Lane, the Roman road, Lady Ann Way and routes near to the British Gypsum site.	accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. In addition, this scheme will have a shared cycle-footway in the verge of the old de-trunked A66 which will tie into the existing footways. The new 5-mile segregated route will encourage active travel, physical activity and access to the countryside, which are linked to positive mental and physical health outcomes. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	
72	148619, 151461, 151484, 152206, 152941, 152969, 153320, 153365, 153815, 153816, 153835, 153869, 153870, 153975, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150453, 153376, 153620, 153897, 153927	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the accessibility of routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, including concerns that the scheme includes insufficient provision of active travel routes and would negatively impact several existing routes. Various locations are mentioned, including routes around Kirkby Thore; Sleastonhow Lane; Priest Lane; Spittals Farm; Hale Grange; Fell Road; Lady Ann Way; and routes near to the British Gypsum site.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. A shared cycle/footway has been proposed along the de-trunked old A66 for Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Crackenthorpe. The new 5-mile segregated route will encourage active travel, physical activity and access to the countryside, which are linked to	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>positive mental and physical health outcomes.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
157	149371, 150439, 153870, 154367	Cumbria County Council	153625, 153628, 154457	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact traffic connectivity to other roads, villages or properties. Respondents specifically mention: the Low Moor caravan site; Long Marton; Barton; Sleastonhow Lane; and Priest Lane. One respondent also expressed concern that underpass designs need to accommodate large farm vehicles.</p>	<p>Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements. Underpasses have been sized to accommodate agricultural vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sleastonhow Farm: approximately 800m of Sleastonhow Lane is being improved under the new alignment. - Low Moor Caravan Site – access remains unchanged in the preferred route. - Priest Lane – we have provided 4.65m headroom in the 6m wide underpass. It is a bridleway and will be shared with several landowners. - Long Marton: A junction facility with the proposed A66 has been incorporated at Long Marton as part of the new design. <p>This is approximately 400m to the east. We have provided 4.65m headroom in the 6m wide underpass. It is a bridleway and will be shared with several landowners.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Access to Barton will not be affected by the construction of the Project and will be maintained along existing routes.</p> <p>Connectivity to the locations mentioned (Low Moor caravan site, Long Marton, Barton, Sleastonhow Lane; and Priest Lane) has either been maintained or has been enhanced.</p> <p>Underpasses have been designed with consideration for the type and size of the agricultural vehicles required to use them. Discussions with landowners have taken place to inform these design aspects and will continue through the detailed design phase.</p>	
159	154363		153628	Economics - Local economy – farming/Land	One respondent expressing concern about the economic impact that the proposed land take will have on the farmland or businesses including Sleastonhow Farm, The Farm partnership and Our Limited Partnership.	<p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in Chapter 12 Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>This document provides information on agricultural land holdings: the type, location, and number of agricultural holdings at risk of demolition or from which land would be required/access affected by the Project including disruption to drainage, irrigation, and water supply systems. The</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						assessment does not account for their frequency of use and their level of existing accessibility.	
160	153851, 153945, 154194, 154363, 154366		148599, 150453, 152984, 153625, 153628, 153825, 154191, 154269, 154331	Community impact - Property	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on property: that it will de-value property making it harder to sell, the impact of construction on the house, and the negative impacts such as noise pollution and air pollution. There are also concerns that the road travels in very close proximity to homes and properties, especially in Kirkby Thore.	<p>The environmental assessment considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase on air quality, noise and the safety of both users and residents. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures are set out to reduce the effects where practicable.</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of Project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project. During construction there is potential for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						temporary air quality impacts on residents located close to the route, including residents at the north of Kirkby Thore. However, we are committed to measures that will help minimise impacts such as protecting air quality by implementing a Dust Management Plan. We will also look to reduce the impact of noise on local communities throughout construction and adhering to best practice wherever possible.	
163	149411, 153365, 154363		152236, 152933, 153625, 153628, 153897, 153927, 153953, 154232	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about traffic safety, including design of the junctions at Kirkby Thore and near to Powis Cottage; slip road and lay-by design; increased traffic flows on Sleastonhow Lane during construction of the scheme; and that the scheme would not improve safety for tractors and agricultural machinery. Concern is also expressed that traffic from villages such as Long Marton, Dufton, Bolton and Brampton along with farm machinery and large vehicles would be forced to use narrow roads to travel to Appleby to access the A66.	Relocated junctions at Kirkby Thore (Gypsum Junction), and Powis House: the Gypsum junction has been relocated, so that the storage facility is not affected and facilitates Gypsum HGV movements to avoid the village; further, a junction facility has been incorporated at Long Marton (adjacent to Powis House). Additional junction facilities at the Appleby junction have been removed from the proposed design; the proposed design of the junctions does not adopt slip roads. The lay-by locations associated with the proposed design are as per the spacing requirements of adopted design guidance, and do not afford scope for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>movement without a reduction in the number of lay-bys.</p> <p>The Scheme should improve safety for tractors in that a significant majority of through traffic will use the new route, thus making the surrounding road network quieter.</p> <p>In relation to concerns that traffic from villages would be forced to use narrow roads to travel to the A66, access to the existing A66 will be as present.</p> <p>Concerns regarding use of Sleastonhow Lane during construction phase have been noted. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme, including Kirby Thore, during construction and operation.</p>	
170	153377, 154363, 154366, 154468	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150180, 150196, 152177, 152236, 153376, 153825, 153897, 153927	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that traffic congestion would increase both during construction of the scheme and once in operation. Respondents specifically mention Kirby Thore and the A66 junction at Main Street, Priest Lane, Fell Lane and local connecting roads.	Once in operation, a significant majority of through traffic will use the new route, thus making the surrounding road network quieter in traffic levels. During the construction period, there is likely to be a degree of disruption which will be kept to a minimum. The new route removes traffic from the existing A66. In terms of impact on other parts of the local road network there is a decrease in flows on all of the roads except Long Marton as the decreased journey time	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						on the A66 relieves traffic on local roads. The existing Long Marton Road is realigned to the south to tie in with the proposed new A66 junction. Flows are expected to increase by 13% on Long Marton although the ratio of flow to capacity remains very low so the change will not impact the operation of this road. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
174	149350, 153600, 154363, 154366, 154367		153556, 153620, 153624, 153625	Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the local economy. For example, the financial impact on businesses such as the hen laying unit, the Low Moor Caravan site or shopping areas. Respondents are also concerned about the potential impact on the local rural and tourism economy, such as the impact on the Lady Ann Way.</p>	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in Chapter 6 of the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). Low Moor Caravan Park lies immediately adjacent to the A66 at Temple Sowerby. The removal of traffic along this road is likely to improve amenity for the occupiers of the caravan park and may make it a more attractive environment, increasing patronage, thereby increasing tourism opportunities for the area.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the scheme will support Cumbria's Local</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Industrial Strategy and provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the scheme at a route-wide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.	
230	148631, 149397, 153337	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Temple Sowerby Parish Council	154457	Land - Other	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council, Eden District Council and Temple Sowerby Parish Council expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on land, including concern that the scheme would use too much land and would leave small pieces of isolated land which would be difficult to maintain. Locations specifically mentioned include Sleastonhow Lane and near to the junction in Kirkby Thore. Other concerns expressed include that land used in the scheme would negatively impact local businesses, including the industrial estate at Kirkby Thore, and concerns over use of land owned by Temple Sowerby parish council and land at The Great Mire and The Snout.	The proposed alignment for the A66 adopts what is considered to be the optimal line with regard to adhering to standards and minimising the impact on the immediate local environment (proximity to dwellings, land severances etc.). Where land has been severed, consultation has been made with the adjoining landowners on access arrangement and accommodation works to retain access to severed land. We have sought to work with local business owners to minimise the impact on their operations. For example, at Kirkby Thore the access to the industrial estate has been improved to allow better access. The re-alignment of Sleastonhow Lane has, whilst adhering to standards, sought to optimise the layout of affected land and minimise the occurrence of isolated land parcels. Similarly, the new junction at Kirkby	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>There is of a compact form, and this in turn minimises the occurrence of isolated land parcels.</p> <p>The Population and Human Health chapter (13) of the ES (Application Document 3.2) identifies the significant effects on business and within this scheme has found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For construction as no existing businesses or development land are subject to demolition or land loss no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the construction works for this scheme, with the exception of British Gypsum (this is subject to a minor temporary adverse effect). - During operation overall, the scheme is envisaged to provide minor beneficial impacts through improving journey time reliability and safety, which would serve to improve traffic conditions in the local area <p>We will continue to engage with all landowners impacted by proposed land take including the Parish Council.</p>	
252	148637, 148696, 149358,	Cumbria County Council	149789, 152177	Traffic, transport and	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the	The introduction of the new line of the A66 will lift the significant majority of traffic from the existing A66, with the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	149408, 151504	Eden District Council		junctions - Congestion	scheme would increase congestion, specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore and local connecting roads, and due to increased horse-drawn traffic using the A66 near to Appleby Horse Fair.	result that this road will become significantly quieter. There are no proposals to alter the Appleby junction itself. The new route removes traffic from the existing A66. In terms of impact on other parts of the local road network there is a decrease in flows on all of the roads except Long Marton as the decreased journey time on the A66 relieves traffic on local roads. The existing Long Marton Road is realigned to the south to tie in with the proposed new A66 junction. Flows are expected to increase by 13% on Long Marton although the ratio of flow to capacity remains very low so the change will not impact the operation of this road. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The dedicated open space used for the annual Appleby Horse Fair will be retained in situ. The scheme design protects this land and provides traffic management enhancements during the fair. National Highways does not envisage an increase in horse drawn traffic using the A66, above current levels, as a result of the Project.	
307	148630, 149787, 152960, 153817,		149783, 152961, 153065	Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme is too expensive and a waste of public money, in particular the	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153888, 153945, 154243				number of bridges and underpasses required.	<p>Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. The cost is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Scheme Assessment Report (Application Document 4.2).</p> <p>The proposed road upgrades in this location facilitate improved vehicles movements to the A66 route network and the journey time savings this results in. This has particular economic implications for freight and other business connectivity and will result in far easier traffic movements for occupiers and workers accessing these locations improving access to services and jobs for the local community. The removal of traffic along this road is likely to improve amenity for the occupiers of the caravan park and may make it a more attractive environment, increasing</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						patronage, thereby increasing tourism opportunities for the area. Further information about the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).	
328	154363			Economics - Need case	Respondents expressing concern about the need for the scheme, on the grounds that there is a better solution to a dual carriageway bypass around Kirkby Thore - as there are alternatives to dualling and a by-pass which would be less environmentally damaging and will address the main issues for Kirkby Thore, such as HGV traffic through the village and safety considerations.	Options identification began in 2017 when National Highways commissioned their technical consultant for the stage, with a brief to identify viable dualling options for consideration. National Highways has since carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project (from 2018-20) and has continued the evaluation of alternative route alignments for Kirkby Thore more recently in 2021 (the findings of which were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation). The preferred solution achieves the objectives for the Project in terms of safety, travel time savings and also removing HGV traffic from the village - it is also preferred in terms of a range of environmental considerations. The scheme will increase the capacity of the A66, improve resilience along the route in case of accidents or slow-moving vehicles while also providing a suite of safety improvements along the route in this location. The introduction of a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						proposed bypass will bring significant improvement in amenity for the community of Kirkby Thore and will improve connections within the village, currently severed by the volume of traffic running through the village. Improvements for users of the local traffic network are expected including significant new WCH infrastructure benefits. See Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further details on the need for this Scheme and our assessment of alternatives.	
346	149356, 152230, 152953, 152976, 153351, 153359, 153560, 153564, 153565, 153817, 153821, 153975, 154363	Environment Agency	154331	Alternative route - Red	Respondents including Environment Agency expressing concern about the proposals for the Red Route alignment, including concerns about biodiversity loss, with particular reference to bird species; increased carbon emissions; future industrial development; noise pollution; a negative visual amenity; and a detrimental impact on Crowdundle Beck.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in 2021. We carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance. Our three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Blue Route was chosen as the preferred route presented at the statutory consultation in autumn 2021 as it across all assessment criteria was found to perform best. Most noticeably, the Blue Route performs better with regard to drainage and hydrology, cultural heritage and effects on stakeholders. Following Statutory Consultation design development continued. The design was developed having regard to feedback received throughout the consultation and ongoing engagement, to address environmental and traffic issues that arose following completion of surveys and to incorporate mitigation for impacts that had been identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). More information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
353	154363		153847	Economics - Local economy - farming	Respondents expressing concern about the potential negative impacts of the scheme on the agricultural economy, including the possibility of severed slurry pipes affecting farm	An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in Chapter 12 Population and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					water supplies, and land take undermining farming businesses, with particular reference to Sleastonhow Farm.	Human Health in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This document provides information on agricultural land holdings: the type, location, and number of agricultural holdings at risk of demolition or from which land would be required/access affected by the Project including disruption to drainage, irrigation, and water supply systems. The assessment does not account for their frequency of use and their level of existing accessibility.	
355	153564, 153565, 153816, 153838, 153851, 153909, 153919, 153923, 153945, 153949, 153960, 154363		149800, 151473, 152177, 152984, 153042, 153917, 153920, 153942, 154191, 154260, 154266, 154269	Community impact - Property	Respondents expressing concern about the potential negative impact of the scheme on property. Respondents express concern that the scheme could cause a decrease in property value and negatively impact the local property market, with particular concern about the proximity of roads to houses, especially in Kirkby Thore.	National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans and details have been refined up to Development Consent Order submission to ensure any mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project and reduce impacts on affected landowners as far as reasonably practicable. The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2-3.4) considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase on air quality, noise and the safety of both	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>users and residents. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures are set out to reduce the effects where practicable.</p> <p>Delivery of these mitigation measures will be secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of Project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project.</p> <p>During construction there is potential for temporary air quality impacts on residents located close to the route, including residents at the north of Kirkby Thore. However, we are committed to measures that will help minimise impacts such as protecting</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						air quality by implementing a Dust Management Plan. We will also look to reduce the impact of noise on local communities throughout construction and adhering to best practice wherever possible.	
358	150460, 151472, 152230, 152267, 153037, 153560, 153564, 153815, 153817, 153851, 153912, 153925, 153975, 154013, 154363	Environment Agency Natural England	150438, 150464, 152236, 153321, 154199, 154203, 154232, 154330, 154331	Alternative route - Orange	Respondents including Environment Agency and Natural England expressing concern about the impact of the alternative Orange Route. Concerns include safety; increased land take; logistical challenges; the loss of local footpaths; and environmental impacts such as the risk of flooding and noise pollution.	National Highways acknowledges your comments with regard to the Orange Route. We have now had a chance to complete further surveys in area and review feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation as a result of this work the decision has been taken to take the Blue Route through the DCO process. The assessment demonstrates that the Blue Route alignment alternative is preferred over the Orange Route alignment. The Blue Route alignment performs better in a number of different areas most notably with regard to drainage and hydrology, cultural heritage and effects on stakeholders. Further information about route development can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	No
362	149367, 151504, 152952,		149785, 151473	Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing concern about the cost of the scheme, including comments that the scheme is	The cost is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	152956, 152976, 153351, 153817, 153821, 153855, 153878, 153880, 153882, 153885, 153888, 153926, 154218, 154363				too expensive and that the Orange Route would be cheaper.	<p>including journey time reliability from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2)</p> <p>National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including impacts on cultural heritage.</p> <p>In the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), it can be seen that the assessment of costs between the orange and the blue route resulted in a "Neutral" assessment meaning that neither option was noticeably cheaper or more expensive than the other. The mainline</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>of the Orange Route would be cheaper to construct than the Blue option as it requires significantly less earthworks. However, any savings are likely to be offset by costs associated with constructing a more extensive network of side roads to provide local connectivity, and the costs associated with additional land take required – particularly the acquisition and demolition of Bridge End Farm, which has been noted in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) as a significant cost to the scheme. In addition, the Orange Route has a potential requirement for land take from a housing allocation.</p> <p>The traffic assessment indicated that the Orange Route would have marginal benefits in terms of traffic flow on the A66 mainline at Kirkby Thore and journey time savings. However, there were no significant differences for safety or accessibility. There are no significant differences in impact from a safety perspective between routes. Disruption during construction is likely to be greater for the Orange Route given increased traffic management requirements of construction close to the existing A66. Most environmental impacts during</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>construction and operation were assessed as either Neutral or Better for the Orange Route (compared to Blue), however there are significant impacts to cultural heritage and population and human health for the Orange Route as more designated sites would be affected and greater land take required.</p> <p>It has been assessed that there will be larger negative effects on a number of businesses along the Orange Route. Local traffic will be able to use the de-trunked A66 to access these businesses as part of the Blue Route.</p>	
363	151484, 152911, 153817, 153855, 153878, 153880, 153885, 153888, 153926, 153944, 154363, 154366	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150194, 152961, 153032, 154260, 154266	Engineering design and development - General	<p>Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the engineering design of the scheme. Concerns expressed include:</p> <p>The length, cost and safety of the route.</p> <p>That it would negatively impact connectivity for Kirkby Thore residents.</p> <p>That an existing junction in the scheme does not meet current design standards.</p>	<p>We acknowledge and have reviewed comments on the alternative routes that have been provided during consultation events and have completed further surveys and design and we are progressing with the Blue Route. Reasons for this include: This route has the least effect on the environment, biodiversity and cultural heritage; the least effect on local businesses and farms; the safest to build; improved air quality for the receptors considered; the least effect on the river Eden and its tributaries; the least effect on historic sites.</p> <p>The Blue route has been developed partly in response to the Autumn 2021</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Consultation feedback, one of the major changes has been to relocate the Kirkby Thore junction to Fell Lane. One of the reasons for this change is to solve the issues associated with the part of Main Street (east of Ashton Leigh Cottages) that is narrow and poorly aligned.</p> <p>The existing terrain in the area is challenging and all routes achieve the best balance between road user requirements and the effects on the environment.</p> <p>The Blue route achieves excellent connectivity between local villages/towns by allowing the existing A66 to become a local road and reconnecting it at east and west ends into the local road network.</p> <p>Taking the Blue route around the north of Kirkby Thore requires more bends than would be desired, but the geometry (shape) of the road complies with current design standards for the speeds that users will expect to travel at on a road with a 70mph speed limit.</p> <p>New and amended existing junctions are designed to current national design standards and are subject to the road safety audit process in the current and subsequent design development phases.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
371	153975, 154363		153953	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the proposed design mitigation measures, including comments that the measures would not adequately mitigate potential impacts on local residents such as noise, visual impacts and loss of recreation facilities. Concern is also expressed that it would be difficult to mitigate impacts of the proposed bridge over the floodplain.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.</p> <p>Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>In relation to the recreational facilities, the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard.</p> <p>A full EIA has been carried out including a detailed assessment of the potential risks to groundwater and surface water, as set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage, and the Water Environment (Application</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						Document 3.2) and its technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed as part of the ES and is contained in the ES Appendices (Application Document 3.4). Environmental mitigation measures are set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) compliance with which is secured by the provisions of the draft DCO.	
372	153325, 153365, 153564, 153565, 153838, 153869, 153870, 153888, 153919, 153926, 153949, 153960, 154363, 162143		152177, 152216, 152961, 152999, 153310, 153927, 153953, 153962, 154200, 154225, 154266	Community impact - People	Respondents expressing general concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of local communities, specifically mentioning Kirkby Thore, Culgaith and Temple Sowerby.	<p>The environmental assessment assessed both the construction and operational phases of the development for the potential to give rise to significant adverse effects. This includes air quality and noise. Where the potential for adverse effects is predicted, mitigation proposals are incorporated into the design to reduce such effects where practicable.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.</p> <p>During construction Kirkby Thore Primary School and the residential area of Dunfell View and Sandersons Croft will be at risk of adverse impacts on wellbeing from dust effects. Requirements for dust mitigation are, however, considered to remove any significant impacts. The Air Quality assessment has not identified any significant effects on NOx and PM10 concentrations resulting from construction activities. Therefore, the health effects are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Construction noise effects will combine with significant visual effects in residential areas on the western and northern edges of Kirkby Thore, including Low Moor Park and Sandersons Croft, and at Kirkby Thore Primary School. These combined effects are likely to result in a temporary increase in levels of annoyance, reduced enjoyment of the public realm and open space, and a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>reduction in the perceived quality of the living environment for the affected communities. This is assessed as a negative health effect.</p> <p>The Project will affect local air quality through changes to road alignment, traffic flow, speed and fleet composition. However, as the air quality across the study area is good and the number of sensitive receptors experiencing changes in air quality is low, no significant air quality impacts have been identified. Therefore, the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Noise and visual effects will adversely affect the wellbeing of the community at Sanderson Croft in Kirby Thore through annoyance and possible sleep disturbance, reduced enjoyment of outdoor space (including gardens and an area of public open space), and a perceived reduction in the quality of the living environment. These responses will lessen over time, as planting becomes established, and the community becomes used to the presence of the new bypass. This is assessed as a negative health effect in the early years of operation, reducing to neutral in year 15 of operation.</p> <p>Elsewhere in Kirby Thore there will be adverse visual impacts in the early years of operation due to the presence</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>of the new bypass and beneficial effects on noise due to reduced traffic flows on the de-trunked A66. The combination of adverse visual and beneficial noise effects will lead to changes in levels of enjoyment of outdoor space and perceptions of the quality of the local environment across the village. It is likely that individuals within the community will respond to these effects in different ways, resulting in both positive and negative effects on wellbeing in the short term. Over time, as planting becomes established, negative health effects will be reduced to neutral.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
391	153965, 154363		151473, 152216, 152999, 153033, 153042, 154266	Community impact – Health – Alternatives	Respondents expressing concern that the preferred route alignment would have a detrimental impact on the mental and physical wellbeing of residents, due to increased noise and air pollution.	National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Statement including impacts on cultural heritage. Further information about the Project's development can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>With regards to Population and Human Health, the impacts are assessed as neutral between the Blue and Orange Route as although fewer receptors are at risk of experiencing adverse noise impact on the Orange Route, there are a greater number of properties experiencing a beneficial effect on the Blue Route.</p> <p>Most environmental impacts during construction and operation are assessed as either Neutral or Better for the Orange Route (compared to Blue), however there would be significant impacts to the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the harm that could be caused to the heritage asset by the Orange Route would be likely to conflict with national planning policy.</p> <p>Specifically for air quality it was considered that there would be no material difference between the Blue and Orange Route at construction and operation. While noise impacts during</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>construction for the Orange Route were considered to be similar to the Blue Route, however, at operation, the Orange Route would result in overall fewer significant effects than the Blue Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route alignment has better geometry and requires fewer relaxations and departures from standard than the Blue Route alignment and is shorter in length and requires less earthworks. However, the Orange Route would perform worse in terms of drainage and hydrology and would also perform worse than the Blue Route in terms of buildability as it is an online solution.</p> <p>The Orange Route would perform worse than the Blue Route in terms of land take, impacts on residential premises (as demolition of premises would be required), and there would be larger negative effects on a number of businesses along the Orange Route including the need to demolish a large dairy farm.</p> <p>On the balance of impacts, it is our conclusion that the Blue Route is our preference. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>(Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2-3.4) assessed both the construction and operational phases of the Project for the potential to give rise to significant adverse effects. This includes air quality and noise. Where the potential for adverse effects is predicted, mitigation proposals have been incorporated into the design to reduce such effects where practicable. The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. In order to reduce noise effects for receptors in Kirkby Thore and Long Marton, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. A</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>construction vibration assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), has been carried out in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 guidance within a study area of 100m from the closest construction activity, as a worst-case this is assumed to be at the Development Consent Order boundary. Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of Project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project.</p> <p>During construction there is potential for temporary air quality impacts on residents located close to the route, including residents at the north of Kirkby Thore. However, we are committed to measures that will help minimise impacts such as protecting air quality by implementing a Dust Management Plan. We will also look to reduce the impact of noise on local</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>communities throughout construction and adhering to best practice wherever possible.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 within the DMRB as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where practicable. During construction Kirkby Thore Primary School and the residential area of Dunfell View and Sandersons Croft will be at risk of adverse impacts on wellbeing from dust effects. Requirements for dust mitigation are, however, considered to remove any significant impacts. The Air Quality assessment has not identified any significant effects on NOx and PM10</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>concentrations resulting from construction activities. Therefore, the health effects are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Construction noise effects will combine with significant visual effects in residential areas on the western and northern edges of Kirkby Thore, including Low Moor Park and Sandersons Croft, and at Kirkby Thore Primary School. These combined effects are likely to result in a temporary increase in levels of annoyance, reduced enjoyment of the public realm and open space, and a reduction in the perceived quality of the living environment for the affected communities. This is assessed as a negative health effect.</p> <p>The Project will affect local air quality through changes to road alignment, traffic flow, speed and fleet composition. However, as the air quality across the study area is good and the number of sensitive receptors experiencing changes in air quality is low, no significant air quality impacts have been identified. Therefore, the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Noise and visual effects will adversely affect the wellbeing of the community at Sanderson Croft in Kirby Thore through annoyance and possible sleep disturbance, reduced enjoyment of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>outdoor space (including gardens and an area of public open space), and a perceived reduction in the quality of the living environment. These responses will lessen over time, as planting becomes established, and the community becomes used to the presence of the new bypass. This is assessed as a negative health effect in the early years of operation, reducing to neutral in year 15 of operation.</p> <p>Elsewhere in Kirby Thore there will be adverse visual impacts in the early years of operation due to the presence of the new bypass and beneficial effects on noise due to reduced traffic flows on the de-trunked A66. The combination of adverse visual and beneficial noise effects will lead to changes in levels of enjoyment of outdoor space and perceptions of the quality of the local environment across the village. It is likely that individuals within the community will respond to these effects in different ways, resulting in both positive and negative effects on wellbeing in the short term. Over time, as planting becomes established, negative health effects will be reduced to neutral.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
392	153809, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Northern Gas Networks	152216, 154266	Construction - Disruption	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council express concern that the construction of the preferred route alignment would be disruptive to the local community, increasing congestion in the area, affecting the local Fair, and that it would impact a gas main supplying the local quarry.	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that with the construction of the new route being located away from the current A66, construction activities will have limited impacts on current traffic flows or movements. Traffic data also suggests that material movements on the A66 will also have very limited impact. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption. Local routes will not be permitted for construction vehicles, with independent haul routes being established where possible to minimise any construction affects. During construction, the Appleby Horse Fair Multi-Agency Strategic Coordinating Group (MASCG) will be liaised with around the timing of works, adequate diversions, and routing of Fair traffic away from the A66 to minimise impacts on journeys to and from the Fair and on the surrounding road network. This principle is set out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and will be incorporated into Construction Method Management Statement (Application Document 2.6). Refer to the Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) for further information about how National Highways has considered Appleby Horse Fair.</p> <p>As part of the Project, to upgrade the road network and associated new structures, National Highways recognises that the Project may require certain utility infrastructure to be diverted, where it has not been possible to incorporate existing services as part of the design. Where this is the case, it will work with the relevant utility companies to seek to minimise disruption, with a view to ensuring any new diversions are in place prior to existing infrastructure being moved/switched off. This will be governed by the protective provisions for the benefit of utility companies contained in the DCO. In respect to Gas services being disrupted to the local quarry, any diversion works would be well communicated and undertaken outside of business hours to mitigate any impacts.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
480	153037, 153359, 153960, 154461	Cumbria County Council	153000, 153942, 154190, 154199, 154203, 154225, 154331	Additional Route - Orange	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing additional concern about the Orange Route. Concerns expressed include it would be more expensive on the grounds that it would require purchase of an existing farm; construction of this route would cause more traffic disruption; and the route would increase traffic and noise for local residents. Respondents also expressing concerns that the Orange Route would increase flooding risk for local residents and negatively impact cultural heritage sites, wildlife habitats, footpaths and bridleways. Respondents expressing further concerns that it would increase journey times and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>We acknowledge and have reviewed comments on the alternative routes that have been provided during consultation events and have completed further surveys and design and we are progressing with the Blue Route.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Given the impact the Orange Route would have on the Kirkby Thore Roman Fort and Associated Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument, the application for development consent would therefore have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in order to put forward the Orange Route alternative for Examination. This would require a case for the scheme to be made that potential substantial harm or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
481	153337, 153359, 153817, 153851, 154461	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Additional Route - Red	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing additional concerns about the Red Route. This includes concerns such as: it is too close to Long Marton, which would affect the local primary schools and residents with noise, light and air pollution; that the red route has 3.5 times more CO2 emissions than the Orange Route, there is much more land taken by the Red Route which means more construction materials and more maintenance and that the route is too close to a bridleway along old Roman Road.	<p>In terms of the Red Route this was identified as a possible alternative as it provided a shorter crossing of the Trout Beck. Following further design work and feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation it has been decided that the Blue option is preferred over the red. The main drivers for this relate to the fact that the crossing of Trout Beck would need a structure that was approximately 18m above ground level which would have detrimental effects on the landscape. Additionally, the red route moves the A66 closer to the gypsum mineworkings and Long Marton.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
483	149411, 153816, 153945, 154363, 154366, 154468	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150180, 153310, 153376, 153556, 153920, 153927	Engineering design and development - General	<p>Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the engineering design and development of the scheme.</p> <p>This includes comments that the dual carriageway built around Temple Sowerby is not well designed.</p> <p>The acceleration lane onto the A66 existing dual carriageway at Temple Sowerby westbound is too short.</p> <p>The plans will increase journey time.</p> <p>Respondents also expressing confusion around the areas shown within the red line and why the Blue Route is specifically designed with the disruption of lorries from British Gypsum in mind.</p>	<p>The scheme is designed in accordance with the latest national design standards which provide advice on junction types and lengths of merges and diverges.</p> <p>Improvements to the existing A66 junction at Temple Sowerby fall outside the remit for the A66 Project as we are only looking at the dualling of the remaining single carriageway sections of the route between Scotch Corner and Penrith. The use of this junction would have formed part of the proposals to provide access to British Gypsum on the Orange Route. The decision has now been taken to progress the Blue Route through the DCO process meaning that the Temple Sowerby junction will continue to operate as it does now. The junction was designed in accordance with the standards applicable at the time.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment report shows the impact of the scheme on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time (in both directions) for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						A new junction at the British Gypsum access to the north of Kirkby Thore will pass over the proposed A66 alignment on a bridge structure. This junction will maintain the key local connection onto the A66 and has the additional benefit of providing access to businesses and hauliers to the north of the village. This will contribute to a reduction in the number of HGV movements through Kirkby Thore.	
541	152954, 153359, 153851, 153960, 154013, 154194, 154363, 154366		151473, 153842, 153953	Community impact - People – Alternatives	Respondents expressing concerns about the community impact of the proposed scheme stating that the Blue Route has no benefit for the community and concern the road will disconnect villages of Temple Sowerby, Newbiggin, Milburn and Knock. In addition, concern about the impact on residents, such as visual landscape, noise and pollution. A further concern is that the Blue Route and Red Routes will both lead to a loss of shooting rights.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in 2021. National Highways carried out an extensive sifting exercise in the current design phase to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This sifting exercise compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic, stakeholders' feedback and policy compliance. National Highways' three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>Access to the villages of Temple Sowerby, Newbiggin, Milburn and Knock will be retained and not disconnected.</p> <p>The Blue Route was chosen as the preferred route as across all assessment criteria it was found to perform best. Most noticeably, the Blue Route performs better with regard to drainage and hydrology, cultural heritage and effects on stakeholders. More information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>National Highways continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the scheme using clear statutory procedures, to understand the effects of the scheme on their land interest such as shooting rights. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.</p> <p>Community benefits have been considered as part of the Project development. By dualling the remaining single carriageway sections, we will reduce the number of accidents</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>and resulting casualties predicted to happen on the route.</p> <p>During operation, there is also the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity may also be a significant effect for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and usability of community land and assets.</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. In order to reduce noise effects for receptors in Kirkby Thore and Long Marton, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. A construction vibration assessment reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), has been carried out in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 111 guidance within a study area of 100m from the closest construction activity, as a worst-case this is assumed to be at the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Development Consent Order boundary. Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of Project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Regarding visibility, the landscape and visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration of the design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. An Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2 to 3.4) has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where practicable. Updated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						ecological and landscape mitigation plans are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	
554	153614, 153816, 153869, 153870, 154366		153376, 153556, 153624, 153842, 153897, 153927, 153953, 154225	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents expressing concern about the proposed mitigation for the design of the scheme. This includes general concerns that the proposed mitigation is insufficient, and more specific concerns that there are insufficient proposed mitigations for noise and light pollution and visual impact, and that the timber sound-boarding is unacceptable as it is liable to disintegrate. There are also concerns about the lack of tree-planting and the positioning of hedgerows.	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual considers the impact of the scheme on visual receptors and landscape character including light pollution from headlights of car users.</p> <p>Where adverse environmental impacts are identified mitigation is proposed. Our landscape architects and ecologists have developed environmental mitigation which considers visual impacts of the scheme, identifying planting areas (including hedgerows) and appropriate species to screen intrusive views and light pollution. Planting aims to maximise biodiversity as well as delivering landscape mitigation. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) provide an indication of how the mitigation could be implemented. The Project design has been refined since the PEI Report</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>and requirements for ecological mitigation have reduced.</p> <p>The use of trees to act as acoustic screening to minimise noise, is generally not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have also been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the alignment and cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise. Monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation measures would be completed as part of National Highways Project</p> <p>The Project design has been developed since the PEI Report was published and the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore. No adverse significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore School or Dunfell View are identified.</p> <p>At Sleastonhow, there are predicted to be noise increases, however, it is not sustainable to provide additional mitigation in the form of a noise barrier at this location, further details are provided within the ES Chapter.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>There is now a proposed junction to the north of Sanderson's Croft, however, the earth bunding/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts and potential landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>As a result of the Project, we expect a reduction in noise levels along Main Street.</p>	
555	150175	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150180, 150196, 153620, 154227	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about provision in the scheme for the safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents express particular concern that the scheme would increase traffic around Main Street in Kirkby Thore which would negatively impact walking and cycling safety.</p>	<p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked old A66, where it will remain. Safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders (WCH) is of paramount importance. WCH provision will be of adequate width and design for users. Any at-grade crossing points will be designed in accordance with current national standards and subject to the road safety audit process.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>There will be an 86% decrease in traffic flows on Main Street to the South of Kirkby Thore once the Project is operational. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
562	152946, 153960	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152936, 153847, 154260	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concerns about provision in the scheme for the safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.</p> <p>Respondents' express concerns about safety of horse-drawn vehicles leaving Appleby Horse Fair and joining the A66.</p> <p>The current routes are unsafe for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Increased traffic near to Midland View cottages in Kirkby Thore would increase risk for pedestrians accessing the village</p> <p>Proposals to divert a footpath to share a bridge with farm vehicles and animals would pose a safety risk.</p>	<p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, additional east-west WCH provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes, including the Kirby Thore section of Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This, combined with the de-trunking of the A66 will significantly improve safety for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>The de-trunking of sections of the A66 will create a safety benefit in relation to the Appleby Horse Fair. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders regarding this and will support Cumbria County Council in routing and traffic management arrangements for the horse fair.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Further information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>The point raised regarding Midland View Cottages has been addressed as part of moving the junction from Main Street to the British Gypsum access. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists will be expected to respect the country code and the property they are walking through. This type of shared bridge is not an unusual practice in a rural environment.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders as the project progresses through the next stages of development.</p>	
580	154363, 154366		152177, 152984, 153376, 153825, 153827, 153897, 153927, 154266	Construction - Disruption	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the construction of the preferred route alignment and the disruption this would cause for the local community, including the length of time of potential disruption. Concerns include reduced access to and from properties; construction traffic through villages; loss of</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption and disruption to stakeholders through the implementation of control measures during construction, in line with a well formulated programme of works.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					<p>continuous farm access; loss of power to local businesses and concerns that Sleastonhow Lane is unsuitable for construction traffic.</p>	<p>Traffic management will also be controlled, with route selection for diversions being of paramount importance to prevent issues in local villages. At all stages, stakeholders, local councils and interested parties will be kept informed about traffic management with concerns being noted and actions taken.</p> <p>The Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme is expected to take around 3 years to construct. At this stage, National Highways has programmed to start this scheme in 2025, this may be subject to change.</p> <p>With the proposed route being constructed around the northern side of the village, it will enable the existing A66 traffic to be maintained on the current road whilst the works is being undertaken on the new route, with little impact on A66 traffic flows.</p> <p>The new A66 route will look to improve access to properties on the whole, with improved road crossing points and a reduction in accident black spots. During construction, Principal Contractors will work closely with affected stakeholders and landowners to ensure alternative and suitable access arrangements are in place at all times during the construction process.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a commitment in the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the measures that must be implemented through the Construction Traffic Management Plan and includes an outline of the plan at Annex B13.</p> <p>The new A66 road will look to be constructed in a linear way, with construction traffic movements being maintained on the new road as it is created. This will ensure a large percentage of movements are away from residents and road users. Construction traffic will also be dictated to follow prescribed routes and thus mitigating the effects of construction on residents and road users. Local roads such as Sleastonhow Lane will not be permitted to carry construction vehicles for the main works.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, for example bridge installations, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance. Where local access to properties or business is required to be maintained, additional measures will look to be put in place.</p> <p>Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>During construction, disruption to services (such as water and power) will be planned so that temporary or permanent diversions are in place before they are affected which should result in disruptions being minimised/eliminated. These will be communicated in advance to affected parties. Under no circumstances will utilities be disconnected, leaving businesses without power.</p> <p>Following detailed route selection design, the new A66 looks to minimise the impacts on the agricultural land and where possible the route looks to respect land boundaries and minimise the land take required to construct the new road. Where farmland looks to be divided, suitable access provisions will look to be adopted to ensure connectivity.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
582	153836, 154363		152216, 153927	Community impact - Health	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the physical and mental well-being of the local community, including concerns about the impact of air, noise, and light pollution. Particular concern is highlighted for residents of Kirkby Thore.</p>	<p>The environmental assessment assessed both the construction and operational phases of the development for the potential to give rise to significant adverse effects. This includes air quality and noise. Where the potential for adverse effects is predicted, mitigation proposals will be incorporated into the design to reduce such effects where practicable.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where practicable. Across the Temple Sowerby to Appleby study area, there will be significant adverse noise effects at 10 rural dwellings and a significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>beneficial noise effects at 17 rural dwellings. Residents in these properties may experience positive and negative changes in levels of annoyance, sleep disturbance and enjoyment of outdoor space. Due to the low level of exposure, noise effects at individual rural dwellings are not considered to give rise to changes in population health and wellbeing, and therefore the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the scheme and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). The impact of the scheme on Landscape and Visual can be found in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
604	151484, 153365, 153894, 153975	Cumbria County Council Eden	150180, 152177, 152216, 153033, 153041, 153042,	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria Country Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about traffic safety, including: the junction at Main Street, Kirkby Thore; sharp corners; slip road design; high speeds;	We have received a number of responses outlining concerns with the location of the junction on Main Street and the unsuitability of the existing local road in this area to cope with any increase in traffic. This was also raised	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
		District Council	153953, 154260, 154266, 154330, 154331		narrow roads; poor visibility; horse-drawn vehicles and flooding at Sleastonhow Lane and Main Street.	<p>as a concern at the public events in Kirkby Thore. We have now had a chance to review the feedback and look further at the design around this area. Having considered this feedback, we have taken the decision to move the location of this junction further west to the British Gypsum access on Fell Lane, thereby removing the respondent's concern regarding the junction design on Main Street. This will prevent any problems occurring through the narrow section of Main St and will also remove impacts on the industrial estate.</p> <p>The road has been designed to comply with National Highways latest design standards contained within DMRB. This includes those design standards relating to horizontal curvature, road width and visibility. Road Safety Audits have been carried out in accordance with the Road Safety Audit Brief and the design team has carefully considered the problems and recommendations in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1) Report and has provided responses to recommendations raised by the Road Safety Audit Team. Further information can be found in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
611			153376, 153625	Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	Respondents expressing concern about the potential increase in anti-social behaviour such as litter or trespassing due to the positioning of the lay-bys on a slight curve.	National Highways notes comments regarding lay-bys, which are being provided where they have been lost due to the scheme. The replacement lay-bys are designed to latest standards and positioned in accordance with current guidance. While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. The new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker more reliable journey times, enabling people to spend less time on the road, which may lead to reduced litter/fly tipping.	No
615	150189		153620, 154331	Engineering design and development - Safety	Respondents expressing concerns with the design of the scheme on the grounds of safety, specifically around lay-bys and junctions around the Temple Sowerby bypass. One respondent also highlighted low overhead electricity lines which may pose a safety risk to large vehicles.	The design has been prepared in accordance with the latest national design standards. All junctions on the new sections of A66 will comply with these standards and designs are also subject to an independent road safety audit to highlight and address any potential issues. Lay-bys are being provided where they are lost due to the Project. Again, these are designed to latest standards	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>and positioned in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p>The comment regarding low overhead electricity lines is noted and will be considered as part of the detailed design of any construction compound and safe working methodologies will be followed in relation to any works carried out in the vicinity of overhead electricity lines.</p>	
678	148635, 153364, 153600, 153617, 153619, 153821, 153965, 154363		149783, 149785, 151473, 153033, 153574, 154225, 154266	Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the potential impacts of the scheme on the local economy and businesses. Respondents express concern that the scheme could negatively impact tourism in the area, the property market, and local businesses.</p>	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the scheme will support Cumbria's Local Industrial Strategy and provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the scheme at a route-wide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p> <p>Low Moor Caravan Park lies immediately adjacent to the A66 at Temple Sowerby. The removal of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>traffic along this road is likely to improve amenity for the occupiers of the caravan park and may make it a more attractive environment, increasing patronage, thereby increasing tourism opportunities for the area.</p> <p>In providing a bypass, the existing 'old A66' alignment will be retained. Farm and other business accesses as well as residential property accesses will be retained, however, the significant reduction in traffic along this road will result in far easier traffic movements for occupiers and workers accessing these locations improving access to services and jobs for the local community.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
679	149787, 153815, 153858, 153945, 154179, 154366		153556, 153624, 153625, 154457	Land - Agricultural	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impacts of the scheme on agricultural land. Respondents state that the proposed land take would result in the loss of productive agricultural land, including concern over the location of mitigation measures such as drainage ponds, species rich grassland and woodland. Other respondents expressing concern</p>	<p>Where our proposals affect farming operations, we have provided accommodation works such as underpasses or bridges to maintain access.</p> <p>The Project team has worked with an external assessor to undertake an audit of the impacts on agricultural land.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					that the land take would sever existing land holdings which could halt farming operations. Locations specifically mentioned are Spittals Farm and land near to Sleastonhow Lane.	<p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes this assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land including an assessment of the proportion of the land holding affected. The assessment also sets out mitigation measures for impacts on and land taken from agricultural land including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. - accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where possible to avoid potential crop loss. - maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible - outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>Suitable mitigation measures are being agreed with the owners of Spittals Farm and the land near to Sleastonhow Lane.</p> <p>Our public liaison officers have been working with landowners since the start of the Project to understand land use and to help the Project team to minimise impacts. This liaison will continue as we move into the DCO process.</p>	
737	153855, 153858, 154194, 154366		153381, 153847	Land - Other	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on land use. Concerns include that the scheme would use too much land, that soil health would be degraded and that the scheme would negatively impact a planned solar energy farm.</p>	<p>The scheme design seeks to minimise the area of land required both temporarily and permanently. Land possessed temporarily will be returned to its former owner. .</p> <p>The potential for the scheme to affect agricultural land is set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, Application Document 3.2.</p> <p>The PEI Report was informed by desk-based studies. A soil survey has now also been completed and fed into Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and outline mitigation proposals. . A Soil Management Plan will be produced prior to works commencing and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						The Project considers interaction with committed developments (those with approved planning permission) within Chapter 15, Cumulative Effects, of the ES (Application Document 3.2). These developments have been agreed with Local Authorities. Where a development does not have planning permission, due to the uncertainty of whether the development will be progressed, the assessment does not consider potential impacts. We are aware of the solar farm plan however and are working with the landowner in question.	
742	150182, 153838, 153888, 153919, 153965, 154363		153942, 153962	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would lead to an increase in traffic volumes. Concerns expressed include increased traffic through Kirkby Thore in the event of an accident or congestion on the A66; that the scheme would increase vehicle speeds and that the scheme would result in increased traffic and noise to the northern part of Kirkby Thore village.	The scheme will remove circa 23,000 vehicles per day from the village of Kirkby Thore. The construction of a dual carriageway road will reduce the frequency with which the A66 is blocked in both directions (due to an incident) as one carriageway will remain open. A 30mph speed limit will be implemented on the de-trunked section of the A66 through the village. Please refer to the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) for assessments of traffic volumes. While the potential for accidents is expected to be reduced overall as a result of the proposed road standard improvements, in the event of accidents, breakdowns or	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>slow-moving vehicles, the second lane of the road will provide resilience along the route. The additional lane will enable passing or turn back facilities, ensuring the route remains open.</p> <p>It is assessed that the environmental impacts associated with the scheme are also significant, in terms of noise and air quality. The scheme will improve resilience along the route in case of accidents or slow-moving vehicles while also providing a suite of safety improvements along the route in this location. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>A false bund would be created on the south side of the new A66, around the north of Kirkby Thore. The false bund, formed by creating an embankment above existing ground levels, would increase the depth of cutting to visually screen the road and to reduce noise impacts to the village of Kirkby Thore. Further information about noise assessments carried out can be found in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
776	151346, 153351, 153617, 153619,		153310, 153847	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would lead to a loss of agricultural land, mentioning the Eden valley, land near to Kirkby Thore and	The scheme design seeks to minimise the area of land required both temporarily and permanently.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	153888, 153919, 153926, 153944, 154366				at Sleastonhow Farm. Concerns expressed include the amount of land used for the road and for proposed environmental mitigation measures such as woodland and drainage ponds and that the scheme would split farmland in a number of locations which would negatively impact access.	<p>We have refined our mitigation plans since Autumn 2021 Consultation. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all of our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. We have refined the Order limits as far as we are able to do so with the current level of design and further refinement will happen at the detailed design stage should development consent be granted..</p> <p>A soil survey has now also been completed and fed into Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and outline mitigation proposals. The Environmental Mitigation Map (Application Document 2.8) shows how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land, including the proportion of farm holdings that will be affected and sets out a number of proposed measures to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>mitigate for the loss of agricultural land, including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. - accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where possible to avoid potential crop loss. - maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible - outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. <p>Access to fields will be maintained during construction with, if required, alternative access arrangements made.</p>	
795	154194		149783	Economics - Need case	Respondents expressing concern that access to and from British Gypsum is an insufficient reason to choose the preferred route alignment, on the	National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
					grounds that British Gypsum might not be there in the future.	<p>Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the Preferred Route Announcement at the end of PCF Stage 2 in 2019. Ahead of the Autumn 2021 Consultation, a review of the development of the traffic model during PCF Stage 2 was carried out to confirm the conclusions reached at the end of PCF Stage 2. This was comprised of an extensive optioneering process, which presented 3 different routes which were subjected to a rigorous process taking into account a number of different factors (environment, community, policy etc.), in addition to the access to British Gypsum being a factor.</p> <p>The three imperatives of Safety, Customer Service and Delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						<p>alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>The route around Kirkby Thore has many benefits beyond serving British Gypsum. A new junction at Main Street to the northeast of Kirkby Thore means that Main Street will pass over the proposed A66 alignment on a bridge structure. This junction will maintain the key local connection onto the A66 and has the additional benefit of providing access to businesses and hauliers to the north of the village. This will contribute to a reduction in the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						number of HGV movements through Kirkby Thore. The preferred route also has lower environmental impacts whilst still delivering the required improvements. Further information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
832	148625, 148627, 148629, 148632, 148639, 149387, 149389, 149397, 149399, 149402, 149406, 149410, 151475		148628, 150196, 153574	Land - Facilities / amenities	Respondents expressing concern that land used by the scheme would negatively impact local facilities for self-storage and for the storage of caravans and motorhomes, specifically mentioning the facility at Kirkby Thore.	As a result of the comments received as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation as well as the completion of further surveys and optioneering works we have now taken the decision to move the location of the Kirkby Thore Junction with Main Street further to the west. It will now be located on Fell Lane which links to the access road for British Gypsum. The movement of this junction means that the Industrial Estate and Caravan Storage Area is no longer affected by the scheme.	Yes
861	148617, 148624, 148627, 148630, 148631, 148635, 149384, 149389, 149399, 149406,		148622, 148634, 150194	Land - Facilities / amenities	Respondents expressing concern that land used by the scheme would negatively impact facilities for self-storage and for storage of caravans and motorhomes, specifically mentioning the facility at Kirkby Thore. Concern is also expressed that the scheme would bypass the only filling	As a result of the comments received as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation as well as the completion of further surveys and optioneering works we have now taken the decision to move the location of the Kirkby Thore Junction with Main Street further to the west. It will now be located on Fell Lane which links to the access road for British Gypsum. The	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
	150412, 150413, 150436, 153936				station on the A66 between Scotch Corner and Rheged.	movement of this junction means that the Industrial Estate and Caravan Storage Area is no longer affected by the scheme. While the scheme would by-pass the filling station at Kirkby Thore, access would still be maintained on the old A66.	
882	153617			Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	One respondent expressing concern about the potential antisocial behaviour that this route may encourage, with particular reference to littering and overnight camping.	While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. The new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker more reliable journey times, enabling people to spend less time on the road, which may lead to reduced litter/fly tipping. The responsibility for litter collection for this section of the A66 sits with Cumbria County Council. Regarding overnight camping, the management and control of how byways are used is a matter for Cumbria County Council as the responsible authority.	No
1198			154180	Construction Mitigate construction	Respondent suggesting slurry pipe is diverted over the bridge to the slurry lagoon.	We are aware of slurry being pumped into the lagoon and will undertake appropriate diversion works as part of the scheme to ensure that any	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)f				
						equipment associated with the lagoon remains operational after the construction of the new road.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Crackenthorpe – Environment’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
602	153359		150196	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular relating to air pollution. Concerns include the blue route and red route passing within 200 metres of the school at Kirkby Thore, compared with the orange route which passes along the edge of the village.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including air quality which was not identified as a differentiator across route options. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information. for further information.</p> <p>The PEI Report presented a preliminary air quality impact assessment. The full air quality assessment, which is presented in ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2), has been updated following updates to the traffic model and Project design and considers construction and operation effects. No likely significant effects are concluded for air quality for construction phase traffic impacts. Mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts from construction dust to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>includes an air quality and dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on-site and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows DMRB LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Air quality impacts on receptors beyond this distance are considered to be negligible.</p> <p>Kirkby Thore School building is approximately 220m from the centre line of the scheme alignment, however the road will be in deep cutting which will help mitigate the impact of the road. Modelling of air quality changes show that there will not be a significant change in air quality at the school building or in the playing field. No likely significant effects are concluded for air</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						quality during the operational phase at any receptor. There are no predicted exceedances of the relevant Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) for NO2, PM10 or PM2.5 during the operational phase of the Project.	
1112		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	The red route would avoid impact upon the Scheduled Monument (Redlands Bank), as it passes some distance to the north of it.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage. The blue route was taken forward into the final preliminary design. A range of factors informed the decision, including preliminary flood modelling which demonstrated that a crossing of Trout Beck at this location could be designed without impact on the River Eden SAC; there was a significant impact on the Scheduled Monument to the south of Kirkby Thore as result from any online option (Orange in this case) as well as economic factors and buildability.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Redlands Bank Roman camp location has resulted in the Order Limits being altered with the road alignment refined in this area and the direct scheme impact limited to the construction of a cycle path.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Following mitigation no significant effect is identified for the Redlands Bank Roman camp.</p>	
1111		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Historic England suggestion that the blue route may impinge on Roman Camp at Redlands Bank and anticipates that impacts can be mitigated by careful alignment of the blue route at this point.	<p>Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Redlands Bank Roman camp location has resulted in the Order Limits being altered with the road alignment refined in this area and the direct scheme impact limited to the construction of a cycle path.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Following mitigation no significant effect is identified for the Redlands Bank Roman camp.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
506		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report- Cultural heritage	One respondent expressing concern that the DCO boundary extends into the Crackenthorpe Roman camp.	Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Crackenthorpe Roman camp (Redlands Bank) location has resulted in the Order Limits being altered with the road alignment refined in this area and the direct scheme impact limited to the construction of a cycle path. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Following mitigation no significant effect is identified for the Crackenthorpe Roman camp.	Yes
152	148619, 152981, 153797, 154264	Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on cultural heritage, specifically on the Roman road and at Crackenthorpe Roman Camp, where archaeological features may extend beyond the site.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is now reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) and includes details of proposed mitigation measures. Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Crackenthorpe Roman camp (Redlands Bank) location has resulted in the Order Limits being altered with the road alignment refined in this area and the direct scheme impact limited to the construction of a cycle path.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Following mitigation no significant effect is identified for the Crackenthorpe Roman camp. In addition, no significant effects are identified where the roman road exists as a bridleway within this scheme.	
1110		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Historic England expressing concern that the orange route identifies significant adverse impacts on Roman Camp east of Redlands Bank. The only option for mitigation would have to be through preservation by record.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage.</p> <p>The blue route was taken forward into the final preliminary design. A range of factors informed the decision, including preliminary flood modelling which demonstrated that a crossing of Trout Beck at this location could be designed without impact on the SAC; the significant impact on the Scheduled Monument to the south of Kirkby Thore arising from any online or southern route; economic factors and buildability. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Redlands Bank Roman camp location has resulted in the Order Limits being altered with the road alignment refined in this area and the direct scheme impact limited to the construction of a cycle path.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Following mitigation in the form of a comprehensive programme of archaeological recording analysis and publication, no significant effect is identified for the Redlands Bank Roman camp.</p>	
885	153797, 153919			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern about the possible impact of the scheme on visual and landscape aspects of the environment. In particular, respondents state that the scheme would diminish the countryside and cut through SACs and SSSIs.	The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. Mitigation measures include slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. In some instances, the design has included increased heights of bunds to remove	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>the need for acoustic barriers and remain in keeping with the local landscape character. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. The Project team has worked collaboratively with landscape architects and ecologists working together to develop proposed mitigation measures to minimise the Project impact on designations such as SACs and SSSIs. Where the Project interacts with SACs and SSSIs such as the River Eden, careful design consideration has gone into ensuring minimal impact on these designations and the protected species and habitats within them. For example, the crossing of Trout Beck east of Kirkby Thore has been put onto a viaduct over the watercourse and its flood plain to avoid impacting on the natural flood regime. Other SSSIs and SACs in the area of the Project have been avoided and mitigation in place for any mobile</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>species associated with them such as birds, fish and mammals. Environmental assessment has concluded no significant impacts on any SAC or SSSI.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) and the assessment of impacts on any SACs or SSSIs is set out in Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Application Document 3.5 and 3.6)</p>	
943	153335		151350	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing support for the proposed environmental mitigation measures, in particular the creation of invertebrate habitats and that the scheme would avoid damage to river banks.	National Highways acknowledges support for the scheme. The ecological impacts of the scheme are described, and mitigation (including for invertebrate habitats and avoiding damage to river banks) is detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). Delivery of these mitigation measures will be secured through the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	No
1049	150169		152249	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents suggesting measures to reduce environmental impact of the project on wildlife and habitats, including: crossing provision such as tunnels, culverts, and land bridges be	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full baseline, impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
				Wildlife / habitats	included for local wildlife; and that habitat-forming techniques should be used, such as loose stone walling and hawthorn hedgerows.	<p>sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where required and practicable. Where this is not possible and likely significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the within the DCO within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and the Environmental Mitigation Maps identify how mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting, greening of proposed overbridges and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species.</p> <p>All new watercourse crossings have been designed to facilitate the free passage of aquatic and riparian species. Where existing culverts are to be replaced, they too are designed to facilitate the free passage of these</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						species. This includes planting species-rich native hedgerows and retaining and reinstating drystone walls that contribute to the landscape character.	
600	148619, 153359, 153365, 153797, 154177		150461, 154457	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular that the scheme would have a negative impact on wildlife and habitats. Respondents expressing concern that deer and birds would be adversely impacted by the scheme, and that the proposals provide insufficient safe crossing points for wildlife. Other respondents expressing concern that habitats would be destroyed. Others specifically mention the impacts on a wild greenway between Appleby and Powis cottages. Respondents also raise queries as to how land proposed for mitigation will be maintained and managed.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project. This assessment has identified that there is no direct impact on the wild greenway noted on Roman Road between Appleby and Powis cottages. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where required and practicable. This includes birds and notable mammals likely to be impacted by the Project.</p> <p>Where potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is set out in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and an indication of how it could be implemented within Order Limits is provided on the Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>The outline monitoring, maintenance and management measures for up to 30 years following completion of ecological mitigation measures are set out within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (an Annex to the EMP, Application Document 2.7) provided alongside the illustrative Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8.)</p>	
635	153365		150461, 151510, 153065, 154222, 154229, 154231	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern about the scheme increasing local flood risks. Areas about which concerns are expressed include: the River Eden; the Roman road; and the proposed drainage pond behind	National Highways note the consultees' concerns about flooding. The Project has developed a Flood Risk Assessment which has been consulted upon with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					<p>Crackenthorpe by Far Broom. Concern is expressed that Far Broom farm and other houses are at direct flood risk and that water attenuation should not be planned in this direction. Concern is also expressed that proposed drainage pond mitigation measures do not consider the risk of increased flooding due to climate change.</p>	<p>Authorities as part of the DCO submission (Refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4)).</p> <p>The results of the flood modelling for the Project indicate no increased risk of flooding as a result of the Project to River Eden; the Roman road; and the proposed drainage pond behind Crackenthorpe by Far Broom.</p> <p>The assessment identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Chapter 14 the ES (Application Document 3.2) presents a full impact assessment in relation to the road drainage and the water environment. The chapter describes the baseline conditions of the existing water environment in the study area and the methodology used to assess potential impacts during the construction and operational phases of the Project, before presenting the results of these assessments and any further mitigation measures or monitoring deemed necessary. Where practicable, the number of ponds has</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						been rationalised in response to feedback from engagement whilst minimising the risk of flooding. All structures and culverts under the new road will be designed to accommodate future flood events.	
927	150169, 151469, 153343	Cracken-thorpe Parish Meeting	152249, 153306	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	Respondents suggesting measures to reduce environmental impact of the scheme by planting trees, stating that additional planting should be carried out to create visual screening along the road. Other respondents state that mature trees should be retained, and that tree planting should seek to create wildlife corridors.	<p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of the environmental effects of the Project including upon mature and veteran trees, and sets out details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where mitigation has been identified as being required, mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, suitable planting.</p> <p>The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail and are outlined illustratively within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Planting is considered in the context of ecological mitigation, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions. The outline monitoring, maintenance and management measures for up to 30 years following completion of ecological mitigation measures are set out within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (an Annex to the EMP (Application Document 2.7) provided alongside the illustrative Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes avoiding the loss of all mature/notable trees and woodlands where practicable and restoring and enhancing landscape features and wildlife corridors such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat, wildlife corridors and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife. Outline measures have been included within the EMP to ensure all</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						sensitive/notable habitat (including mature trees and existing wildlife corridors) near construction works are protected (e.g. buffer zones, presence of Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) where required etc).	
59	153359, 153365, 153797, 153817, 153839, 153871		151510, 152983,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that road upgrades are contradictory to climate change commitments, including Cumbria and national net zero targets. Concern expressed regarding the predicted greater carbon emissions from constructing the red and blue routes compared with the orange route.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. The climate impact arising from different route options formed one element of the route selection process. The PEI Report concluded that no route options resulted in a significant adverse effect on climate.</p> <p>The ES sets out a detailed assessment of the predicted impact of the Project on climate receptors (see Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) including how the Project complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)).</p> <p>As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>For the selected route (blue), at both construction and operation, the environmental impact assessment on climate receptors, as reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the expected net change in Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHGs) arising from the Project is not considered have a material impact on the ability of the government to meet its carbon targets. On this basis, and in accordance with the NPSNN, it is concluded as being not significant.</p> <p>Minimising GHG emissions through design is a core principle of National Highway's standards. This includes delivering measures such as material recovery and using recycled materials; reducing construction traffic; and using renewable energy – and these measures are set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) for the Project. The Project will continue to measure, monitor and reduce GHG emissions throughout construction and operation. The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan supports the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan which provides a system level strategy for decarbonisation. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to be net zero in construction..</p> <p>The assessment also considers how resilient the road will be to future changes to the climate. The design has considered the climatic changes that are predicted ensuring that the road is resilient to more extreme weather events. For example, the drainage design includes allowances for increased future rainfall. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p>	
878	153966			Environment – general (non PEI Report) – General - Design	Respondent expressing concern, in regards a selection of a route which is largely offline and the possible environmental impact the scheme could have in the area.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process.</p> <p>This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>The blue route was taken forward into the final preliminary design. A range of factors informed the decision, including preliminary flood modelling which demonstrated that a crossing of Trout Beck at this location could be designed without impact on the SAC; the significant impact on the Scheduled Monument to the south of Kirkby Thore arising from any online or southern route; economic factors and buildability.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Route Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4), which provides an assessment of the effects of the Project on the environment and identifies how adverse effects will be mitigated.</p> <p>Throughout the Project design process, National Highways has sought to avoid and reduce the environmental impacts of the design whilst taking into account feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
944	151349, 153343			General – Design and Noise	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should be designed to minimise environmental impact, specifically mentioning that noise mitigation measures such as permanent spoil verges and quieter road surfaces should be included.	A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the Project and reported in the Environmental Statement within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Mitigation measures have been designed into the Project to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the alignment and cuttings (such as permeant soil verges where appropriate), low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.	No
995			153321	Noise	One respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would provide environmental benefits, in particular through reduced noise levels for local residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the Project.	No
628	153359, 153560, 153817, 153818, 153821, 154253,		151468, 153306,	Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular querying how baseline noise levels have been ascertained as their residential property is not in proximity to noise monitoring locations. Respondents also expressing concern that the proposed mitigation measures would be ineffective, and that further noise barriers should be provided .	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out including the noise survey methodology, identifying each monitoring location and the duration of the survey period. Details of the environmental noise survey	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					<p>Other respondents state that factors such as road elevation and increased speed limits would exacerbate noise pollution.</p>	<p>carried out at representative locations are presented in section 12.7 Baseline Conditions and in Appendix 12.1 Baseline Noise Survey results (Document Application 3.4). Location of the environmental noise survey is presented in Figure 12.1 Operational Noise Study Area (Document Application 3.3). The baseline noise levels have been predicted in line with CRTN and DMRB LA111 using the traffic model for 2019 which include parameters such as traffic flows, speed and percentage of heavy good vehicles. Details of the traffic model are presented in the Transport Assessment (Application Number 3.7) and Appendix 2.1 Traffic Modelling Data (Application Number 3.4).</p> <p>Modelling which considers the speed of traffic and road elevation is used to inform the noise impact assessment, which is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). These factors are therefore fully taken into account in the assessment.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.</p> <p>National Highways has also produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the EMP are secured through a Requirement in the draft DCO. Where a likely significant effect has been identified as a result of the operation of the Project, an assessment of the viability of providing a noise barrier in the form of a fence or earthwork/earth bund has been carried out where appropriate. Details of the barriers relevant to the Temple Sowerby to Appleby are presented in table 12.20 of the ES Noise and vibration chapter (under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures).</p> <p>As noted in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), monitoring post opening will be carried out to ensure embedded mitigation measures are included (or an equivalent performance is achieved with an</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						alternative design), and any noise mitigation measures are verified to ensure they meet the design specifications. This would be completed as part of national Highways Project Evaluation procedure.	
1013	153044			General – Design	One respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that the proposed B6542 junctions would provide environmental benefits by reducing traffic flow through Appleby.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the Project.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Crackenthorpe’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
57	149795, 151472, 152243, 153377, 153799, 153835, 153839		153381	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve access to walking, cycling and horse-riding routes, in particular mentioning rerouting public rights of way, use of the old A66 road and cycle access to Appleby.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
229	148550, 148564, 148565, 148569, 148572, 148578, 148583, 148588, 148591, 148600, 148603, 148604, 148612, 148615, 148621, 148626, 148630, 148637, 149351, 149370, 149394, 150460,		150187, 151468, 153306, 154192	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing support for the scheme without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152243, 153037, 153335, 153859, 153907, 153909, 154218						
639	152939, 153851, 154198, 154250		153306, 153321, 153381	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve connectivity for local residents and businesses. Respondents mention access at Crackenthorpe, sand Appleby and that the scheme would reconnect parts of Kirkby Thore.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
641	154250		150461, 153321	Community Impact - People	Respondents expressing support for the scheme as it would benefit local residents, specifically mentioning improved connectivity in Kirkby Thore and that proposed route is not near Crackenthorpe.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
644	148568, 150462, 151331, 151458, 153043, 153377, 154264, 154341, 162144		150461, 151350, 152236, 153321	Engineering design and development - scheme design	Respondents expressing support for the proposed scheme design, including support for the Blue Route, support for the new bridge near Powis Cottages and for the proposed junction design near Appleby.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. Please see row 15 for further details of changes made since consultation.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
657			153959	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Commuting	A respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve traffic for commuters.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
926			153306	Land - Land take	A respondent supports the land take planned for the Blue Route, as it offers the least obstruction for HGVs to their local business.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
942	149795, 153335		148599, 149355	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve road safety, in particular around Kirkby Thore, Crackenthorpe and local villages, and by allowing walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to use the old A66.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
994	149352, 149417, 150460, 152224, 152923, 153044, 153377		148586	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce traffic congestion. Respondents specifically mention the B6542 junction and junctions and road near to the Appleby bypass.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
1014	153043			Construction	A respondent expressing general support for the construction of the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
1078	148566, 148585		150461	Get on with it / overdue	Respondents expressing support for the scheme and urging the Applicant	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					to complete the project as soon as possible.		
56	149374, 153365, 153833, 153839			Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the scheme in general terms without providing further details.	<p>Thank you for your feedback regarding the scheme.</p> <p>The proposal to upgrade the A66 is a Project at the heart of National Highways plans to build back better and level up the North of England by improving transport infrastructure and boosting connections across the region. It is the best way to meet the future transport needs of those living, working, and travelling along the corridor in the 21st century. Dualling the remaining sections of the A66 will provide motor users with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end-to-end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity, and will not be at the expense of non-motorised users.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.	
15	148616, 150189, 151469, 153377, 153815, 153821, 153835, 153851, 153956, 154253, 154341	Cracken-thorpe Parish Meeting	150196, 154222, 154229, 154491	Engineering design and development - Modified design	Respondents suggesting modifications to the engineering design, including lay-bys on right-hand curves to improve visibility; noise mitigation measures; reduction of verges on old route to prevent illegal parking; additional slip roads and moving the junction closer to where the roads meet near Kirkby Thore.	<p>Whilst National Highways welcomes input and design change recommendations from stakeholders, it is not always possible to realise all recommendations due to limitations with construction practices, feasibility, services, safety or land acquisition. We have set out below the design changes that have taken place since the commencement of the public engagement events.</p> <p>Since the public consultation event in the Autumn of 2021 the design has been amended to include an all-movement junction onto both east and westbound carriageways of the proposed A66 dual carriageway from the road known as Long Marton.</p> <p>Because of the Roman Camp Scheduled Monument (between Redlands Bank Farm and Powis Cottages) the dual carriageway will need to be built at existing ground levels where it crosses the existing</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Long Marton (road), and this means that the existing Long Marton (road) cannot cross over and have a junction onto the dual carriageway. To achieve a junction on Long Marton (road) the existing road has been realigned through the fields so that it can go underneath the dual carriageway. The realigned Long Marton (road) will be a much more efficient length of road than the existing, it will have a shared cycleway/footway and it will be closer to the road into Bolton - improving movements between Bolton and Long Marton. The existing bridleway between Long Marton (road) and the railway will cross over the new Long Marton Road via a bridge that will be designed for farm traffic as well as non-motorised users.</p> <p>As part of the decision to include the junction for Long Marton and Bolton, it has been decided to remove the proposed east-bound slip road at Appleby from the design.</p> <p>On the westbound carriageway it was proposed to maintain the 'on' movement currently provided by the B6542. Due to challenges with the existing terrain, and issues with user safety, the Project team have been unable to find a satisfactory way to do this. Users will need to travel along the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>existing A66 to the Long Marton Junction which will be an all-movement junction. The existing A66 will remain a national speed limit road (unless Cumbria County Council wish to change the speed limit) so travel time to the Long Marton junction should be similar to travel time on the dual carriageway.</p> <p>Both of these junction alterations were proposed for the west side of Appleby, the junctions on the east side will not be affected by this Project.</p> <p>Currently there are no proposals for changes to junctions at Appleby.</p> <p>Where new bridges are proposed walkers, cyclists and horse riders (WCH) will be separated from motorised traffic using shared use footways/cycleways except where the bridges are primarily for farm traffic (on farmland). Underpasses are primarily for farm traffic and WCH users will share a surface with the farm traffic.</p> <p>Where the dual carriageway passes around Kirkby Thore the carriageways will be below the existing field levels by up to 10m to reduce the impact of the road on the view of the Pennines and to reduce the noise level. The noise level will be further reduced by installing a noise barrier (fence) along the edges of the fields (above the road</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>level). In places the fence will be hidden by trees that will be planted as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Camping on Highway verges is a concern that will need to be managed where possible. The verges have a number of functions, the main function to provide forward visibility around corners and this means that the verges cannot be narrowed or populated with trees or other camping deterrents. Tried measures such as bollards and fencing have been unsuccessful in the past, but proposals can be discussed with the adopting authority (Cumbria County Council) at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The proposed A66 dual carriageway will have laybys sited at intervals recommended by the design standards. These laybys are necessary because there will not be a hard shoulder and motorists will need places to pull over in an emergency. Between Temple Sowerby and Appleby, the dual carriageway has only one length of straight (around the Crackenthorpe area), which means that the laybys can either be sited where the road curves or they will have to be omitted from the design. Siting a layby on a curve has safety concerns due to visibility, but the risks</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						associated with a layby being on a curve are less than the risks associated of not having them at all. When siting a layby on a curve there are different risks associated depending on whether it bends to the left or the right as the driver is travelling along it). It is safer to site the laybys on left hand curves, so all the reference design includes laybys between Crackenthorpe and Temple Sowerby (there are four in total) that have been sited on left hand curves. Visibility to the laybys and from the laybys (when exiting) will be satisfactory, and the laybys will not interfere with the visibility along the dual carriageway. The precise location of the laybys will be determined during the detailed design process.	
36	153333, 153815, 154177, 154249, 154253		151468, 151510	Request for further information	<p>Respondents suggesting that additional information about the scheme is required, specifically mentioning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • junction design • slip road design • compound locations • cycle paths • noise maps • mitigation measures • land take decisions 	More information on junction and slip road design, compound locations and cycle paths are located in the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) and for cycle paths also in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19) The detail of the mitigation proposed by the Project team to manage issues such as noise as well as to provide for lost habitats are contained in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>We have sought to minimise land take where possible. The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses and have worked with landowners to accommodate their wishes where possible. Negotiations with landowners (and land interests) are set out in the Schedule of Negotiations (Application Document:5.10). Our Public Liaison Officers have undertaken discussions with landowners since August 2020 on the Project. The land subject to the Application is the essential land required to build the improved A66 and associated infrastructure and to include mitigation land.</p>	
58	151462, 153839			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	<p>Respondents suggesting ideas for active travel provision as part of the scheme. Respondents suggest that a segregated active travel route should be created, with crossing points, alongside the route. Others state that active travel should be encouraged without providing further details.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualled road, it will be reconnected via a safe, grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade-separated junction, an accommodation underpass or</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed along the de-trunked old A66 for Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Crackenthorpe. National Highways encourage active travel and have an initiative supporting it, though as the provider and maintainer of the strategic road network it is not really within the scope of its role.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
253	149371, 153818	Cumbria County Council	153306, 154222, 154231	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents suggesting improving vehicular access on this section of the Project. They suggest that additional access junctions should be included in Long Marton and to the west of Appleby bypass.</p> <p>Others suggest that access should be provided for private and agricultural vehicles to reach land holdings and commercial properties.</p> <p>Other respondents state that the underpass should be redesigned to improve access for agricultural machinery.</p>	<p>Following the removal of the alteration to the existing eastbound junction and the relocation of the existing westbound junction (both at Appleby) the all-movement junction at Long Marton has been reinstated. This is the best solution for the Project. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) that contains the options assessed and the development of the Project.</p> <p>It has not always been possible to accommodate an underpass with enough clearance to allow tall vehicles to pass through. Where possible (for example at Roger Head Farm, and Crossfell House Farm) a bridge has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>been proposed instead of an underpass, allowing much taller vehicles to cross. Because of the cost and the engineering difficulty in providing a passage across the proposed dual carriageway (underpass or bridge) passages have been rationalised to combine routes for different landowners and users. This means that they will not always be sited in an ideal location for each landowner or user.</p> <p>Following receipt of additional survey data and comments from the autumn consultation, works to the existing eastbound junction at Appleby (to provide access onto the A66) have been discontinued. This was discussed and agreed between specialists from National Highways and Cumbria County Council. The proposed alteration to the eastbound junction would have added an 'on' movement to the existing 'off' movement. This proposal has been discontinued due to the difficulties with the site, these difficulties included safety concerns and impacts on the Fair Hill field, and the design of the existing junction presenting challenges with the alterations.</p> <p>On the westbound carriageway it was proposed to maintain the 'on'</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						movement currently provided by the B6542. Due to challenges with the existing terrain, and issues with user safety, the Project team have been unable to find a satisfactory way to do this. Users will therefore travel along the existing A66 to the Long Marton junction which will be an all-movement junction. The existing A66 will remain a national speed limit road (unless Cumbria County Council wish to change the speed limit) so travel time to the Long Marton junction should be similar to travel time on the dual carriageway.	
549	149369, 149407, 151469, 151472, 151484, 151486, 151491, 152211, 152238, 152906, 152931, 152979, 153377, 153817, 153860, 153861	Cracken-thorpe Parish Meeting Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152249	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should provide safe, dedicated routes and road and roundabout crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents mention routes near Center Parcs, Temple Sowerby, Appleby, Sandford, Crackenthorpe and Kirkby Thore.	All new and re-routed Public Rights of Way (PRoW) that need to cross the A66 will do so via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade-separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. For roundabouts, such as at Kemplay Bank, we have also ensured that crossing points are integrated into the design. Full crossing point detail will be added during the next phase of design development and will be subject to the road safety audit process.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been between Penrith and Temple Sowerby (inc. Center Parcs).</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the whole Temple Sowerby to Appleby (Crackenthorpe) section along the de-trunked old A66.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed between Appleby and Brough.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
630	149353, 153851, 153919, 153926, 153947, 153956, 153966		150187, 153917, 154491	Engineering design and development - Alternative route	<p>Respondents suggesting that the scheme should use an alternative route. Respondents suggest that the scheme should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow the existing road. Be moved south of Long Marton. Include a Kirkby Stephen bypass. Be moved closer to Powis road. Or follow the route of the old Kirkby Thore railway. 	<p>National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Other respondents suggesting that the orange scheme should be chosen, or that an online route should be used.</p>	<p>Preferred Route Announcement in May 2020.</p> <p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the Project during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in 2020.</p> <p>We carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance. Our three imperatives of safety, customer service and delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route. The Orange Route was discounted based on a number of issues including the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore and the impact on a number of landowners including the acquisition and demolition of some or all of the farm</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>buildings at Bridge End Farm. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the heritage asset could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information and the Project Development Objective Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have been reviewing feedback, working further on developing the design and completing surveys. This is to help us gain a better understanding of areas including environment, ecology, heritage, and drainage.</p> <p>We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design can be revised to improve aspects such as community connectivity, environmental and land impacts. Further information on these refinements can be found in the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project Development Objective Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>On the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section, we have made changes to three key junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The junction which was shown on Main Street in Kirkby Thore is now being moved west to the British Gypsum access road. This new junction arrangement provides a more suitable route for HGVs between businesses to the north and the A66, which was a concern raised in consultation feedback by locals. The previously proposed junction severed a number of farm access tracks including Metcalf Bridge, which have now been realigned accordingly to tie-in with the new junction proposals. - The Long Marton Junction has been reintroduced and will provide full access on and off the A66. The design of this new junction has also allowed us to change the alignment of the new A66 slightly in this area which will move it further away from the line of the Roman road. The Environmental Statement - Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. The reintroduction of this junction has been 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>as a result of feedback at autumn consultation.</p> <p>- The left in, left out junction on the A66 Westbound carriageway near Crackenthorpe has been removed together with the eastbound access on slip onto the A66 meaning that there is no longer an impact on the Appleby Fair field at this location. Following receipt of additional survey data and comments from the autumn consultation works to the existing eastbound junction at Appleby (to provide access onto the A66) have been discontinued. This was discussed and agreed between specialists from National Highways and Cumbria County Council. The proposed alteration to the eastbound junction would have added an 'on' movement to the existing 'off' movement. This proposal has been discontinued due to the difficulties with the site, these difficulties included safety concerns and the inability to alter the Fair Hill field, and the design of the existing junction presenting challenges with the alterations.</p> <p>On the westbound carriageway it was proposed to maintain the 'on' movement currently provided by the B6542. Due to challenges with the existing terrain, and issues with user</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>safety, the Project team have been unable to find a satisfactory way to do this. Users will travel along the existing A66 to the Long Marton Junction which will be an all-movement junction. The existing A66 will remain a national speed limit road (unless Cumbria County Council wish to change the speed limit) so travel time to the Long Marton junction should be similar to travel time on the dual carriageway.</p> <p>Further information on the development of the scheme is available in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
672	154177		153306	Land - Land take	<p>Respondents suggesting changes to the proposed land take of the scheme, including that National Highways should provide compensation for any land taken; that there should be no additional land take requirements outside of the scheme proposals; and that access to commercial property affected by the land take should be guaranteed.</p>	<p>The project requires land outside that required for the construction of the road. The land identified for environmental mitigation will mitigate effects and, as such, it is essential to the delivery of the Project. National Highways is committed to working with landowners to avoid the need to exercise compulsory acquisition powers if appropriate agreements can be entered into.</p> <p>In relation to the rights National Highways requires, the purposes for which rights are required are set out in a schedule to the draft DCO. Generally, rights are required for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>access and in relation to the surface water drainage system. Additionally, National Highways has identified certain areas of land that it requires only for the purposes of construction of the Project. The purposes for which such land can be temporarily possessed are also set out in a schedule to the draft DCO.</p> <p>Access to businesses will be maintained.</p>	
675	154253		152249	Community impact - Local people	<p>Respondents suggesting measures to reduce impact of the Project on the local community, specifically mentioning that employment opportunities linked to the Project should be advertised locally, and compensation should be made available.</p>	<p>A range of jobs will be generated during the construction programme. This will include unskilled and skilled construction jobs as well as engineering, planning and management professionals. The number of construction workers predicted to be engaged in the construction of the Project is set out in the Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 2 The Project. The Principal Contractor will be required to seek opportunities to maximise the benefits of the local supply chain and support local businesses during construction.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) includes a commitment to develop a Skills and Employment Strategy, which will be the responsibility of the Principal Contractor. An essay plan of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the strategy is included at Appendix B which covers the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open procurement and supporting local businesses through the Project supply chain where practicable. • Inspiring the next generation. • Providing opportunities for unemployed and under-represented groups. • Developing local training infrastructure. • Developing a workforce with the right skills. <p>An assessment of the effect of the local community is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
676	153818		154457	Construction - Mitigate construction	Respondents suggesting measures to mitigate the impacts of the construction phase of the Project, specifically mentioning that construction lighting should be dimmed at night, and that the construction compound should be moved to allow businesses to continue operating.	It is expected that most schemes will have a site compound established, with some likely to be larger than others. It is proposed to establish three main compounds across the Project which are to be situated within the extents of M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank, Temple Sowerby to Appleby and Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and these are expected to help service the other satellite compounds. The compound sizes will be relative to the available land, connectivity with the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66 and interface with utilities to minimise the environmental impacts of the works. Figure 2.3 Indicative Construction Areas (Application Document 3.3) show the indicative construction compounds, haul roads and working areas that have formed the basis of the environmental assessment within Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4.</p> <p>Compound locations and sizing will be further defined during detailed design. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the visual impact of construction compounds. During construction there would be lighting associated with construction compounds and construction activities which could potentially contribute to or constitute temporary localised significant effects. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) provides a commitment that a Site Establishment Plan (SEP) is developed in detail in substantial accordance with the essay plan included at Annex B14 of the EMP. The SEP provides details of lighting requirements which must be followed in the establishment of construction compounds. This includes that lighting will be provided for security and safety during hours of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>darkness with care taken to avoid spillage of lighting towards adjacent properties or wildlife sites by facing lighting units into the compound and using cut off or low-level lighting where practicable.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan, as required by the Environmental Management Plan (EMP - compliance with which is secured in the DCO). Annex B13 of the EMP sets out an outline essay plan of the contents of the Construction Traffic Management Plan that will be implemented. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include requirements for temporary alternative access to residential areas, community facilities and businesses and details of proposed traffic management measures, including phasing plans, route restrictions and speed limits.</p>	
759	149374, 152931, 153833 153365, 153797, 153871			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents suggesting that sustainable transport should be part of the Project. These respondents state that the capital invested in the Project should be used to provide sustainable and public transport schemes.	National Highways acknowledges the views suggesting that sustainable transport should be part of the Project. However, this is a national issue which rests with Central Government Policy. Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network, leading to worsening problems on the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>We have developed a WCH design strategy to integrate WCH proposals into the Project and encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. The project objectives (set out below) have informed the highway design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A low-speed, low-traffic route parallel to the A66 for pedestrians and cyclists should be created where possible, in order to replace and connect existing routes affected by the A66 improvements. This could mean utilising the de-trunked sections of single carriageway, where they remain open to traffic; 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All facilities for WCH users should be a betterment, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement project; Re-establish any WCH routes severed by the proposed works; and Where public rights of way (PRoWs) converge at the upgraded A66 carriageway, then a grade-separated crossing facility is required to cross. Designers should divert PRoWs to the nearest grade separated crossing. Additional distance of the alternative route should always be minimised. <p>We have engaged with bus operators to understand the frequency of use of existing bus stops on or close to the A66 (as set out in Section 10.5 of the Transport Assessment, Application Document: 3.7) and we understand that bus stops in the vicinity are very lightly used. We continue to discuss with Cumbria County Council the need for re-provision of the Whinfell Park bus stop.</p>	
1029	148549, 148580, 148589, 148618,			Engineering design and development -	Respondents suggesting design changes to the Project, including the provision of basic rest facilities and overnight parking for motorhomes and	A new service area for HGV's or motorhomes with electric and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152919, 152923			Motorhome / rest facilities	HGVs. Respondents suggest that an Aire style motorhome site could be included as part of the design.	<p>hydrogen re-charging points is not within the scope of the Project.</p> <p>All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries.</p> <p>Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p> <p>We are exploring opportunities to incorporate EV charging in the community.</p>	
1031	152202, 152914	Cracken-thorpe Parish Meeting	152249	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents suggesting that the Project should provide additional facilities such as: roadside services, HGV rest areas, and litter facilities.	<p>A new service area for HGVs, motorhomes or car users with electric and hydrogen re-charging points is not within the scope of the Project. All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards. New laybys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards. Details of the locations of laybys can be found in the works plans.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1048	148549	Cracken-thorpe Parish Meeting	152249	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting that the Project should include changes to traffic signs, reduced speed limits and installation of speed and CCTV cameras to improve safety and combat crime, without giving specific locations.	<p>National Highways appreciates this feedback. Laybys will be replaced where they are removed as part of the Project in accordance with national standards. There are no plans to include specific parking areas as part of the Project. Signing strategies are being developed as the Project progresses.</p> <p>National Speed Limits would apply on sections of both the new and old A66, it should be noted that traffic levels on the old A66 will decrease significantly. The Project would have a speed limit of 70 miles per hour (mph), with the exception of a section of the A66 from the M6 junction 40 through Kemplay Bank which will have a speed limit of 50mph.</p> <p>Technology provisions are being developed but given the rural nature of the Project the intention is to keep these to a minimum. The provision of security cameras falls outside the remit of National Highways.</p>	No
1052	151349			Community impact - Listen to locals	One respondent suggesting that the scheme should consider the views of local residents and businesses, specifically mentioning those in Crackenthorpe.	Engagement has been ongoing through the relevant Community Liaison Group and with relevant stakeholders such as Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, local parish councils and community representatives.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways have continued to engage with stakeholders, Community Liaison Groups, landowners and persons with an interest in the land (PILs) to keep them updated on the progress of the Project and discuss any technical matters relevant to the preparation of the Project. National Highways do not view engagement and consultation as a single point in time and this has been reflected in our ongoing approach to engaging at a local, regional and national level as set out in the Consultation Report (Application document 4.4).</p> <p>National Highways listened to local communities through the consultation process that was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the host local authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the Project proposals was shared and feedback received via online, at public events, and local deposit locations. National Highways' Project team members were on hand at to talk through matters relating the proposals.</p> <p>The material published for the autumn 2021 consultation was based on the information available at that time and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the Project proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the Project up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to continued engagement with stakeholders and the local community as the Project progresses through Examination, and if development consent is granted, into the detailed design and construction stage of the Project All feedback from the consultation has been thoroughly reviewed and National Highways have taken it into consideration and used it to help improve the final design. Chapter 6 (Section 6.6) of this consultation report sets out how we have had regard to the feedback from the consultation and records the changes made from as a result of the feedback received.</p> <p>Following the 2021 autumn consultation, design changes were made to the Project. These considered</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						feedback from the consultation, ongoing engagement with stakeholders and landowners, as well as results from emerging environmental survey data and technical assessment work. Some of these changes resulted in further smaller supplementary consultations, set out in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).	
16	153359, 153818, 153850, 153926, 154177		150461, 151468, 153306	Land - Agricultural	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impacts of the Project on agricultural land.</p> <p>Respondents state that the proposed land take would result in the loss of productive agricultural land.</p> <p>Other respondents expressing concern that the land take would sever existing land holdings which could halt farming operations.</p> <p>Respondents also expressing concern that the land used for construction compounds could be left unproductive after completion.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land.</p> <p>Where possible, National Highways has sought to reduce required land take and use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.</p> <p>Agricultural land holding surveys have been carried out in the form of meetings with the landowners and/or submission of questionnaire responses. The surveys have been used to assess the impact of the Project on future viability of the holdings. We have also undertaken Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) surveys to understand the quality of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the land along the areas required for construction of the Project.</p> <p>Where farms are severed, we will provide accommodation works such as bridges or underpasses to allow operations to continue.</p> <p>Land required only temporarily for construction compounds would be used temporarily before being returned to its original use after the works.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement with the landowners will be required with a view to restoring the land to the reasonable satisfaction of the owner. The Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) defines that a Soil Management Plan is required to be produced by the Principal Contractor prior to construction phase covering the handling, storage and reinstatement procedures to be followed to manage the disturbance to all soil resources, both permanent and temporary during the construction of the Project.</p>	
180	148563, 150174, 152959, 153815, 153947, 154250	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150187, 153306, 154229, 154231	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact traffic connectivity to the A66 for local residents from Penrith, Powis, and Long Marton. Respondents expressing concern that the proposed junctions and diversions would increase journey	Through the positioning of the new junction locations, connectivity to the A66 for local residents from Penrith, Powis, and Long Marton will be improved. It is highly unlikely that the proposed junctions and the proposed line of the A66 will encourage	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					times and encourage road users to use unsuitable local roads. Other respondents expressing concern that the height of the proposed underpass would restrict access for agricultural vehicles.	<p>movement on unsuitable local roads: the existing A66 will remain in operation which will pick up any vehicles not wishing to use the proposed new A66.</p> <p>Further information on route development can be found in the Route Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>Underpasses have been designed with consideration for the type and size of the agricultural vehicles required to use them. Discussions with landowners have taken place and will continue through the detailed design phase.</p>	
553	148619, 151461, 151472, 151484, 152969, 152981, 153835, 153860	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150196	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would not provide adequate access to routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.</p> <p>In particular, respondents expressing concern that active travel routes around Appleby and the bridleway between the Roman Road and Crackenthorpe could be severed.</p> <p>Other respondents expressing concern that the proposals lack adequate active travel provision, and that the proposed diversions would increase journey times.</p>	<p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 consultation process, enhanced east-west walking & cycling connectivity has now been provided on the majority of schemes which will make the route a lot more attractive and accessible from an active travel perspective. These facilities are typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway, or in the verge along the de-trunked A66.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4). At Crackenthorpe, Footpaths 317006, 317012, and 317004 would all be severed by the proposed alignment of the A66. Two underpasses are proposed to redirect the footways and reconnect them with the existing Bridleway 341001 which runs along the line of the old Roman Road, parallel to the proposed dualling alignment. This Bridleway would not be affected by the proposed dualling. The diversions for the footpaths are minimal, with no additional diversion length for Footpath 317012, around 40m for Footpath 317006, and around 200m for Footpath 317004.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Crackenthorpe extents along the de-trunked old A66 with an extension beyond the scheme limits to connect Appleby.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via the nearest safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Lengths of proposed diversions have been kept to a minimum so as not to discourage the use of realigned routes that cross the A66. Where diversions to the nearest proposed crossing feature were deemed excessive, additional standalone crossing facilities such as pedestrian overbridges/ underpasses have been included.</p>	
629	153359, 153947, 153965, 153966, 154253, 154341			Community Impact – People – Alternatives	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the negative impact of the scheme on the community. Concerns include: the potential damage to the Roman Road, potential noise and visual impacts, the removal of the proposed Long Marton junction and bridge, which respondents state reduces local connectivity; and a concern that the Blue Route would cause greater disruption than the Orange Route, as it would divert from the current A66 corridor.</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in May 2020. National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative routes for Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This compared engineering, environmental, traffic, economic and stakeholders as well as policy compliance.</p> <p>The three imperatives of safety, customer service and delivery were crucial to assessing these options. An initial sift between the Blue and Red Route was carried out to determine a preferred northern bypass to then compare against the online Orange</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Route. The Blue Route was taken forward as the northern bypass alternative to be compared with the online Orange Route.</p> <p>The Orange Route was discounted primarily due to the unavoidable impact on the Roman Fort and Vicus Scheduled Ancient Monument south of Kirkby Thore. It was considered that, as there were viable alternative routes, the substantial harm caused to the site could not be justified and would conflict with national planning policy. Whilst the Blue and the Orange Routes both pass through the Roman Camp at Long Marton, the Orange Route impacted the Roman Fort and Vicus, the Blue Route does not. This was our primary consideration in promoting the Blue Route. Please refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>A full environmental assessment has been carried out for the Project and this includes consideration of noise and vibration impacts within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and landscape and visual impacts within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have been reviewing feedback, working further on developing the design and completing surveys. This is to help us gain a better understanding of areas including environment, ecology, heritage, and drainage.</p> <p>We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design can be revised to improve aspects such as community connectivity, environmental and land impacts.</p> <p>On the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section, we are looking to make changes to three key junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The junction which was shown on Main Street in Kirkby Thore is now being moved west to the British Gypsum access road. This will help to address concerns raised with respect to the narrow section of Main Street in the north of the village and its suitability to handle increased traffic. The relocation also avoids impacts on the industrial estate and in particular a caravan storage yard which would have had to relocate. - The Long Marton Junction has been reintroduced and will provide full access on and off the A66. The design 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of this new junction has also allowed us to change the alignment of the new A66 slightly in this area which will move it further away from the line of the Roman road. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.</p> <p>- The left in left out junction on the A66 Westbound carriageway near Crackenthorpe has been removed together with the eastbound access on slip onto the A66 meaning that there is no longer an impact on the Appleby Fair field at this location.</p>	
637	152911, 152959, 153809, 153956	Eden District Council	150187, 150196, 151468, 153376, 154231	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase traffic and congestion, specifically mentioning congestion in Kirkby Stephen, Kirkby Thore, Long Marton road, the B6262, and on other unspecified local roads. Other respondents expressing concern that Appleby could experience congestion due to unsuitable road infrastructure. Respondents also expressing concern that HGV and horse-drawn traffic could create congestion.</p>	<p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have reviewed feedback, worked further on developing the design and completing surveys. This has helped us gain a better understanding of the Project. We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design has been revised to improve aspects such as community connectivity, environmental and land impacts.</p> <p>On the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section, we have looked at changes to three key junctions this includes the provision of an all-movement junction at Long Marton which will allow full</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>access onto and off the new A66. The design of this new junction has also allowed us to change the alignment of the new A66 slightly in this area which will move it further away from the line of the Roman road.</p> <p>Additionally, the provision of this junction has also allowed us to remove the proposed junctions at the east end of the scheme to the west of Appleby and the eastbound exit close to Appleby Fair field will remain as existing. Eastbound traffic will still be able to exit the A66 and access Appleby. The existing west bound slip road out of Appleby will be made into a two-way road so traffic will be able to use the old A66 to both access Appleby from the west and access local villages to the east.</p> <p>The introduction of the new junction at Long Marton and the revision of the location of the Kirkby Thore junction will allow HGVs to access facilities in Long Marton and the British Gypsum plant directly from the new A66. HGVs will no longer have to travel through the village of Kirkby Thore.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to the horse-drawn traffic causing congestion, we are working closely with the travelling community and other stakeholders</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						including Cumbria County Council with regard to provision of access for horse-drawn vehicles. It is anticipated that these vehicles will be able to use sections of the old A66 when they are de-trunked which will cater for local traffic and have lower usage as passing traffic will use the new dualled sections of the A66.	
645	152911, 153377, 154264			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents express particular concern about routes around Appleby, and for the safety of horse-drawn traffic.	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Crackenthorpe extents along the de-trunked old A66, where it will remain. WCH surveys have informed design decisions on WCH provision. Traffic management will continue to be applied on the A66 during the Appleby Horse Fair, to manage horse-drawn traffic.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A Road Safety Audit has been carried out that identifies recommendations and the design team has carefully considered the recommendations and accepted where appropriate the items raised in the audit. Refer to the Transport Assessment Chapter 9 Road Safety (Application Document 3.7) for further information.	
662	153365, 153809	Cumbria County Council	153948	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about traffic safety on the grounds that the scheme Project could lead to a higher number of accidents due to higher speeds and increased HGV use.	<p>It should be noted that the proposed left in left out junction on the new A66 close to Crackenthorpe has now been removed due to the reintroduction of an all-movement junction at Long Marton.</p> <p>With regard to safety of the Project evidence shows that a dual carriageway is safer. The number of collisions is shown to be less, and the severity of the accidents is also found to be less when compared with a single carriageway route. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) contains the number of accidents saved over the 60-year period by introducing the A66 Project improvements. Over the 60-year appraisal period there is an overall reduction of 6,975 accidents of which 4% involve personal injury and 96% are damage only.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Additionally, the increased number of lanes on a dual carriageway together with the ability to turn traffic around at the grade separated junctions make the management of traffic easier in the event of an incident.	
674	150174, 153036, 153815, 154249, 154253		151468	Engineering design and development - General	<p>Respondents expressing general concerns about various aspects of the engineering design of the scheme.</p> <p>Losses of junctions to the main A66 at Long Marton Road and Powis Road.</p> <p>The proposal to align the new road with the existing Roman road.</p>	<p>Since the Autumn 2021 consultation, we have been reviewing feedback, working further on developing the design and completing surveys. This is to help us gain a better understanding of areas including environment, ecology, heritage, and drainage.</p> <p>We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design can be revised to improve aspects such as community connectivity, environmental and land impacts.</p> <p>On the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section, we have made changes to three key junctions:</p> <p>The junction which was shown on Main Street in Kirkby Thore has now been moved west to the British Gypsum Access.</p> <p>The Long Marton Junction has been reintroduced and will provide full access on and off the A66. The design of this new junction has also allowed us to change the alignment of the new</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66 slightly in this area which will move it further away from the line of the Roman road. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.</p> <p>The left in left out junction on the A66 Westbound carriageway near Crackenthorpe has been removed together with the eastbound access on slip onto the A66 meaning that there is no longer an impact on the Appleby Fair field at this location.</p>	
862	153818			Economics - Local economy	<p>A respondent expressing concern about the impacts on agricultural businesses from private land being repurposed as ecological conservation areas.</p>	<p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, further completed surveys have been used to inform the ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Application Document 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment. The outcome from the completed assessment is a reduction in area of the mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) sets out the methodology used to identify the mitigation required, based on the impacts on the Project and where it has been provided. The proposals are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						set out on the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Where land is required for mitigation planting, this has been discussed with the affected landowners and the effects on their landholdings have been assessed. More information is set out in the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2),	
864	153343, 153818, 153923		150196, 153306	Community Impact - Property	Respondents expressing concern that the Project would have a negative impact on property values and quality of life for residents living near to new and upgraded roads. Concerns include impacts to safety and saleability for a property by new slip road; concern with increased noise and views of traffic at Castlerigg House; concerns about mineral and manorial rights at Lonsdale Settled Estates, including concerns that future mineral reserves will be affected.	Regarding safety concerns, National Highways are committed to maintaining an ongoing conversation about construction with local people, businesses, and organisations. Any new roads are designed and constructed in accordance with the standards contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Our designs are also subject to Road Safety Audits which are carried out throughout the Project's development. The audits are carried out by independent specialist road safety auditors. We regularly monitor the safety of our network and work throughout the year to ensure our motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards. National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>proposed construction and operation of the Project, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the Project is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the Project in a safe manner. Where a scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>It is not within the scope of the EIA to consider the impact of the Project on property values. However, the EIA does consider the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of a scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The noise assessment (set out in Chapter 12 of the ES; Application Document 3.2) has identified both residential and non-residential receptors that are likely to be subject to significant noise effects during construction and operation.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Where there is potential for significant noise impacts during construction there will be compliance with the control measures detailed in the Environmental Management Plan and a Noise and Vibration Management Plan. During operation an assessment of providing a noise barrier in the form of a fence or earthwork/earth bund has been undertaken where appropriate for any significant noise effects identified.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the Project and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality, and the views are assessed and reported on in Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The impact of the Project on quality of life and wellbeing is assessed and reported on in the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						found in the publications section on the National Highways web site.	
881	153833, 153926, 153966		150461	Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing concern about the cost of the scheme, including comments that the Blue Route will be expensive and that the scheme contains the Project's longest stretch of off-line dual carriageway, which will be costly.	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The cost is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the Project is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	No
925		Northern Gas Networks	153306	Construction - Infrastructure	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on other infrastructure, specifically on construction work near to the	As part of the Project, to upgrade the road network and associated new structures, National Highways recognises that the Project may	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Intermediate Pressure gas main and potential disruption to utility supplies that cross the A66 to Old Station Yard.	<p>require certain utility infrastructure to be diverted, where it has not been possible to incorporate existing services as part of the design. Where this is the case, it will work with the relevant utility companies to seek to minimise disruption, with a view to ensuring any new diversions are in place prior to existing infrastructure being moved/switched off. This will be governed by the protective provisions for the benefit of utility companies contained in the DCO.</p> <p>National Highways will work closely with any affected parties (including in relation to the Intermediate Pressure gas main and utility supplies that cross the A66 to Old Station Yard) to ensure that services are identified and then protected or diverted as appropriate to ensure that no damage occurs and there is no loss of service.</p>	
945	148591, 153809		150461	Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing concern that construction of the scheme would cause disruption for local residents and users of the A66, including concerns that construction traffic could adversely impact safety in local villages and that walking and cycling routes could be impacted, as well as the impact of new speed limits on the A66.	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, noting the point about speed limits, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>management will be important, and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The majority of the new dual carriageway will be built entirely offline with physical traffic management measures only required on the A66 around the tie-in points between existing and new carriageway. This will help to reduce adverse safety impacts on local villages and walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (a requirement of the Environmental Management Plan, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout the majority of the works. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion route.</p> <p>Engagement with affected parties will be ongoing as the Project develops through detailed design.</p> <p>The CTMP requirements includes for diversion routes to be discussed with</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Local Highway Authority in advanced of required closures, notice periods to be given prior to the implementation of certain temporary traffic measures including the occupation or temporary closure of existing roads, which shall follow consultation with the relevant local highway authority. The EMP also specifies in relation to the CTMP that access to site by construction traffic along residential roads will generally be prohibited unless there are clear reasons for their use. Where residential roads are to be utilised, the residents shall be kept informed in advance of the timing of the works. Where there are key concerns raised during construction, the traffic management team on site will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>If a PRoW is severed by the new dualled road scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade-separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						During construction, there may be a requirement to include temporary closures or diversions of PRow. The EMP requires the Principal Contractor (PC) to develop a PRow management plan prior to starting the project. The plan requires the development of measures to be implemented by the PC for each route affected by the Project, including general and specific provisions for closures and diversions, signage and information, forms of managed closure and re-provision details. The plan aims to minimise disruption to WCH provisions through provision of temporary diversions where appropriate, together with signage and ensure that information about temporary closures and diversions is provided through appropriate means, in order to minimise inconvenience caused to WCH users of PRow.	
1025	153036		151468	Construction - General	Respondents expressing general concern over the construction of the scheme, including working hours, storage of equipment and the complexity of construction when aligning with the existing Roman road.	The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>set out within it will be implemented in full.</p> <p>The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project.</p> <p>Within the EMP it is stated that core construction working hours of 07:30 – 18:00 Monday to Friday and 07:30 - 13:00 Saturday will be adhered to by the Principal Contractor except in case of emergency or in respect of 'additional working hours', details of which are provided within the EMP.</p> <p>Where work is required outside of the core working hours, the Principal Contractor(s) will liaise with the relevant Local Authority to agree the procedures for notifying local residents and any site-specific constraints that need to be applied. This process is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Plant and material movements will vary on each scheme due to the volume of earthworks, landscaping, new road construction and number of structures required, and as such it is not possible at this stage to specify where equipment will be stored, however all equipment will be stored</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>safely with minimum disruption caused to road users.</p> <p>For further information about construction compounds, working hours and storage of materials and equipment, please refer to the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>ES Chapter Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. The Roman road running between Scotch Corner and Penrith (Brougham) via Bowes identified by Margary as RR82 (00-0001) (Margary, 1957) and its Post Medieval turnpiked successor (00-0002) is considered within the assessment and following implementation of mitigation, the Roman road and its turnpiked successor are not predicted to be subject to significant effects.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Appleby to Brough – Environment’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
140		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents expressing support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it may mitigate the visual impact on the surrounding AONB landscape.	The positive feedback regarding the scheme is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4). Please refer to ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for details of how National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process.	No
640		Cumbria County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	One respondent expressing support for the consideration of local cultural heritage, including Roman history.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the approach of the Project in considering potential impacts on the historic environment. Further details are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
642	153337	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152980	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing support in relation to the mitigation of landscape and visual impacts of the scheme, including the restoration of upland heath at Coupland and the Applicant's consideration of the AONB.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the approach of the Project in considering potential landscape impacts and visual impacts of the Project on the AONB. Further details are reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
685		Cumbria County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	One respondent expressing support in relation to flooding and drainage mitigation of the scheme, including the Applicant's engagement with partner organisations.	National Highways welcomes the engagement with partner organisations on the scheme to date and will continue this valuable relationship. A detailed assessment of the potential risks to groundwater and surface water, is set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage, and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	No
829	153796		153129, 153568, 153935, 153940	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing support for the central Blue Route presented at statutory consultation on the grounds that it will have lower visual impact and will use a minimal amount of AONB land. Respondents note the lower elevation around Warcop and reduced visual impact when compared with the alternative central Black Route.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Please refer to ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for details of how National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) sets out the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment on the basis of this design.	No
899	153048		153129, 153935	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing support for the Central Blue Route on the grounds that the lower elevation will reduce noise impacts around Warcop.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the project. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						3.2).The Central Blue Route was taken forward and is the design assessed in the ES.	
1036			152980	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	One respondent expressed support for the noise mitigation aspects of the preferred route alignment.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the project. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction and operation activities on the environment, such as noise, as well as other environmental impacts, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	No
1090			149779	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Water / flooding	One respondent expressing support for the preferred route on the grounds that it avoids water courses.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Please refer to ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for details of how National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
62		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats	<p>Respondents suggesting additions or amendments to protect wildlife and habitats including:</p> <p>i) a suggestion to protect Lowgill Beck and its population of otters and fish.</p> <p>ii) realigning the boundary at the western end of the scheme to avoid a SSSI.</p>	<p>We address each of these biodiversity, wildlife and habitat comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. This includes Lowgill Beck and its population of otters and fish. The Project was also designed so to avoid any potential significant adverse effects on all SSSI designations. Where potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design through consultation with key stakeholders. Ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>All new watercourse crossings have been designed to facilitate the free passage of aquatic and riparian species. Where existing culverts are to be replaced, they too are designed to facilitate the free passage of these species.</p> <p>ii) The Order Limits have been further refined since the PEI Report was issued at the Autumn 2021 Consultation to ensure it avoids</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						sensitive habitats/designated features where practicable. ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full baseline, impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the project.	
123		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	One respondent suggesting additional work or engagement relating to road drainage and the water environment, including: i) reviewing local flooding issues around Skirsgill Lane; ii) engaging with Cumbria County Council's Technical Working Group; and iii) undertaking hydraulic modelling.	We address each of the water environment comments in turn below. i) A full EIA has been carried out including a detailed assessment of the potential risks to groundwater and surface water, as set out in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage, and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and its technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed as part of the ES and is contained in the Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document Number 3.4). This assessment includes consideration of Skirsgill Lane. The outline drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project. No adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the scheme. The outline	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>ii) Continued engagement has been carried out with the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and has informed the scope of the assessment.</p> <p>iii) A hydraulic model has been developed and is presented in in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</p>	
143		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	<p>Respondents suggesting methods and further engagement to mitigate the negative impacts on landscape and visual amenity, including:</p> <p>i) identifying mitigation for impacts on the AONB,</p>	<p>We address each of these landscape and visual comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) The landscape and visual impact assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 10 (Application Document 3.2), has used representative viewpoints throughout the scheme, as agreed</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Natural England			<p>ii) consulting the North Pennines AONB Partnership; and</p> <p>iii) reducing the time between assessments of operational impacts.</p>	<p>through the TWGs. Additional viewpoints, including elevated views from the AONB have been reviewed. The assessment concludes the AONB is not affected by the works; there will be some changes to the southern boundary but these are not significant and will be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.</p> <p>ii) The North Pennines AONB Partnership were included as members of the Project landscape TWG and have been involved in specific meetings, along with Natural England regarding the potential impact of the Project on the AONB, in particular at Warcop. In addition, National Highways is in the process of preparing a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the North Pennines AONB Partnership, a draft of which is submitted with the DCO.</p> <p>iii) The operational assessment within the ES follows relevant guidance in regards to the time between operational assessments and also incorporates a description of the interim mitigation due to growth between year 1 and year 15. It should be noted that operational impacts would be mitigated throughout the years as planting matures.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
220		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	A respondent suggests that, once a preferred route alignment is selected, further consideration needs to be given to road drainage, ponds, structures, and culverts, and that these should be included in the ES.	<p>Run-off from the scheme will be captured within the scheme's drainage and treated to the required Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard before being discharged into the receiving water environment. The drainage system is designed to capture and treat the pollutants within the road run-off.</p> <p>ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) set out the drainage strategy and preliminary drainage design that National Highways proposes to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment for the preferred Project route. HEWRAT assessments have been conducted on the preliminary drainage design and are reported in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and its appendices (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>An indicative drainage design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Document</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.	
414	153337, 153578, 153853, 153901, 154012	Cumbria County Council	152151, 153135, 153345, 153940, 154006, 154009	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents suggesting flooding and drainage mitigation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) relocating ponds to reduce impact on agriculture, including a proposed pond on the north side of the new A66 adjacent to underpass and the location and size of the ponds on the south side of the new A66 adjacent to Station Road; ii) field drains that will be disrupted as a consequence of construction iii) introducing a floodplain meadow at Ormside Hall; iv) introducing flood defences and steepening the embankments as flood measures v) Potential for flood and drainage works to impact on a railway line 	<p>National Highways note the consultee's comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement and consultation with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been confirmed and has evolved as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. We address each of these flooding and drainage comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) National Highways acknowledge the consultee's concerns regarding pond sizes and locations. The proposed positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, and watercourse outfall depths. With respect to the location of the pond on the north side of the new A66 adjacent to underpass. The consultee's request has been considered, however, moving the pond to the east is not possible as the land is in closer proximity to the beck and designated to be used for flood</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>compensation which cannot be achieved if moved elsewhere. In addition, by connecting the underpass to the existing farm track north of old A66 the impact on the AONB is reduced.</p> <p>The concerns regarding the location and size of the ponds on the south side of the new A66 adjacent to Station Road have been considered and following on from the Autumn 2021 Consultation, these ponds have been reduced in size.</p> <p>ii) During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage. Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever practicable, should this not be possible alternative solutions will be sought, this is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iii) Updated Environmental Mitigation Plans are presented as part of the illustrative ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (an annex to the EMP) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project has been carefully developed to mitigate potential adverse impacts and to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable within the Order Limits. Where potential opportunities for environmental enhancements fall outside the Order Limits and are not associated with direct potential adverse impacts as a result of the Project (e.g., proposed floodplain meadows at Ormside Hall), these will need to be considered as separate opportunities outside the DCO application.</p> <p>iv) National Highways note the consultee's concerns about flooding and these issues have been considered in the Flood Risk Assessment, Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) which has been discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities as part of the DCO submission. All structures and culverts under the new road will be designed to accommodate future flood events. Flood mitigation has been included as part of outline design and modelled as part of hydraulic study carried out and presented within Appendix 14.2.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and includes measures such as adequate working platform levels based on flood modelling and historic records, temporary flood defences, and an early warning alarm system for flood events.</p> <p>The assessment identifies that during operation the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Further developments to the flood risk mitigation will be developed at detailed design stage.</p> <p>v) National Highways acknowledge the consultee's concerns about works affecting the railway. Project works will not impact the railway as the railway is not within Order Limits.</p>	
415	153054, 153839, 154012			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	Respondents suggesting general environmental mitigation schemes, without providing further information.	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. An example of how mitigation could be implemented is shown on the ES Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The information in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate during the Examination of the Project.	
424	150169, 151472, 151520, 153621, 153862, 154182		153039, 153935, 153940, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154183	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	<p>Respondents making a number of suggestions and concerns regarding tree planting and rewilding, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) using land for planting to the North of the A66 and the South side of the A66 and to protect the primary school through planting. ii) Additional evergreen planting on the verges (especially the bank next to the raised bridge across the river here at Coupland Beck) to mitigate noise impacts. iii) removing planting from productive grassland fields from Eastfield to Flitholm and other areas where it is not considered needed. iv) land topography and sloping is not suitable for planting in some areas v) planting may damage a wastewater plant through root damage. vi) impact of mitigation areas on agriculture vii) how ecological mitigation will be maintained. viii) planting should take account of sighting distances along the railway, 	<p>We address each of the comments in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Preliminary information on construction impacts and mitigation was provided within the PEI Report based on the available information ahead of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail and are shown indicatively within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). This includes a mixture of proposed new broadleaved woodland, species-rich grassland, trees, native species-rich hedgerows, and wetland habitats, as appropriate, to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Opportunities to maximise 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>particularly on the inside of curves and footpath crossings in the vicinity of the Army Camp.</p> <p>viii) engaging locally and involving local groups in planting schemes</p>	<p>environmental enhancements have been sought where practicable.</p> <p>ii) With regard to the use of trees to act as acoustic screening to minimise noise, this approach is generally not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation and no allowance is made for the attenuation effects of vegetation. Other research has shown that the use of shrubs or trees as a noise barrier is only effective if the foliage is at least 10m deep, dense, and consistent for the full height of the vegetation. Given the seasonal nature of leaf cover for trees and the density of vegetation required tree planting is not generally adopted as a reliable noise mitigation measure and is therefore not considered by the Project as a noise mitigation measure. The results of the assessment are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), which also sets out the measures included by National Highways to mitigate adverse noise effects.</p> <p>iii) Since the PEI Report was issued at the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the PEI Report from stakeholders where practicable and appropriate. This has included removing planting from productive agricultural land, where appropriate and acceptable to do so. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.7) as an illustration of how the required mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iv) The proposed landscape planting mitigation measures have considered the local topography and slopes of the land.</p> <p>v) Proposed planting has also taken into consideration nearby existing constraints and the proposed planting distances will be indicated at detailed design stage.</p> <p>vi) ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential effect of the scheme on agricultural holdings</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>vii) Maintenance and monitoring measures are outlined in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Once National Highways' Principal Contractor(s) are appointed, longer term maintenance and monitoring programme will be developed.</p> <p>viii) Planting will be developed to take account of existing sight lines for the road and rail and will be defined at detained design stage. The Project Design Principles Report (Application Document 5.11) sets out the Project-wide and scheme-specific design principles by which the detailed design of the Project will be carried out.</p> <p>viii) The suggestion of engaging locally and involving local groups in the scheme is noted and welcomed. National Highways will work with their appointed Principal Contractor to explore such opportunities should the DCO be granted.</p>	
426	150169, 153059, 153337, 154012		154006	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents suggesting mitigation measures to protect wildlife and habitats, including;</p> <p>i) creating wildlife crossings,</p> <p>ii) retention of the wetland at Warcorp,</p> <p>iii) retention of the designated upland heath along the route (connecting and enhancing existing habitats),</p>	<p>Preliminary information on construction impacts and mitigation was provided within the PEI Report based on the available information ahead of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail and are shown illustratively within ES</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					iv) topsoil preservation and v) protection of the Great Crested Newt.	<p>Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). We address each of the wildlife and habitats comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, herptile species and aquatic species. All outline ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>ii) Since the PEI Report, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received from the Autumn 2021 Consultation from stakeholders where appropriate. Updated Environmental Mitigation Maps are presented as part of the illustrative ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and secured through implementation</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Existing areas of notable/sensitive habitat have been retained, where practicable, as part of the Project in the first instance. Where this is not possible, replacement planting/habitat creation will be provided, as illustrated within the outline Environmental Mitigation Maps.</p> <p>iii) Areas of heathland habitat creation have been considered and included within the scheme design where suitable, to connect and enhance the existing extent of habitat. Wetland habitats have also been retained and enhanced where practicable, please refer to the illustrative ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iv) Implementation of mitigation such as retention of topsoil or turf to be used in habitat creation or reinstatement are detailed in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). Further details on Soil Management are provided within ES</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). v) Details on the impact assessment for great crested newts is included in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). Natural England licensing requirements and survey effort have been discussed with Natural England and the project is utilising District Licensing in order to mitigate the effects of the Project on great crested newts, in agreement with Natural England. The latest position is set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Natural England (Application Document 4.5).	
457		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - community impacts	Respondents suggesting additions or amendments to the content of the PEI Report relating to community impacts, specifically referring to the Gypsy Roma and Traveller communities.	Consideration to the gypsy and traveller population, alongside other vulnerable and/or protected characteristic groups, have been addressed within the Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10). Engagement with representatives from the gypsy and traveller community has been ongoing throughout the Project development to ensure that the needs of traveller communities have been considered.	No
867	148612, 149366, 153316			Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents suggest that environmental improvements could be introduced through:	We address each of these landscaping and tree planting comments in turn below.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Tree planting / rewilding	<p>i) tree-planting, which would provide mitigation of the negative visual effects on the AONB and visual screening during and after construction.</p> <p>iii) an effective maintenance scheme to establish the satisfactory establishment of planting.</p>	<p>i) The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. This will be secured through principles detailed within the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p> <p>As part of the scheme, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees, and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and in some areas will have a visual screening function. The landscape and visual impacts of the Project on the AONB and proposed mitigation measures are reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>ii) National Highways agrees that it is essential that the proposed planting is monitored and maintained to allow it to establish well and grow to the desired</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						extent and become effective as mitigation during the long-term operation of the new road infrastructure. An EMP has been developed, including a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan which sets out a framework in which the successful establishment of these measures can be managed and ensured. This document is certified under the DCO to ensure the commitments within it are delivered.	
905	153800		152980	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents suggesting planting and lowering the road to mitigate the visual impact of the scheme.	<p>The scheme design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area with consideration of land topography. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme through the use of embankments and planting and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) describe and illustrate the measures relating to mitigation measures for visual impacts of the scheme.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1093	149366			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Visual impact	A respondent suggests the visual impact of the scheme could be improved by visual screening solutions between the road and Warcop village, potentially using tree-planting or earth-shaping to achieve this.	<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) describe and illustrate the measures relating to mitigation measures for visual impacts of the scheme.</p> <p>The Project proposes to use replacement planting in this area replacing any planting lost through construction works. This will mitigate any visual impacts on Warcop village and as a result the visual impact of the scheme in this location is considered not significant.</p>	No
1113		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondent suggesting that the construction compound to the east of Roman camp and length of Roman Road could impact on archaeological features and needs investigation before the location is confirmed.	The construction compound identified (to the east of NHLE 1019208) does not sit within the scheduled area and consequently, there will not be a direct impact upon the scheduled monument. However, to mitigate any impacts	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>during construction a preservation by record approach will be taken to document any findings made during construction.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report submission, survey work has been carried out within Order Limits to inform the ES, including geophysical survey, trial trenching and geochemical survey, the details of which are set out in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). Where potential impacts on known and unknown archaeology are identified a preservation by record approach will be taken to document any findings made during construction.</p>	
1114		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent suggesting mitigation of impacts, as far as possible, on Warcop Roman camp and Roman road south of west Moor House by design, or (if not possible by design) through preservation by record.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) identifies a preservation by record approach will be taken to document any findings made during construction.	
9		Environment Agency Natural England		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the content of the PEI Report relating to road drainage and water, specifically that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Hilton Beck and Coupland Beck should be included in the report; ii) that identification of Moor Beck in the PEI Report is inconsistent with Environment Agency mapping; and iii) that historical records of flooding at Warcop indicate greater frequency than that identified in the PEI Report. <p>Respondents express concern that lack of consideration of these issues could lead to inaccurate assessments of impacts on water courses.</p>	<p>We address each of these drainage and water environment comments in turn below.</p> <p>Where receptors are within the study area for the scheme, their importance has been determined using the methodology set out within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 113.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Both Hilton Beck and Coupland Beck are referenced within the ES. Both watercourses are within the study area, however were screened out due to lack of hydrological connectivity. As a result, no effects on either watercourse are anticipated as a result of the Project. ii) A naming convention has been developed for the ES to address inconsistencies where no mapped watercourse names exist, with all main rivers considered including Moor Beck. iii) Historic flooding events have also been updated following consultation with the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council. This has been used to inform the impact 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						assessment within the ES chapter and the flood risk assessment in Appendix 14.2 (Application Document 3.4). Please see ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) for further information.	
48	149383, 150176, 151481, 152973, 152992, 152993, 153316, 153329, 153365, 153852, 153901, 153955		152991, 154010	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular that: i) the scheme would have a negative impact on wildlife and their habitats. ii) possible impacts on River Eden and North Pennine Moors SACs, iii) concerns over the management of poisonous weeds.	We address each of the wildlife and biodiversity comments in turn below: i) ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of significant impacts on ecological receptors and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts on habitats and species and would seek to employ best-practice methods for dealing with habitat loss, habitat severance, disturbance and species mortality. ii) Further detail is provided on the anticipated impacts to the River Eden SAC and North Pennine Moors SAC within the accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening and Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Application Document 3.5 and 3.6). The HRA concludes that once the outlined	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigation measures detailed within the report have been implemented, no significant adverse effects as a result of the Project on the River Eden SAC and North Pennine Moors SAC are predicted.</p> <p>iii) Measures for dealing with invasive species and implementing biosecurity measures are incorporated in the EMP, including a requirement for an Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan, an expanded essay plan of which is provided at Annex B15.</p>	
144	151520, 153852	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Natural England</p>		<p>PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects</p>	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the content of the PEI Report relating to landscape and visual amenity, including:</p> <p>i) concern about the impact on the AONB; and</p> <p>ii) the document contains an omission, consideration of Orton Fells NCA.</p>	<p>We address these landscape and visual comments in turn:</p> <p>i) The PEI Report contained an appropriate preliminary assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the Project to inform statutory engagement.</p> <p>The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the scheme to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>The landscape assessment is detailed within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The assessment concludes that whilst there will be some changes to the southern boundary of the AONB as a result of the Project, by retaining the A66 largely within its existing corridor, the effects are not significant on the function and special qualities of the AONB and will be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.</p> <p>ii) Within the ES Chapter, all National Character Areas (NCA) are shown within the designation figures and form part of the landscape and visual assessment if significant effects are likely. No significant impacts are identified on Orton Fells NCA and therefore this NCA is not included further in the assessment.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
202	149350, 149383, 150162, 150434, 151481, 151501, 152244, 152965, 152975, 153329, 153560, 153800, 153810, 153852, 153886, 153887, 153890, 153895, 153901, 153902, 153915, 153955, 154207	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 149418, 150183, 151476, 153129, 153964	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) that the scheme would have a negative impact on the landscape and visual amenity; ii) the visual impact of proposed bridges and junctions; and iii) the impact of the scheme on the landscape of the Eden Valley. 	<p>We address each of these landscapes and visual comments in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The scheme design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. ii) The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the scheme to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. All structures have been designed to be safe to construct and maintain. The Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) provide further information on the schemes design and how the scheme has had careful consideration to the location and sensitive design of structures and materials. iii) Details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). Viewpoints along the Eden Valley have been selected and agreed at Technical Working Group 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						meetings. The ES identifies that the visual impact at these locations is assessed as not significant due to restoration planting following construction of the scheme.	
311	150176, 151481, 152200, 152965, 152973, 153361, 153365, 153810, 153901, 153902, 153903, 154207, 154255	Warcop Parish Council	149418, 153864, 153959, 154185	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the potential for increased flood risk; ii) risk of flooding at Warcop and near Langrigg junction; iii) that the proposed drainage ponds would not provide adequate mitigation; and iv) that drainage pond design has not considered increased risk of flooding due to climate change. 	<p>National Highways note the consultee's concerns about flooding. The flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the outline drainage design are reported in the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4)). We address each of the specific comments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) We have assessed the design in areas of potential flooding, whether that is from groundwater, river water, surface water or from sewer sources. Local people and communities have helped guide our flood modelling by providing their insight into flooding hotspots. We have mapped all these sources in the surrounding area and identified flood issues that the design might cause. There is no increased flood risk as a result of the Project on the basis that the Project design (which takes into account the increase in impermeable area of the Project) 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>incorporates mitigation based on detailed modelling where relevant.</p> <p>ii) The impacts on flood risk as a result of the scheme are detailed within Appendix 14.2. No adverse impacts are identified at Warcop and near Langrigg junction.</p> <p>iii) Proposed drainage ponds have been designed to attenuate and treat the road runoff and climate change uplift values have been incorporated into the design. No significant impacts are identified.</p> <p>iv) The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
312	150162, 152244, 152965, 153349, 153365, 153578, 153629, 153798, 153800, 153853, 153901, 153910, 154171, 154182, 154197, 154211, 154243, 154459	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	151465, 152151, 152153, 153135, 153345, 153964, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154016, 154183, 154184, 154454	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase the risk of flooding or adversely impact on existing drainage systems, including concerns that:</p> <p>i) the planned drainage ponds in the scheme would add water to streams that are prone to flooding;</p> <p>ii) increased tarmac would lead to increased surface runoff, which threatens flooding of Crook Beck in Warcop;</p> <p>iii) the drainage of fields adjacent to the A66 will be impacted by the scheme, requiring land drains to be connected to prevent flooding;</p> <p>iv) land take for the scheme would mean that farmland may be polluted, or more likely to flood, due to poor drainage; and</p> <p>v) designated wetlands habitats are unsuitable at specified locations due to inappropriate field topography and drainage.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultee's concerns about flooding. Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the outline Project drainage design are reported in the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4, Appendix 14.2 (FRA and Appendix 14.10 Outline Drainage Strategy)). We address the concerns in turn below:</p> <p>i) All structures including drainage ponds and culverts under the new road will be designed to accommodate future flood events.</p> <p>ii) From the construction assessment, it is anticipated there are no likely significant effects on the quality or quantity of water or hydromorphology of Crook Beck in Warcop This is on the basis that the Project construction design, EMP (Application Document 2.7) and Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) set out the Project-wide and scheme-specific design principles by which the detailed design of the Project will be carried out. Similarly, from the operation assessment, there is no increased flood risk as a result of the Project on the basis that the Project design (which takes into account the increase in impermeable area of the Project)</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>incorporates the recommendations for mitigation based on detailed modelling where relevant.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The proposed positions of drainage ponds have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from consultation whilst minimising the risk of flooding. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>iii to v) During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage. Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever possible. If it is not possible to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>connect existing land drainage, alternative solutions such as installing new drains, will be sought. This is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>iv) The outline drainage design developed for the scheme will treat water to the environmental quality standard (EQS) as outlined in DMRB LA113 and detailed in Appendix 14.3 (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>v) All required field survey work to inform potential significant impacts (including those relating to designated wetland habitats) as a result of the Project have been completed and are provided in full within the ES. ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of significant impacts on ecological receptors and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects.</p>	
319	150460, 152945, 153309, 153339, 153365, 153560, 153798, 153853, 153862,		151465, 152994, 153307, 153379, 153806, 153934, 154008, 154232,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the environmental impact of the scheme and the effects on wildlife and habitats, including:</p> <p>i) that the scheme would destroy existing habitats.</p> <p>ii) a lack of road crossing points for animals proposed for the scheme;</p>	<p>We address each of these wildlife and habitat comments in turn below.</p> <p>i) The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project based on the available information known at the time of writing. Since the PEI Report was issued at the Autumn 2021 Consultation all required field survey</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153863, 153891, 154211, 154233, 154243, 154248		154234, 154454		<p>iii) that the species and habitat types used for mitigation may be unsuitable for the locations selected and potentially at risk of disease, creating toxic environment features or replacing other valuable habitat;</p> <p>iv) habitat features such as topsoil and local seeds be returned to their place where development requires disturbing land;</p> <p>v) areas designated as species rich grassland require fencing off to avoid public disturbance;</p> <p>vi) specific concern for particular species threatened by the scheme, including curlew; deer lapwing; red squirrels; water voles; great crested newts; and white-clawed crayfish; and</p> <p>vii) further surveys are needed to assess potential threats from construction plans, specifically mentioning the streams leading to Sandford Mire for crayfish.</p>	<p>work to inform potential significant impacts as a result of the Project have been completed. The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project.</p> <p>ii) Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting, and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. All outline ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>iii) Since the PEI Report was issued at the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received to the PEI Report from stakeholders where practicable and appropriate. An illustration of how the ecological and landscape mitigation that is required</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>could be delivered within the Order Limits is presented within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures the implementation of ecological and landscape mitigation measures.</p> <p>iv) and v) Broad management requirements for each habitat type are provided within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) produced as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). More detailed management prescriptions (e.g topsoil preparation, fencing etc) for these habitats will be prepared during the detailed design post the DCO examination process.</p> <p>vi)The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where required and practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>vii) A second iteration of the EMP will be developed by the Principal</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Contractor pre-construction and will include all required mitigation measures in order to comply with relevant ecological and environmental legislation and best practice. This includes the provision of all ecological pre-construction surveys where required.	
411	151353, 151520, 152200, 152948, 153309, 153349, 153380, 153560, 153578, 153615, 153621, 153796, 153832, 153836, 153848, 153901, 153910, 153913, 153955, 154182, 154248, 154255, 154483		149779, 152980, 152994, 153379, 153806, 154006, 154008, 154010, 154016, 154183, 154184, 154234, 162158	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concerns about noise pollution as a result of the scheme, including:</p> <p>i) that moving the road closer to residential properties and increasing the speed limit would increase noise levels, at several locations including Sandford, Warcop, Kirkby Thore, and Appleby golf course.</p> <p>ii) questioning whether the mitigation measures proposed would be effective.</p>	<p>We address each of the comments raised on noise in turn:</p> <p>i) Noise change maps within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) show both adverse and beneficial impacts due to the proposed scheme. The ES did not identify any significant adverse effects at Sandford or at Appleby Golf Course. Significant adverse and beneficial effects at Warcop and Kirkby Thore due to the proposed scheme are presented in section 12.10 of the ES.</p> <p>ii) The scheme design includes the use of a lower noise road surface, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce propagation of traffic noise during operation. Practicable measures to screen the surrounding area from highway noise have been applied through the embedded noise mitigation in the design, and barriers are proposed where they have been demonstrated</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						to be effective and sustainable. Residual effects are reported in section 12.10 and Table 12-45 of the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation measures would be completed as part of National Highways Project Evaluation procedures, which evaluates how highway schemes are delivered and would provide an opportunity to highlight any potential issues.	
479	153872	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the PEI Report, with respect to biodiversity, wildlife, and habitats including concerns about:</p> <p>i) insufficient consideration given to the potential pollution and disturbance of streams along this route, specifically mentioning that Lowgill Beck passes through a proposed construction work area which threatens trout, bullhead, eels, and brook lamprey.</p> <p>ii) the impact on salmon and otters is not considered where streams are culverted.</p> <p>iii) impacts on particular protected species are not sufficiently assessed within the PEI Report, including curlews; oyster catchers; red squirrels; and water voles.</p>	<p>We address these biodiversity comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme and outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being undertaken. Since the PEI Report was issued at statutory consultation the scheme design has undergone refinement. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the scheme is now reported in the ES (Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2)) and includes details of all surveys and modelling used to inform the assessment. This includes an assessment of potential impacts on</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>iv) protection for these species is not mentioned and state that there is potential fragmentation and food chain impacts.</p> <p>v) about the use of desktop data and note the absence of fieldwork data, with a lack of clarity within the data, noting that it is not always clear which figures relate to which locations.</p>	<p>Lowgill Beck and the fish species that it supports.</p> <p>ii and iii) ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the scheme would affect wildlife and habitats and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. All surveys to support the assessment have been undertaken in accordance with current industry standards and best practice guidance or through consultation/agreement with Natural England where a bespoke approach has been required. Full survey results, modelling outputs, construction timescales/methodologies, where known and available, and associated outline ecological mitigation designs are provided within the ES Chapter. This includes an assessment on fish species, riparian mammals (otter and water vole), red squirrels and bird species as a result of the Project (e.g. including where sections of watercourse requires culverting). Watercourses in this area have been demonstrated to be functionally linked to the River Eden SAC, and as such have also been considered (including the impacts on species for which the site is designated) within the Statement to Inform Appropriate</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Assessment (Application Document 3.6).</p> <p>iv) Some of the species mentioned in the comments as well as crayfish eDNA have been recorded in Lowgill Beck. Mitigation measures to protect the SAC species and Low Gill Beck are set out in the ES and the Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment, and include the implementation of best practice construction techniques, pollution prevention measures and the implementation of a surface water management system using measures such as temporary silt fencing, cut off ditches, settlement ponds and bunds. An Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) Management Plan will also be implemented to avoid the introduction or spread of INNS as a result of the Project. An outline INNS Management Plan is provided as Annex B15 to the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and the Principal Contractor will develop the INNS Management Plan in accordance with this document.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts and are detailed within the ES. These include, but are</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>not limited to, suitable fencing, planting, and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species.</p> <p>Methodologies and timing of works in/near water are detailed within the EMP. Impacts will be minimised through sensitive timing of works and best practice construction, such as low impact piling methodologies.</p> <p>v) Where comments have been received on the presentation of data within the PEI Report these have been noted and considered as part of the production of the ES. ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2), Biodiversity Figures (Application Document 3.3) and all supporting Technical Appendices (Application Document 3.4) present the results of all field survey work undertaken to inform the ES in full.</p>	
489	151481, 152200, 152948, 152965, 153349, 153380, 153560, 153615, 153832, 153848,			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the potential impact of the scheme on the environment, with specific reference to the impact on air quality, including concerns:</p> <p>i) that residential areas could be subject to increased air pollution due to higher speed limits, stationary traffic, and the close proximity of the proposed route.</p>	<p>We address each of the comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) The air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) considers construction and operational effects of the scheme. It has been updated using the latest traffic model and scheme design data, which takes into account traffic speeds including stationary traffic. No exceedances of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153856, 153913, 154197, 154211, 154248				<p>ii) that air quality in Warcop and Sandford would deteriorate.</p> <p>iii) that there will be dust and debris in the Brough area from HGVs using the flyover to access to the quarry at Hellbeck.</p>	<p>the Air Quality Objectives for NO2, PM10 or PM2.5 are predicted and no likely significant effects are concluded at any modelled location.</p> <p>ii) The air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on sensitive receptors (human or designated ecological sites) within 200m of the ARN, located in Warcop and Sandford.</p> <p>iii) Vehicle movements associated with the operation of Hellbeck Quarry, together with the employment of vehicle-specific mitigation measures to prevent dust and debris will be the responsibility of the quarry's haulage operator. In terms of the Project, a qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction of the Project has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan, with measures to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						monitor effectiveness of mitigation, onsite and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.	
490	151501, 153560, 153621, 154245, 154248		149779, 151476, 153379, 153806, 154016	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Light	Respondents expressing concerns about light pollution as a result of the scheme, on the grounds that lights from vehicles using the road could shine into private properties and the local Kirkby Thore primary school. Respondents state that this is not properly considered in the consultation materials	An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The ES Chapter includes the consideration of effects of lighting including from car users. The local school at Kirkby Thore would not be impacted by light pollution as the scheme is in cutting in this location and therefore there is no sight of vehicles from the school.	No
505	150434, 151481, 152244, 152948, 153339, 153380, 153560, 153615, 153621, 153800, 153863, 153886, 153887, 153891, 153895, 153911,		151465, 151476, 152980, 153940, 153964, 154016	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern about the possible impacts of the scheme on visual aspects and the landscape including concerns that: i) Warcop, Kirkby Thore, Appleby, Brough, and the existing AONB land would suffer from visual blight as a result of the Project; ii) embankments, cuttings, and woodland planting would diminish the scenic beauty of the area, specifically mentioning the views experienced from the Eden Valley railway line;	We address each of these landscape/visual comments in turn below: i) The proposed route through the Warcop section uses the old A66 as the new eastbound carriageway and a new westbound carriageway is built to the south. A new local road is then built to the north in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This route option reduces the impact on the village of Warcop, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) training ranges and the AONB. At Kirkby Thore the Project has been placed within a cutting to mitigate visual impacts. Visual impacts	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153943, 153955, 153957, 154197				<p>iii) mitigation measures such as woodland and drainage ponds would destroy ancient countryside; and</p> <p>iv) about the additions to MOD training facilities on the grounds that this may cause disruption through increased aircraft activity and land clearance.</p>	<p>at Appleby and Brough are not identified as significant as there are no views of the scheme from these locations.</p> <p>ii) The landscape-led approach to this scheme has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the area. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. Photomontage 6.8 on Figure 10.9: Viewpoint Photomontages (Application Document 3.3) is representative of views from the Eden Valley railway at Warcop. It shows the potential impact of the Project on visual receptors using the railway.</p> <p>iii) ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) identifies the mitigation measures required to mitigate the landscape and visual effects of the scheme and integrate it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland, and grassland planting in a sensitive way respecting the character of the countryside. The landscape design</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.3). These plans, alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall scheme design principles.</p> <p>iv) The Project is not proposing additional MOD training facilities. The Project is proposing the movement of the helipad from the existing pitch to a new pitch location. As the helipad will be within the MoD ownership the Project does not have an influence on the operations of the helipad.</p>	
612	153830		153927, 154185	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	<p>Respondents expressing concern, in general terms without being specific, about the possible detrimental environmental impact the scheme could have in the area.</p>	<p>National Highways has produced an ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4), which provides a detailed and robust assessment of the effects of the scheme on the environment and identifies how adverse effects will be mitigated.</p> <p>Throughout the scheme design process, National Highways has sought to avoid and reduce the environmental impacts of the design whilst taking into account feedback from consultation.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
730	149411, 150434, 151481, 151501, 153319, 153380, 153792, 153810, 153877, 153901, 153905, 153955, 154207, 154233	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 149418, 149788, 150183, 151476, 153317, 153383, 153864, 153959, 153964, 154185	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment and in particular the potential for a deterioration in air quality for local residents. Areas mentioned include Warcop, Sandford, Flitholme and vehicles using Hellbeck Quarry.</p>	<p>The impact of the scheme on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The new flyover will provide safe access to the A66, routing vehicles accessing the quarry away from Brough, reducing traffic flows through the village.</p> <p>Vehicle movements associated with the operation of Hellbeck Quarry, together with the employment of vehicle-specific mitigation measures to prevent dust and debris will be the responsibility of the quarry's haulage operator. In terms of the Project, a qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction of the Project has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan, with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						onsite and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events. The air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on sensitive receptors (human or designated ecological sites) within 200m of the ARN, located in Warcop, Sandford and Flitholme.	
732	152945, 152948, 152973, 153559, 153872, 153901, 153913		153379, 153806, 154234	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	<p>Respondents expressing concern about PEI Report environmental issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) potential for negative impact on cultural heritage assets, including Brough Castle, tumuli at Sandford Junction with the B6259, and other unspecified ancient monuments; ii) that the scheme negates the long-term plan of Eden Valley Railway to expand and combine with Stainmore Railway at Kirkby Stephen, as it would block the Great Musgrave bridge; and iii) that the MOD and AONB land protected from development is less culturally valuable than the farmland that would be taken for the scheme, which they say has substantial heritage value. 	<p>We address each of these comments in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Brough Castle will not be impacted by the Project. The tumuli at Sandford are no longer extant, and in the event remains are present they will be recorded and removed as part of the Project. The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham, and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of an Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). ii) The Project will not block the Great Musgrave bridge. iii) National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the Project 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						to use an alternative route for the new dual carriageway into the MOD training ranges and AONB. Substantial design stage work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises environmental impact and complies with legislation and policy. Refer to Chapter 5.6 of the Route Development Report for further information (Application Document 4.1).	
760	150182, 153309, 153316, 153339, 153365, 153839, 153871, 154363		152983	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase traffic volumes, and therefore greenhouse gas emissions, which respondents say is contrary to climate change commitments. Respondents claim that National Highways expect an additional 3 million tonnes of carbon in additional traffic from the road upgrade over a 60-year appraisal period.	<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the scheme and how it complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), guidance and other climate change legislation as well as the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations).</p> <p>National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the scheme in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations, guidance and policy.</p> <p>The quoted 3 million tonnes of carbon</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>relates to the values presented in the PEI Report. The GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) estimates that the upgrade will add 2,068,844 tCO₂e from increased journeys. The change from PEI Report results from the confirmation of the alignment of the Project, and the adoption of a future dataset on typical vehicle emissions which considers more fully the effects of decarbonisation of road vehicles. The assessment concludes no likely significant effect in accordance with the NPSNN and DMRB LA 114</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction. Measures will be implemented, however, to minimise the greenhouse gas emissions during the construction phase. These are described in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Document 3.2) and secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
772	150162, 151330, 151452, 152232, 152945, 152965, 153309, 153798, 153862, 153911, 154213, 154245, 154483		153307, 153964	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	<p>Respondents expressing general concern that the scheme would have a detrimental impact on the environment, including:</p> <p>i) that use of the land proposed for the scheme would be more environmentally damaging than use of MOD land that has already been damaged by military training.</p> <p>ii) concern about fly-tipping, illegal camping, and the possibility that protests will lead to delays in construction, with the potential for negative environmental consequences as a result.</p>	<p>Each of these comments is addressed in turn below:</p> <p>i) National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the Project to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MOD training ranges to the north of the old A66. Through the design stage work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. Refer to Chapter 5.6 of the Route Development Report for further information (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>ii) While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to work collaboratively and transparently with key stakeholders and those impacted by the A66 dualling project, to engender support for the project and enable construction to proceed in a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						timely manner. National Highways is working with its Principal Contractor to ensure that any disruption during the construction phase is kept to an absolute minimum and has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction and operation activities on the environment, as well as other environmental impacts, will be managed.	
811	148590, 149411, 150434, 151481, 151501, 152973, 153319, 153329, 153792, 153810, 153832, 153851, 153863, 153877, 153901, 153902, 153955, 154207, 154233, 154459, 154460		149376, 149418, 149788, 150183, 151476, 153129, 153317, 153383, 153864, 153959, 153964, 154185	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, in particular:</p> <p>i) that the scheme would increase noise levels for local residents both during construction and once in operation.</p> <p>ii) concern over impacts from the sections of road near Warcop and Dyke Nook and between Flitholme and Brough and that increased speed limits will lead to increased noise levels.</p>	<p>We address each of these noise comments in turn below:</p> <p>i) The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p> <p>ii) The ES chapter sets out the methodology undertaken and how the assessment uses noise modelling which considers the speed of traffic and road elevation. The ES did not identify any significant adverse effects at Dyke Nook and Flitholme. Significant adverse and beneficial effects at Warcop and receptors between Flitholme and Brough, due the proposed scheme are presented in section 12.10 of the ES. Where sustainable, mitigation measures are identified in the ES (as set out in point i) above).</p>	
813	153848, 153901, 154207, 154233		153383	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Light	Respondents expressing concern about the possible light pollution the route alignment on the scheme could cause. Respondents specifically state that the slip road design could result in residential properties becoming disturbed by headlights.	An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The ES Chapter includes the consideration of effects of lighting including from car users.	No
858	153316, 153901		149418, 153964	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on cultural heritage sites, including historic monuments such as	The PEI Report presented a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme on the historic environment.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Cultural heritage	Roman and Bronze Age sites and the Brough Hill fair site.	Further geophysical survey, detailed setting assessments, archive research and trial have been carried out to inform the ES. The impacts of the scheme on the historic environment and proposed mitigation measures are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with Cumbria County Council, Durham County Council, and North Yorkshire County Council Archaeological Officers by means of an Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7).	
1018	H			PEI Report - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the content of the PEI Report relating to noise pollution. Respondents claim that the document could be misleading as it suggests that increased traffic could reduce noise levels.	Despite the increase in traffic flow on the scheme alignment, the Project reduces the amount of traffic in close proximity to some existing receptors and therefore a reduction in noise level is identified in these areas. In this scheme the existing A66 is realigned and taken away from receptors at Wheatsheaf Farm. At the eastern end of the scheme the alignment moves south from the existing A66 in the area of Flitholme until it meets the existing A66 at West View, Brough. ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the criteria for assessment following Government policy. Noise and vibration impacts and effects are reported for all identified sensitive receptors as required by Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 highways standard.	
1056		Natural England		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern about the content of the PEI Report relating to air quality. Respondents are concerned that air pollution would increase on the local road network affecting sensitive receptors more than 200m from the Affected Road Network	<p>The air quality assessment is detailed within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). No exceedances of the Air Quality Objectives for NO₂, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} are predicted and no likely significant effects are concluded at any modelled location within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN).</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Air pollutant impacts from roads are unlikely to be discernible from background pollutant concentrations at distances of 200m as pollutant concentrations from road traffic reduce rapidly from the roadside due to mixing of the plume over this distance.</p> <p>The NO2 Concentrations and Distance from Roads (2008) DEFRA report on the changes in NO2 concentrations in relation to the distance from roads, acknowledges that beyond 50m from the road, NO2 concentrations approach background levels.</p> <p>Therefore, at 100m or more from the road, the difference between the total concentration, including any contribution from the road, and the background concentration should be close to zero.</p> <p>The consideration of transects for the ecological assessment out to 200m from the road, represents a more precautionary approach than the 100m set out in the DEFRA report. Whilst air quality models will show a level of change beyond 200m, this is in part due to the way the model algorithms in dispersion models work, i.e., theoretical infinite end point. Actual monitoring demonstrates that the road component will be undiscernible from</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the background at distances closer than 200m from the edge of the road.	
1115		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing concern that neither the PEI Report (although it is noted in Table 8-9) nor the Figures record that there is a Conservation Area at Brough. This needs to be rectified and assessed appropriately in the ES.	We thank the respondent for identifying that the Conservation Area at Brough has not been included in the PEI Report, this is rectified within the ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). This omission was because the PEI Report focused on the specifics of the individual schemes and the Brough Conservation Area lies outside of the areas to be dualled as part of the project.	No
1250			153039	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Environment - general	Respondents expressing concern about the environmental impact of the scheme and the effects of ecological mitigation areas on a log cabin development at the Laurels.	Since the PEI Report was issued at the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting in these areas have been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received to the PEI Report from stakeholders where practicable and appropriate. The required ecological and landscape mitigation is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and an illustration of how the required mitigation could be implemented is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). As a result of these design refinements there will be no	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						direct impact on the identified log cabins.	
792	152267, 153061, 153832, 153863, 153872, 153877, 153886, 153887, 153895, 153943, 153957, 154211	Warcop Parish Council		Alternative Route - North - Environment - Cultural heritage	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section should be selected on the grounds that it would be travelling through land used by the Ministry of Defence and was therefore similar to a brown field site. Respondents suggest historical sites such as a Roman Signal Station, a Prehistoric Stone Circle, and a Bronze Age burial site should be preserved.	National Highways acknowledge the consultee's request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MOD land to the north of the old A66. National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document t 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>heritage. Cultural heritage surveys undertaken indicate that the extent of the Roman camp Scheduled Ancient Monument and length of Roman road to the north of the A66 between Dyke Nook and Wheatsheaf Farm may be larger than previously understood. The highways alignment design has been updated to minimise impacts to this designated site and it is not intended that the proposed new carriageway encroach into the footprint of the camp. The proposals currently conform with policy to protect the designated heritage assets in this area, including policies 5.131 - 5.133 of the NNNPS, as set out in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and the Legislation and Policy Compliance report (Application Document 3.9). Full details of the environmental assessment and proposed mitigation, including cultural heritage, are included with the Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Appleby to Brough' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
40	148550, 148565, 148578, 148588, 148590, 148615, 149350, 149794, 151452, 152966, 152995, 153377, 153950	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	152151, 152980, 153135, 153321, 154183, 154199, 154212	General / no reason given	Respondents express support for the preferred route alignment, without providing further information.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' support for the scheme being promoted.	No
418	154012		152153, 154007	Land - Land take	Respondents express support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it would reduce the amount of land used.	National Highways welcomes the consultees' support for the scheme. As the preferred route in this scheme follows the existing route it will result in less land required compared to the alternative off line alignments that have been considered .	No
422	150429, 153377, 153851, 153954		152151, 154007, 154009	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents express support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it provides improved access from east-bound traffic at Appleby to the A66. Respondents further state that the preferred route alignment connects local villages such as Flitholme, Langrigg and Great	National Highways welcomes the support expressed for the scheme and agrees that it would improve connectivity, through providing a local road to the south of the new A66 connecting Flitholme and Langrigg allowing residents a connection to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Musgrave. Respondents also express support for a junction at Sandford.	new westbound carriageway and local roads to the south via Musgrave Lane.	
430	148549, 148564, 148568, 148604, 148612, 149350, 149352, 150189, 150462, 150465, 151344, 152174, 152208, 152243, 152268, 152940, 153048, 153316, 153335, 153377, 153578, 153909, 154012, 154233, 162144	Brough Parish Council	148622, 150196, 151465, 152980, 153129, 153948, 154006, 154009, 154205, 154208	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing general support for this section of the route and how it was developed. The process of identifying impacts is praised for having properly considered environmental impact and taken steps to reduce it, fully administering an Environmental Impact Assessment and Preliminary Environmental Impact Report and praised for having collaborated with relevant Organisations effectively.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme and is committed to further engagement as the project progresses.	No
444	153578		154008, 154183	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents express support for the design of the proposed scheme, including comments supporting the wider road.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
469	152995, 153043, 153048, 153316, 153950		149355, 150173, 153321, 154010, 154214	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents express support for the scheme on the grounds of improving connectivity for transport, particularly to villages, which will benefit local communities. Respondents include comments supporting improved connectivity to private properties, farms, and Moor House. Respondents also comment that maintaining the route from Hilton over Warcop Range will benefit MoD vehicles moving between sites. Comments also include support for retaining the road from Brough to Warcop for local traffic.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. National Highways agree that connectivity between villages will be improved as local roads are proposed such that to be provided to the south of the new A66 connecting Flitholme and Langrigg allowing residents a connection to the new westbound carriageway and local roads to the south via Musgrave Lane.	No
573	148637, 150189, 152175, 152200, 153950, 153954, 153963	Warcop Parish Council	153363, 154006	Traffic, transport, and junctions – Safety	Respondents expressing support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it increases safety for the road users. Respondents suggest that these improvements may prevent unnecessary accidents and allow for smoother journeys due to the number of HGVs that use the road.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted and a key objective of the Project is to improve safety and reduce the number and frequency of accidents.	No
845	149417, 151330, 151353, 152178, 153366, 153936, 153950		149355, 153959, 154214	Traffic, transport, and junctions – Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds of improved safety, including comments about road straightening and improved junctions.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted and a key objective of the Project is to improve safety and reduce the number and frequency of accidents.	No
846	149366, 153043,		153129, 153568	Engineering design and	Respondents expressing support for the design of the route, and support it	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153045, 153386, 153950, 153954, 154218			development - Design	being as near as possible to the current route, reducing land take. Some respondents express support for the straightening of the road, noting Wild Boar Hill, west of Warcop and near Hayber Lane as areas with corners that will be made safer. One respondent expresses support for embankments up to 4 metres between Langrigg and Turks Head since this minimises southern encroachment.	promoted and a key objective of the Project is to improve safety and reduce the number and frequency of accidents	
859	150192, 153950		149779, 153964	Engineering design and development - Use existing Infrastructure	Respondents expressing support for the use of existing Infrastructure within the scheme. Respondents state that the black-blue-Black Route is preferable because it follows the previous route and therefore utilises existing structures which reduces the impact of the scheme. One respondent notes their support for the scheme while expressing that new local roads are not needed.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. The design of local roads including utilisation of the existing A66 and construction of new local roads where necessary, has been carried out to support the upgraded A66 junction strategy as well as to ensure suitable local connectivity and safe access to private land and properties.	No
869	153043, 153316			Construction	Support for the proposed construction plans for this scheme within a difficult stretch of road.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. During the construction period, National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. The project will seek to keep stakeholders and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						local communities informed of the construction traffic management plans as the project progresses, in order to minimise disruption.	
895	149781, 149794		153843	Get on with it / overdue / Needs case	Respondents expressing support for the preferred route alignment and encouraging the Applicant to start as soon as possible.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
897	153377, 153912			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it may improve access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	No
900	152243, 153912			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents supporting the route on the grounds of provision for walkers, cyclists, and local traffic, including along the decommissioned A66 route.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	No
921	150429, 152923, 153870, 153950, 153954	Warcop Parish Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents express support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it would ease traffic congestion.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
965	149794, 151472, 153362			Walking, cycling and	Respondents express support for the preferred route alignment on the grounds that it provides route	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. We are committed to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				horse-riders - Safety	diversions for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents refer specifically to the FP 372022 and 372020 routes near Warcop as well as routes near Brough.	working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	
1034	152224, 152949		149355	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support on the grounds that the scheme will reduce congestion.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
1047	152200		150173	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the schemes on the grounds of safer routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, in particular due to road straightening and junction improvements, and the retention of the old road from Brough to Warcop for cyclists and farm vehicles.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project and WCH facilities being promoted	No
1059			152153	Construction	Respondents expressing support for the proposed construction plans, without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. During the construction period, National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. The Project will seek to keep stakeholders and local communities informed of the construction traffic management plans as the Project progresses, in order to minimise disruption.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1060			152153	Economics - Cost	Respondent expressing support for the cost effectiveness of scheme, without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
1067	151348			Community impact - People	A respondent expressing support for the route alignment on the grounds that they believe this is the preference of the local community.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
1089	150460		149779	Community impact - Property	Respondents expressing support for the route alignment on the grounds that it reduces the impact on residents, water courses, the castle, farms, and housing in Brough. Respondents state that disturbance to MoD property would be easily mitigated.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. The proposed works will have an effect on existing MoD facilities, and we will be mitigating these effects through provision of replacement MoD playing fields including a new sports pavilion and helicopter landing area. The existing fuel filling station and tank storage area at Warcop junction will also be relocated further east to be combined with the existing landscaping compound.	No
1091	150192		149779	Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing support for the construction plans as it will minimise disruption and makes best use of the existing Infrastructure.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the construction plans. During the construction period, . As part of the preliminary design a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been drafted which sets out the temporary traffic management (TTM) strategy for the Project. The CTMP provides details of how the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						works will be phased and how the associated TTM measures will be implemented for each phase in order to deliver the schemes safely and efficiently, while minimising the impact on the road users and other stakeholders affected by the Project. The CTMP is also a live document which will be developed further in the detailed design stage ahead of the construction phase. National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. The Project will seek to keep stakeholders and local communities informed of the construction traffic management plans as the Project progresses, in order to minimise disruption for road users and the local community.	
1094	148613			Get on with it / overdue / Needs case	One respondent expressing support for the scheme and encouraging the Applicant to start the Project as soon as possible.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted for this scheme, which has been identified following a rigorous process of assessment of alternative alignments for the route within this scheme.	No
749	151481, 152267,		153340	Oppose	Respondents expressing general opposition to the preferred route	National Highways acknowledges the responders comment opposing the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152945, 152948, 153027, 153365, 153386, 153792, 153832, 153833, 153839, 153853, 153862, 153957, 153965, 154213				alignment within the Appleby to Brough scheme	preferred route for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The preferred route alignment for the Appleby to Brough scheme has been identified following a rigorous sifting process and assessment of alternative alignments for the route. The alternative alignments were assessed against engineering, environmental, traffic, economic, stakeholder principles, with commentary on policy conformity. The Black (West) - Blue (central) - Black (East) route was identified following the assessments and has been confirmed as the preferred route for the scheme. Further details are described in section 5.5 of the Project Development Overview Report, (Application Document 4.1). The need for the scheme and its benefits are set out in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).	
844	149374, 150162, 151481, 152244, 152948, 153365, 153810, 153901, 154213	Warcop Parish Council	153864, 153964, 154234	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing general opposition to the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which sets out general opposition to the Project in general. The A66 is a key national and regional strategic transport corridor that carries high levels of freight traffic and is an important route for tourism and connectivity for nearby communities. The route between the M6 at Penrith and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner is only	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>intermittently dualled and has six separate lengths of single carriageway. The route carries local slow moving agricultural and other traffic making short journeys, which impacts road speeds and capacity. It also includes a high number of private and direct access points along the route. This has a detrimental impact on other users, especially on the single carriageway lengths. The variable road standards, together with the lack of available diversionary routes when incidents occur, affects road safety, reliability, resilience, and attractiveness of the route. The Project intends to deliver solutions for the issues listed above providing benefits to the local communities and businesses. Please refer to the to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out further the need for the Project and the Appleby to Brough scheme.</p> <p>The preferred route alignment for this scheme has been identified following a rigorous process of assessment of alternative alignments for the route. The alternative alignments were assessed against engineering, environmental, traffic, economic, stakeholder principles, with commentary on policy conformity. The Black (West) - Blue (central) - Black (East) route was</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						identified following the assessments and has been confirmed as the preferred route for the scheme. Further details are described in section 5.5 of the Project Development Overview Report, (Application Document 4.1).	
922	148590, 148638, 150434, 152267, 152944, 153380, 153877		149376, 150183	Community impact	Respondents expressing opposition to the scheme due to the impact on local communities bringing the road closer to existing communities of Warcop, Brough, Langrigg, Great Musgrave, Flitholme and Sandford.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the scheme going ahead due to the potential for impact on local communities.</p> <p>This route and design for this scheme has been identified following a rigorous process of assessment of alternative alignments for the route. The alternative alignments were assessed against engineering, environmental, traffic, economic, stakeholder principles, with commentary on policy conformity. The Black (West) - Blue (central) - Black (East) route was identified following the assessments and has been confirmed as the preferred route for the scheme. Further details are described in section 5.5 of the Project Development Overview Report, (Application Document 4.1). An assessment of impact of the Project on the environment and local communities has been carried out (as set out in the ES: Application Document 3.2). The need for the scheme and its benefits are set out in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>We acknowledge that some properties will experience noise impacts during construction and operation but for many of these properties there are mitigation solutions, such as barriers that are recommended in the ES to mitigate these impact (see the NTS and main volume of the ES – Application Documents 3.1 and 3.2). There are also beneficial effects, such as reduction in noise, for local communities that are identified in the ES. An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This chapter identifies significant permanent beneficial effects to 12 community assets and one local business when the route is in operation.</p> <p>In addition, through our work National Highways has sought to identify an alignment and design which minimises the impact on local communities and the environment. As part of the development of this scheme alternative alignments have been considered and as part of this process an alignment that was closer to Warcop (which was the alignment that</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						formed part of the preferred route announced in 2020) was rejected in favour of an alignment further to the north, following the current A66 route.	
44	148642, 151504, 152965, 152992, 152993, 153389, 153848, 153931	Warcop Parish Council	152991, 153383	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Suggestions for modifications to the design of the scheme, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructing a bypass at Kirkby Stephen; Alternative locations for the proposed bridge at West View Farm; and Relocation and reconsideration of the bridge and slip roads at Fox Tower View. 	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the scheme which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021 has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <p>Kirkby Stephen Bypass</p> <p>National Highways and the Department of Transport has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (TPRSS) (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option. A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>considered as part of the TPRSS. Although it was recognised that the by-pass would provide some localised journey time reliability and environmental benefits, the scale of these benefits would be much smaller than the more extensive intervention, associated with the full dualling of the A66. The TPRSS concluded that the A66 full dualling option delivered particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, which smaller interventions, such as the Kirkby Stephen by-pass could not deliver to the same level. National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and have concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not take forward a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.</p> <p>West View Farm and Fox Tower View</p> <p>The comments in relation to West View Farm overbridge and the bridge and slip roads at Fox Tower View are associated with the proposed local</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>access junction at the east end of the scheme.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact of the scheme and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p> <p>The location of the bridge and slip roads is determined by the local topography in the area as well as the need to minimise impacts on the AONB. The new A66 also ties into the existing A66 at this point and there are constraints with regard to alignment and visibility which have to be considered in relation to the position of the bridge and slip roads.</p>	
45	153308, 153902, 154459		153317, 153383, 154010, 154185	Request for further information	Respondents suggesting that more information is needed regarding a number of specific issues with the proposed route, including:	Throughout construction, there is likely to be a short-term effect on the way people access and enjoy the area. Consideration will be given to construction access and crossing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what is being done to prevent HGV traffic through Kirkby Stephen during the construction period; • reviewing flood risks due to recent flooding; • clarification over ownership of land at Fox Tower View that is designated as 'species-rich grassland'; • whether there has been a review of noise and air quality at Dyke Nook View, which is close to the new road; and • costs and plans for an alternative northern route have been considered. 	<p>points to ensure safety for our workers and other road users.</p> <p>Annex B13 of the EMP sets out, in an extended essay plan, the requirements of the Construction Traffic Management Plan. The Principal Contractor is required, in consultation with the relevant local / highways authority, to develop this document during detailed design. This will set out the temporary traffic management (TTM) strategy for the Project. The CTMP will provide details of how the works will be phased and how the associated TTM measures will be implemented for each phase in order to deliver the schemes safely and efficiently, while minimising the impact on the road users and other stakeholders affected by the Project.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. The Project will seek to keep stakeholders and local communities informed of the construction traffic management plans as the Project progresses, in order to minimise disruption for road users and the local community. In some locations, a dedicated haul road will be built alongside the new A66 to keep construction vehicles off local roads</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and to ensure that our construction teams can continue to safely access and exit the Project site. The Principal Contractor will define the requirements relating to traffic management during the construction phase and this will consider the need in settlements such as Kirkby Stephen for temporary alternative access arrangements and specific HGV routes to reduce the impact of construction traffic movements on local communities.</p> <p>We have assessed our design in areas of potential flooding, whether that is from groundwater, river water, surface water or from sewer sources. Local people have helped guide our flood modelling by providing their insight into flooding hotspots. We have mapped all these sources in the surrounding area and identified flood issues our design might cause. A flood risk assessment (FRA) is provided as part of our Development Consent Order application, contained in Appendix 14.2 part of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.4). The FRA assesses the risk of flooding to the scheme and from the scheme to third party land. The ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) sets out the proposed mitigation measures for flooding with further</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>details on these measures contained within Appendix 14.9 (Application Document 3.4). The includes specific mitigation measures for flooding for the Appleby to Brough scheme.</p> <p>Regarding species rich grassland we have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. The completed surveys have been used to inform the ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Document Reference 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The ES does consider the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Receptors around Dyke Nook View</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have been assessed and no significant adverse effects identified during the operation of the Project.</p> <p>The noise assessment as set out in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has identified both residential and non residential receptors that are likely to be subject to significant noise effects during construction and operation.</p> <p>Receptors around Dyke Nook View have been assessed and no significant adverse effects identified during the operation of the Project. The specific noise mitigation measures are to be detailed in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Application Document 2.7). Typically, low noise road surfacing material will be used on the dual carriageway to deliver benefits through reduced noise for nearby receptors. The ES sets out the expected noise changes as a result of the developed preferred option, including the effects of the mitigation measures which are incorporated into the design.</p> <p>The existing air quality along the A66 is generally good and the ES sets out how the improved road could change the local air quality. While there may be an increase in the volume of traffic using the A66 following our planned</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>improvements, the local road network can expect to see lower levels of air pollution. This is largely due to reduced vehicle emissions resulting from efficiencies and technological improvements in the national fleet between 2019 and 2029, for example with the introduction of electric vehicles.</p> <p>During Project design development the Project team has worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with enhanced knowledge and experience of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project.</p> <p>A summary of previous route options assessments carried out is presented in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
90	148620, 149369, 149407, 150175, 150179, 151330, 151469, 151470, 151484, 151486, 152178, 152211, 152238, 152906, 152979, 152995, 153045, 153319, 153366, 153386, 153798, 153799, 153835, 153839, 153851, 153860, 153862, 153912, 153929, 154171	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Musgrave Parish Council Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority	149418, 150173, 153568, 153968	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents referring to routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, in particular suggesting a cycle track from the A66 Café to the Coupland track.	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed parallel to the new dualled A66 for Appleby to Brough. Near to Café Sixty-Six there are proposals for an accommodation underpass for local farm access which will give pedestrians a segregated crossing of the dual carriageway. A shared cycleway/footway is proposed on the north side of the dual carriageway to tie into the existing PRoW in this location.</p> <p>Whist a further link to Coupland remains out of scope for this project, the option of providing a route on the north side of the A66 to connect to Cafe Sixty-six is part of our ongoing considerations and is subject to a separate Designated Funding application.</p> <p>Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	
115a	154012		154007	Construction - Mitigate construction	Respondents requesting further information and confirmation about the redline boundary near their land, apparatus being diverted onto their land and associated accommodation works required during construction.	<p>National Highways notes the comments in relation to accommodation works. Details of the red line boundary (Order Limits) for the Project can be found on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5).</p> <p>Any accommodation works agreed will be discussed with the individual landowners, and where appropriate occupiers concerned, alongside negotiations to acquire the interests in land that we require to deliver the Project. We have written to all relevant landowners with interests within the Order limits and invited those persons to negotiate the acquisition of the required interests in land. National Highways hopes that individual landowners concern in relation to accommodation works can be progress via this mechanism.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design of the Project the details of statutory undertakers' (SU's) plant and equipment have been procured. A clash detection exercise was undertaken overlaying the records with the proposed design to identify any</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						potential diversion or protection works. Initial meetings have been held with affect SU's and the redline line has been adjusted to incorporate any identified diversion or protection works. The requirement for and extents of diversion or protection will be confirmed at detailed design.	
115b		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Mitigate construction	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council request a feasibility study to be undertaken to determine the solution to issues on the Project's primary diversion route in Cumbria, working with the Councils to agree mitigation measures.	<p>The identification of diversion routes as necessary will be carefully considered and National Highways welcomes discussion about identified diversion routes.</p> <p>Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) sets out, in an extended essay plan, the requirements of the Construction Traffic Management Plan. A draft CTMP has been created at the preliminary design stage and the PC is required, in consultation with the relevant local / highways authority, to develop this document during detailed design. This will set out the temporary traffic management (TTM) strategy for the Project. The CTMP will provide details of how the works will be phased and how the associated TTM measures will be implemented for each phase in order to deliver the schemes safely and efficiently, while minimising the impact on the road users and other</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stakeholders affected by the Project. The rural nature of the A66, as it crosses the Pennines, means that there are few opportunities for suitable diversions along its 49-mile length. Initial discussions regarding suitable diversion routes and have taken place with the affected local authorities and the National Highways Area 13 & 14 team representatives. It should be noted that heavy goods vehicles will be diverted via the A69. The need for closures of the A66 will be kept to a minimum and the contractor will be required to maintain the single carriageway lengths of the A66 throughout the construction phase. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes. National Highways has continued to engage with the local authorities concerning construction diversion routes, following the Autumn 2021 consultation, as set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council. Further engagement on the details of the CTMP with the local authorities is a requirement of the EMP.</p> <p>In relation to the request for a feasibility study to be undertaken to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>determine any solutions to any potential issues on the Project's primary diversion route in Cumbria. We will look to work with the Council during the detailed design to determine the condition of the identified diversion routes and to agree any potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Visual inspections and conditions surveys will need to be carried out to agree if any remedial works will be required both before or after the construction works are complete. This is set out in the Environmental Management Plan, which will be secured by the DCO should it be made. National Highways welcomes discussion about these surveys.</p>	
116	149350, 152152, 152232, 152940, 152966, 153578, 153621, 153796, 153862, 153955, 154012, 154182, 154233, 154243, 154248	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152151, 152153, 152994, 153307, 153340, 153345, 154008, 154183, 154184, 154454	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents suggesting modifications to the design of route, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I.A cattle grid at Low Broomrigg; II.Fencing around the junction and along the track to Musgrave Lane; III.Moving the road at either side of Langrigg Westbound junction closer to the access road; Bringing the access road to Flitholme further south; IV.Providing a bypass to Kirkby Stephen; V.Moving the junction east to add a slip road at the Western end of Brough; 	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. Further information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below:</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					VI. Making the embankments steeper to use less land and infilling the old A66 to the west of Wheatsheaf Farm.	<p>I. Cattle grid locations will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways, future asset owners and landowners to discuss and agree details for fencing and accommodation works.</p> <p>II. Permanent fencing locations will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways, landowners and future asset owners, to discuss and agree details for fencing and accommodation works.</p> <p>III. Local road at Langrigg: we acknowledge the consultees' request to move the local road at Langrigg further south, however the design proposal for this local road has been developed to take into account local topography, design standards, and to provide a route outside of the flood plain to connect the new A66 with Flitholme Road and cannot be moved further to the south without adversely affecting these factors.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>IV. National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (TPRSS) (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the Preferred Route Announcement at the end of PCF Stage 2 in 2019. The feedback also relates to a number of other points which are considered below. A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the TPRSS. Although it was recognised that the by-pass would provide some localised journey time reliability and environmental benefits, the scale of these benefits would be much smaller than the more extensive intervention, associated with the full dualling of the A66. The TPRSS concluded that the A66 full dualling option delivered particularly strong benefits in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, which smaller interventions, such as the Kirkby Stephen by-pass could not deliver to the same level. National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and have concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not take forward a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.</p> <p>V. National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on the future quarry lorry movements. National Highways are unable to provide access to the Eastbound A66 at this location due to the position of the local road between Warcop and Brough on the northern side of the new A66.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>VI. The current design has adopted 1:3 earthwork slopes following review of the Phase 1 Ground Investigation Report. Should steepening of earthworks slopes need to be considered, further detailed ground investigations will be required at the detailed design stage at each individual location. National Highways have considered the specific request regarding infilling the existing A66 to the west of Wheatsheaf Farm. At this time it is not fully understood whether existing utilities apparatus in verges of existing A66 will be diverted/abandoned or remain so we are unable to confirm during this stage of design development. There may however be an opportunity to consider this further in subsequent stages of design.</p>	
117	153309, 153578, 153585, 153615, 153848, 153853, 153862, 153901,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152151, 152153, 153135, 153340, 153345, 154006, 154008, 154009,	Request for further information	Respondents requesting further information, including the potential need for mitigation related to the de-trunked sections of the A66 and the likelihood of unauthorised stopping occurring by travellers attending the fair, operational traffic through Appleby and Kirkby Stephen and the impact of	<p>De-trunking and unauthorised stopping</p> <p>National Highways has carried out initial discussions with local authorities on the proposed de-trunking strategy for the Project. A draft de-trunking agreement is currently being prepared</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154171, 154182, 154459		154010, 154183		<p>the scheme within Kirkby Stephen and other towns in the area. A query is also made as to whether there any plans to fund any improvements before the project begins.</p> <p>A query is also made as to what the maintenance requirements for areas of ecological mitigation will be and the extent of ecological mitigation.</p> <p>A query is also made as to several locations near Wildboar Hill with concerns earth works will dry up spring lines and what mitigation measures are in place for this.</p> <p>A query is also made as to whether the proposed pond North of West View, is required.</p> <p>A query is also raised in regards the spring at Flitholme and whether a hydrologist survey will be carried out prior to any construction works and again after construction.</p> <p>Respondents requesting further information about the final design of accommodation works.</p>	<p>by National Highways and further discussion with local authorities will be arranged to discuss the detail and manage this process going forward.</p> <p>While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour, unauthorised camping, and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for local services, including the local branch of the police service. During construction we will continue to liaise with the Multi Agency Strategic Co-ordinating Group (MASCAG) and the local authority around provision of safe stopping places.</p> <p>We have carried out a construction and operation traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project. This model considers the locations of Appleby, Kirkby Stephen, and other local towns. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). This traffic model underpins the technical environmental assessment carried out on the scheme including air quality and noise assessments.</p> <p>Mitigation/enhancement appropriate to the phase of the scheme (construction and operation) will be developed and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>implemented at these Project stages to mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>Maintenance and monitoring measures are outlined in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Once the Principal Contractor is appointed, longer term maintenance and monitoring programme will be developed.</p> <p>Road Drainage and the Water Environment</p> <p>Impacts of the scheme (e.g., from cuttings) on groundwater receptors are considered within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendix (Appendix 14 of Application Document 3.4). Field surveys and GIS/Site Investigation data have also been used to inform the EIA. Identified springs are included as potential receptors within the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment ES Appendix 14.6: Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.4) . Should assessments indicate that the receptor could potentially be impacted by the works, appropriate surveying will be carried out to confirm that the receptors have not been disturbed. Should the works result in disturbance of the supply, appropriate mitigation</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>will be implemented, or an alternative source supplied.</p> <p>With respect to Flitholme Spring the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) has concluded that: "The 'spring' is utilised for supply of fields and buildings but lies within the construction footprint, so will likely be directly impacted (i.e. loss of supply) by the proposed roadworks that will connect the Flitholme local road to the underpass. To prevent a significant impact on the water supply, appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures are to be implemented to ensure continued supply, in consultation with the stakeholder. With mitigation implemented as outlined above and within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), the risk posed to the receptors would be negligible, resulting in a slight adverse impact."</p> <p>With respect to Wildboar Hill the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) has concluded that: "due to uncertainty in the exact location of the springs, there is the potential for a significant impact without appropriate mitigation measures. Surveying of areas at risk prior to commencement</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of construction will assist in the identification of spring locations and enable a further assessment of risk to be carried out. If required following further assessment, appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures will need to be implemented to ensure continued supply (e.g. lining of cuttings or replacement mains supply etc), in consultation with the stakeholder. With mitigation implemented as outlined above and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), the risk posed to the receptors would be negligible, resulting in a slight adverse impact.</p> <p>With respect to the siting of drainage ponds, National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding their location and can advise that the proposed pond design must comply with design principle LI16, as stated in the Project Design Principles (PDP) document (Application Document 5.11). The design will provide enough capacity in the ponds to be able drain the scheme Infrastructure provided by the Project for a storm frequency advised by design guidance. The ponds will store water and will regulate and control the flow out of the pond into the outfalls, drainage ditches or watercourses. The outline drainage design is presented</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>In addition the effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water, have been assessed in detail and consider potential impacts to flows and impacts on water quality. This is reported in detail in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Ecological mitigation and planting</p> <p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation material presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along with details for drainage ponds and a number of these items</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>raised concerns from landowners and local residents. National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation proposals which are appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project. The planting proposals submitted with the DCO are illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps, (Application document 2.8).</p> <p>Accommodation Works</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project. Accommodation works will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways and landowners to discuss and agree details for accommodation works.</p>	
245	151520, 153578, 153629, 153800, 154012, 154182	Cumbria County Council	152151, 152153, 152980, 153379, 153568, 153806, 153934, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009,	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents suggesting mitigation measures in the engineering design, including noise mitigation measures such as wooden fences, evergreen trees and shrubs, and dampening road surfaces.</p> <p>Respondents specifically mention the Flitholme-Turks Head-Brough junctions, Lowgill Beck, West View,</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
			154010, 154183, 154184, 154212		between Appleby and Brough, Hayber Lane and Old Long Byre.	<p>stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. In relation to the specific points raised around Flitholme-Turks Head-Brough junctions, Lowgill Beck, West View, between Appleby and Brough, Hayber Lane and Old Long Byre the following mitigation measures.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the matters raised on mitigation measures and that the precise form of acoustic screening, where it is required, will be addressed as part of the detailed design. Other mitigation measures and design solutions are proposed to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the design of alignment and cuttings, a new smooth road surface and landscaped earthworks.</p> <p>Further information on Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for this location and others are set out in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and measure to manage and minimise noise are set out in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan – an Annex to the EMP (Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme and proposed lighting can be found within</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	
255	152232, 153851, 153862, 154012, 154182, 162160	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152151, 152153, 154006, 154008, 154010, 154183, 154184	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents suggesting changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An access road is made suitable for moving stock (Eastfield Farm), • Improving access to local farm buildings (West View Farm), • Moving access to Flitholme further south, , • Access along track to Warcop which runs from Flitholme junction to Warcop, • The current single lane A66 should be maintained for use of local residents. • Access is provided at all times for New Hall for all vehicular access. 	<p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways acknowledge the consultees' request, however after undertaking ongoing engagement with the affected landowner in this location the Project is not providing an access track. A fenced 10m grass margin from Flitholme Road to the field directly east of East Field Farm has been included within the scheme design with no through route to Warcop. The purpose of this grass margin is to allow occasional movement of sheep from the north side of the existing A66 to fields on the south using the underpass at Flitholme Road. • National Highways notes the consultees' request for the access track to go around the front of the buildings at West View Farm. This change has been accommodated into the proposed design. • National Highways acknowledges the consultees' request to move the Flitholme Road further south, however the design proposal for this local road has been developed 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>to take into account local topography, design standards, and to allow a safe route through the new underpass to connect to the existing A66 to be de-trunked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways acknowledges the consultees' request for improved access and the new junction at Warcop has been designed to allow safe access to the new A66 and local road network. • The outcome from the autumn consultation and engagement is that National Highways are proposing the Bivvy Site (on MoD land) as the preferred option for the relocation of Brough Hill Fair. The Bivvy Site is circa 5 acres in size, is adjacent to the current Brough Hill Fair site, and will be remediated so that the existing ground within the full site extents is rolled and compacted to provide a firm, evenly graded surface. Access to the site will be from Station Road. • National Highways acknowledges the request for the existing A66 to be retained for use by local residents. The proposed Project design maintains a local road between Moorhouse Lane and 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Brought using a combination of the existing A66 single carriageway, and a new local road built to the north of the existing A66.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to provide the additional carriageway to the new A66 the existing New Hall Farm underpass needs to be extended as the existing width and headroom is not sufficient for its intended future use. 	
309	150465	Warcop Parish Council		Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggest adding rest facilities to the scheme, including upgrading Café 66 to a small fuel station serving refreshments on either side of the new road, and upgrading Stainmore Services.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request, but the provision of services is not part of the Project scope. Access will be maintained to Cafe Sixty-six off of the new A66 eastbound carriageway.</p> <p>Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p>	No
313	148563, 148590, 148638, 149377, 149411, 150176,	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 153379, 153806, 153864,	Alternative route - North - Community impact	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should use an alternative northern route alignment because of the benefits it could create for local communities. Respondents suggest that a northern alignment would be	National Highways acknowledge the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150179, 150414, 152200, 152232, 152244, 152944, 152945, 152948, 152965, 152975, 153318, 153353, 153356, 153360, 153361, 153380, 153585, 153810, 153830, 153832, 153851, 153877, 153890, 153892, 153899, 153901, 153902, 153903, 153913, 153922, 153941, 154207, 154243, 154251,		154212, 154457		<p>preferred due to its distance from residential areas. Specifically, respondents state that Flitholme, Sandford, Warcop, Appleby Brough, and Langrigg could benefit from the route being further away. Others suggest that a northern alignment would create less community severance and eliminate the need to relocate the Brough Hill fair.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that residents should be prioritised over the MoD in regard to land use.</p>	<p>impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites.</p> <p>The individual points raised in the consultee response are considered further below:</p> <p>Route widening to the north at Sandford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation, between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane, proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing A66 carriageway. Details of the Appleby to Brough schemes development are provided in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) Following feedback received at the Autumn 2021 Consultation and in order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment was proposed. The new carriageway for the re-aligned A66 is proposed to be built on the northern side of the existing A66 carriageway rather 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154341, 154459, 154483					<p>than the southern side. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in Winter 2022. Refer to Chapter 7 of this Consultation Report. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were raised about drainage ponds at Sandford and near Warcop and as a consequence of the changes to the design in these areas National Highways have been able to refine pond design to reduce land take for the permanent works. <p>Warcop central section and a route further to the north</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges to the north of the existing A66. Through the design stage, work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected by policies of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) and by legislation as a nationally designated site..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm the road alignment was changed and an alignment was adopted with lower visual and noise impacts on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB. • During the design stage there was engagement with the MoD, Warcop Parish Council, local landowners, and Statutory Bodies on the alignment alternative. All were given the opportunity to comment, and engagement has shown there was support for this alternative when compared with the Preferred Route design announced in May 2020. As such, the revised route alignment 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for constructing the new route in the AONB a sifting exercise was carried out and an initial assessment of the route alignments against the policy considerations of the NNNPS (paragraph 5.151) was carried out prior to the Autumn 2021 Consultation and the assessment supported the case for exceptional circumstances for the incursion of the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB. This exceptional circumstances case has been developed following the Autumn 2021 Consultation and is presented in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) provides further details on the work carried out in assessing the route alignment against alternatives. National Highways acknowledges consultees' requests for a route even further into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66, but these routes would have considerable impact 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>on the AONB and MoD operations and are therefore considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent. Also National Highways needs to ensure that the route that is promoted accords with other national policy (as set out in the NNNPS), in addition to policy to protect the landscape of the AONB. This includes policy 5.54 that protects operational defence land, which states that “It is important that new national networks Infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>Brough Hill Fair Replacement Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair has been considered as part of the project and its location has been determined following ongoing engagement with the Gypsy Community and Landowners. The outcome from this consultation and engagement is that National Highways are proposing the Bivvy Site (on MoD land) as the preferred option for the relocation of Brough Hill 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Fair. The Bivvy Site is circa 5 acres in size, is adjacent to the current Brough Hill Fair site, and will be remediated so that the existing ground within the full site extents is rolled and compacted to provide a firm, evenly graded surface. Access to the site will be from Station Road.	
318	152911, 153366, 153856, 153956, 154182, 154243		153345, 153376, 154006	Engineering design and development - Additional improvements	<p>Respondents suggesting improvements to the engineering design including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An upgraded junction with the A685 to Kendal; • The creation of a Kirkby Stephen bypass • The introduction of cattle grids. 	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at the preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Upgraded junction with the A685 Kirkby Stephen bypass</p> <p>National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the Preferred Route Announcement at the end of PCF Stage 2 in 2019. A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the TPRSS. Although it was recognised that the by-pass would provide some localised journey time reliability and environmental benefits, the scale of these benefits would be much smaller than the more extensive intervention, associated with the full dualling of the A66. The TPRSS concluded that the A66 full dualling option delivered particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, which smaller interventions, such as the Kirkby Stephen by-pass could not deliver to the same level. National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and have concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not take forward a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Cattle grid locations will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways, future asset owners and landowners to discuss and agree details for fencing and accommodation works.	
320	153621, 153800, 153872, 154243, 154250, 154462		162158	Alternative route - Other	Respondents suggesting alternative northern routes. These include combining Warcop eastbound, westbound and Sandford junctions into one; moving the road away from the railway line; moving the route further south; and moving the A66 westbound junction to a new location.	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Further details are described in section 5.5 of the Project Development Overview Report, (Document Reference 4.1).</p> <p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways acknowledges the consultees requests for the Project to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges to the north of the existing A66. Through the design stage work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.. The more northerly route requested by the consultee is considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent. given the potential impact on the AONB and conflicts with national policy. Also National Highways needs to ensure that the route that is promoted accords with other national policy (as set out in the NNNPS), in addition to policy to protect the AONB. This includes policy 5.54 that protects operational defence land, which states that “It is important that 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>new national networks Infra-structure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways also acknowledge the concerns about construction noise and disruption when the site works commence. The planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during the detailed design phase; and • National Highways acknowledge the concern about land being taken by the Project on the south side of the existing A66. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites. If required mitigation for land lost will be provided that is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project. 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
413	153332, 153386, 153578, 153862, 154012		152151, 154008, 154183	Land - Facilities / amenities	Respondents suggesting additional facilities and amenities to compensate for changes in land use, including an agricultural shed on MoD land and the provision of parking facilities for HGVs.	<p>National Highways note the consultees' comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement.</p> <p>National Highways note the request to relocate the landowners' agricultural farm building onto land owned by the MoD. However we cannot acquire land from one landowner, thereby impacting on their operation, to meet the needs of another.</p> <p>National Highways are in ongoing discussions with landowners and detail of accommodation works will be developed further in the next stage of the Project. Provision of dedicated HGV facilities is outside the scope of this Project but lay-bys will be provided as close to the current locations as practicle and in line with guidance.</p>	No
416	150473, 154012		152153	Engineering design and development - Compound location	Respondents suggesting relocating the compound to anywhere else, and another requesting topsoil be located in an alternative location to level their fields out.	National Highways note the consultees concerns about potential compound locations and since the Autumn 2021 Consultation these locations have been refined and were part of a Spring 22. Supplementary Consultation with further locations of the compounds proposed. The outcome of the consultation is contained in Chapter 7 and Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						We acknowledge the consultees request for surplus topsoil to be used to regrade fields. Further work and engagement with landowners is ongoing to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans. Details are being refined to ensure any mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project and reduce impacts on affected landowners.	
417	150179, 152244, 153578, 153621, 153862, 154012, 154483		152151, 152153, 153135, 153340, 153345, 154183	Land - Land take	Respondents suggesting mitigation measures for land take, including taking some land from the MoD; minimising the amount of agricultural land used for environmental mitigation in general and ponds; and moving the road at Langrigg further south.	National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The feedback received at the Autumn 2021 Consultation relates to a number of points which are considered below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West View Farm access tracks: we acknowledge the consultee's concerns regarding the location of the track on the north side of the new A66 adjacent to West View Farm underpass. The consultee's request has been considered, however, moving it to the east is not possible due to the land closer to the beck being designated to be used for flood compensation and this flood plain 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>compensation cannot be achieved elsewhere, likewise by connecting the underpass to the existing farm track to north of existing A66 reduces impact on the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sizes and proposed positions of the land that has been identified as being required for surface water drainage features has been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, ground conditions, designated flood zone locations, available outfall options and watercourse outfall depths. • Local road at Langrigg: we acknowledge the consultees request to move the local road at Langrigg further south, however the design proposal for this local road has been developed to take into account local topography, design standards, and to provide a route outside of the flood plain to connect the new A66 with Flitholme Road and cannot be moved further to the south without adversely affecting these factors • Environmental mitigation in general: we acknowledge the consultee's concerns on 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>environmental mitigation proposals presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation which presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along with details for drainage ponds and a number of these items raised concerns from landowners and local residents. National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation proposals which are appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of land identified for surface water features : we acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding the location and size of these areas identified for surface water attenuation on the south side of the new A66, adjacent to Station Road. The consultees request has been considered and since the Autumn 2021 Consultation the land identified as being required for surface water drainage features has been reduced in size. However, moving them to the 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						northern side of new A66 is not possible due to the land to the north being designated to be used for flood compensation and which cannot be achieved elsewhere within the scheme.	
419	154182		154007	Land - Agricultural	Respondents suggesting mitigating the effects of the land take on nearby agriculture by relocating drainage ponds, and provision of an agricultural shed on MoD land with sheep handling facilities to reduce movement of sheep.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding pond sizes and locations and advise that the proposed positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, and watercourse outfall depths.</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees comments regarding accommodation works and these will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways and landowners to discuss and agree details. Any proposals in relation to the Ministry of Defence land will require the agreement of the Ministry of Defence and accord with national policy of the NNNPS, including policy 5.54 that protects operational defence land, which states that “It is important that new national networks Infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets”.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
423		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents suggest there could be increases in traffic flows which could lead to more accidents and therefore mitigation related to safety improvements may be required on this section of the A685.	National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee, however any works to the A685 are outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location. An assessment of Project impacts on accidents as detailed in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) concludes that the project will not only reduce the number of accidents on the A66 itself, but also on the surrounding road network as a result of the increased flow on the A66 removing traffic from other rural links.	No
427			154008, 154009	Community impact - Property	Respondents suggesting the relocation of negatively impacted residential properties, Dacre House, and Hylton Holme.	The environmental assessment carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase (Environmental Statement, Application Document 3.2). Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been developed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
470	152224, 152965, 153319			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting introducing different forms of traffic control to improve safety, including restricting HGVs to the inside lane only; 40mph restrictions to control HGV traffic and traffic calming around the main route into to Brough, especially because of the proximity of the school.	National Highways acknowledge the comments of the consultee regarding traffic control to improve safety. We would not consider restricting HGVs to the inside lane of the A66. Slow moving HGVs would potentially cause major delays to traffic if this type of restriction is put in place. A high proportion of the traffic using the A66 is freight based including many heavy goods vehicles. Two of the objectives of the Project are to provide additional capacity to reduce delays and queues and to provide reliability to reduce congestion and improve the reliability of users journeys across the route. The A66 is a high speed road that bypasses Brough. We have assessed the route as part of the traffic modelling work and have no justification to consider reducing the speed limit from 60mph which would impact our Project objectives of better capacity and reliability. With regards a proposed 40mph on the approach into Brough, this sits outside of the scope of this Project and would be the responsibility of the local authority to consider if works are required to Main Street. The new A66, side roads and junctions will be designed to latest standards	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and speed limits will be enforced by an appropriate signing strategy.	
537	151353, 151461, 152174, 152248, 152975, 153319, 153329, 153907, 154207			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents suggesting improving routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents suggest different detailed routes along the scheme, particularly where there are currently sections where walkers, cyclists and horse-riders do not currently have safe provision.	<p>The Project objectives include improving routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.</p> <p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, an east-west walking and cycling route has now been added to the Appleby to Brough scheme. The type and detail of the route varies along the scheme length but is typically a shared cycleway either as a standalone facility or combined with private means of access tracks.</p> <p>The proposed WCH provisions are a betterment of the current provision, particularly the improvement in east-west connectivity which not only creates longer east-west active travel routes but also connect existing north-south PRoW to enhance available recreation routes in the area. The grade separation of crossing facilities also provides enhancements in safety for users.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. Where a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. Again the detail and type varies depending on the classification on the existing route which is severed/reconnected.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
591	153380, 153629, 153798, 153800, 153810, 153822, 153836, 153875, 153890, 153891, 153899, 153901, 153902, 153903, 153946,	Musgrave Parish Council	153379, 153806, 153864, 154219, 154234, 154454	Alternative route - North - Land	<p>Respondents suggesting that an alternative northern route should be chosen for the scheme because it could have a reduced impact on land use. Respondents suggest that a northern route could go through AONB land without encroaching upon the MoD firing range, which they suggest is unappealing scrubland. Others suggest that a northern route should be chosen to minimise the loss of productive agricultural land. Respondents also suggest that since the land to the north is owned by the government, it would be simpler to</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out in the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153955, 154250, 154264, 154341, 154459				acquire land. Others state that the natural topography of the land in the north could act as a natural mitigator for noise pollution and visual blight.	<p>highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them. However paragraph 5.151 of the NNNPS states that the Secretary of State should refuse development consent in these areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. Any alternative routes through the AONB will require an exceptional circumstances case to be put forward.</p> <p>Please refer to the section 5.6 of the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1) which details how the Appleby to Brough scheme alignment has been developed and options that have been considered. A sifting exercise was carried out for the scheme, prior to the autumn 2021 consultation, to compare the alignment alternatives for the scheme. Alignments were assessed against engineering, environmental, traffic, economic, stakeholder principles, with commentary on policy conformity. Any route through MoD land would need careful consideration.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Any proposals in relation to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) land will require the agreement of the MoD and accord with national policy of the NNNPS, including policy 5.54 that protects operational defence land, which states that "It is important that new national networks Infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets".</p> <p>The Warcop camp is an active facility with live rounds being fired so health and safety would require a lot of consideration and possible relocation of facilities. Ground investigation including detailed below ground surveys would be required to confirm ground conditions and to rule out the presence of unexploded ordnances. Similar to other land owners, the MoD would require compensation and relocation of facilities if they were impacted by the scheme</p> <p>The MoD land is deemed to be Crown land and the transfer of the land will be by agreement between the MoD and National Highways. MoD will only agree to any land transfer once any identified conditions and requirements in regard to their operations have been agreed.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>In terms of the topography of the land to the north acting as a natural mitigator for noise pollution and visual blight, we cannot comment on this currently. Detailed surveys and assessments would be required to assess noise and landscape impacts for any proposed alignment.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	
598	151504, 152948, 153061, 153798, 153911, 154255, 154483	Warcop Parish Council		Community impact - Listen to locals	<p>Respondents suggesting that more engagement with local people is needed to understand potential impacts on the local community. Comments include local opinions are less valued than environmental issues concerning the AONB; alternatives have not been properly considered although these would be favoured by local people.</p>	<p>Engagement has been ongoing through the Appleby to Brough scheme Community Liaison Group and with Warcop Parish Council. Valued Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. National Highways' project team were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application.</p> <p>In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its non-technical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.</p> <p>The Route Development Report (RDR) for the Project (included as Appendix 3 of the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)), was produced just before autumn 2021 consultation and includes details of the early development of the Appleby to Brough scheme and gives insight into the alternatives alignments considered before the preferred alignment was chosen.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the options considered and assessment criteria used to identify the preferred alignment.</p> <p>Further details of the environmental assessment on the various alternative routes considered can be found in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
601	150434, 152200, 152948, 153380, 153578, 153851, 153872, 153877, 153901, 153911, 153955, 154250, 154255,	Warcop Parish Council	153864	Alternative Route - North - Environment	<p>Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section should be selected on the grounds that it would be less visually intrusive to local residents and would also be more scenic for motorists on the route, and less loss of valuable land on the south side.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154462, 154483					<p>the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the A66.</p> <p>The PDOR (Application Document 4.1) details how the Appleby to Brough scheme alignment has been developed and the options that have been considered.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concern about valuable land being taken by the Project on the south side of the existing A66 at Sandford. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts, including visual impacts, on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites. In Autumn 2021, the route promoted between Café Sixty-six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>on the southern side of the existing carriageway. In order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment has been made. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further supplementary consultation was carried out on this matter in Spring 22. Refer to Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) for this item. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.</p> <p>An assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the Scheme has been undertaken and is reported in ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
603	152948, 153901, 153902, 153922, 154207, 154470		153968	Community impact - Listen to locals	<p>Respondents suggest further local engagement about community impact, on the grounds that local communities have the best understanding of how the Project will impact people's health, livelihoods, and environment. Respondents state that a northern</p>	<p>Regarding points about people's health and environment, an assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>bypass was the agreed preferred option at a Public Meeting in Warcop Parish Hall on 23 July 2021 and not enough consideration has been given to this option.</p>	<p>carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.</p> <p>In regard to points about engagement, National Highways have continued to engage with stakeholders, Community Liaison Groups, landowners and PILs to keep them updated on the progress of the Project and discuss any technical matters relevant to the preparation of the Project. National Highways do not view engagement and consultation as a single point in time and this has been reflected in our ongoing approach to engaging at a local, regional and national level as set out in the Consultation Report [Application document 4.4]. National Highways listened to local communities through the consultation process that was carried out in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the host local authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was shared and feedback received via online, at public events, and local deposit locations. National Highways' Project team were on hand at exhibitions to explain and listen to matters relating the proposals. The material published for the autumn 2021 consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals. National Highways are committed to continued engagement with stakeholders and the local community as the Project progresses through Examination, and if development consent is granted, into the detailed</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>design and construction stage of the Project</p> <p>All feedback from the consultation has been thoroughly reviewed and National Highways have used it to help improve the final design. Following the 2021 statutory consultation, design changes were made to the Project. These considered feedback from the consultation, ongoing engagement with stakeholders and landowners, as well as results from emerging environmental survey data and technical assessment work. Some of these changes resulted in further smaller supplementary consultations, set out in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report [Application document 4.4].</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the options considered and assessment criteria used to identify the preferred alignment..</p> <p>The Route Development Report (RDR) for the Project (included as Appendix 3 of the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)), was produced just before autumn 2021 consultation and includes details of the early development of the Appleby to Brough scheme and gives insight into the alternatives alignments considered before the preferred alignment was chosen.</p>	
605	149794, 150176, 150179, 152200, 152948, 153347, 153356, 153380, 153810,	Musgrave Parish Council Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 151476, 153864, 153968, 154212	Alternative route - North - Economics / cost	Respondents suggesting that a northern route alignment would be beneficial due to its possible economic and cost benefits. Respondents state, in general terms, that a northern route would be cheaper to construct. Others specifically suggest that the route would require fewer junctions, therefore costing less to build.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153830, 153863, 153872, 153890, 153901, 153902, 153946, 154207, 154341				<p>Respondents state that a northern route alignment could result in fewer compulsory purchases and contraflow requirements, thus lowering costs. One respondent feels that a northern route through an AONB could generate tourism.</p>	<p>protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route being put forward would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, environmental impacts, highway alignments. Junctions, drainage requirements, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives taken forward, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	
606	150176, 152200, 152914, 153863, 153910, 153946, 154341	Musgrave Parish Council Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 153864, 154212	Alternative route - North - Engineering design and development	<p>Respondents suggesting that a northern route would be a better alternative as it would require fewer junctions and slip roads, thus simplifying engineering processes. Others state that mitigation measures such as screening and balancing ponds could be easier to incorporate into a northern route.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside</p>	USERS

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>Currently the proposed scheme has 5 no junctions or accesses on to the A66. By moving the new carriageway north it may have been possible to reduce the number of junctions but there will be other potential engineering challenges in terms of embankments on the side of the hillside, drainage considerations, steeper gradients for WCH users,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>more bridge structures which may be complex to build and a reduction of environmental mitigation opportunities close to the A66.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	
653		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Access during construction	Respondents suggesting additions to the Construction Traffic Management Plan around managing Appleby Horse Fair traffic during construction.	The Appleby Horse Fair is an largescaleevent that will require careful traffic management to ensure it can take place successfully, without traffic congestion issues over and above what would be expected at an event of this nature. The Principal Contractor will work closely with Local Authority and stakeholder representatives close to the fair to ensure additional mitigation measures are implemented. Such measures and agreements will be incorporated into the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).	No
673	149794, 150176, 150179, 152200, 152965, 153329, 153347, 153877, 153890,	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183	Alternative route - North - Construction	Respondents suggesting that an alternative northern route would be a better proposal because it may be easier to construct. Respondents state that building an offline route would increase worker safety and reduce traffic disruption during construction. Others claim that fewer structures such as bridges would have to be	National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153901, 153922, 154264				constructed if a northern route was chosen. One respondent list, in detail, the potential logistical and design benefits that a northern route could bring to the construction process.	<p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Currently the proposed scheme has 5 no junctions or accesses on to the A66. By moving the new carriageway north it may have been possible to reduce the number of junctions but there will be other potential engineering challenges in terms of embankments on the side of the hillside, drainage considerations, steeper gradients for WCH users, more bridge structures which may be complex to build and a reduction of environmental mitigation opportunities close to the A66.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p> <p>Taking note of the point raised, National Highways is confident that when taking all elements into consideration the current proposed route selection is the most appropriate to improve journey reliability time and safety for road users, whilst looking to mitigate the effects of construction. the construction of either route option will always remain challenging, with the Principal Contractors ensuring the safety of the workforce, stakeholders and road users at all times.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
718	151462, 153839, 153911		153568	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	Respondents suggesting encouraging active travel through safe routes and local and national initiatives.	A low-speed, low-traffic route parallel to the A66 for pedestrians and cyclists is part of the proposals, where it has been possible to accommodate this in order to provide an active travel corridor for these groups. As well as providing new routes this provision also replaces and connects existing routes affected by the A66 improvements. This has been achieved through utilising the verge of the de-trunked sections of single carriageway, where they remain open to traffic or providing a route parallel to the new dual carriageway. All facilities for WCH users would be a betterment, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement Project and will provide further opportunity to encourage a shift towards active travel for communities along the route. Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19). Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	Yes
729	149374, 153365			Traffic, transport, and junctions -	Respondents suggesting that sustainable transport should be prioritised, that the investment in the	National Highways acknowledges the views with regard to the need to reduce reliance on motor vehicles.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Sustainable transport	Project should instead be put towards public transport, and that goods could be transported by train as well as more local options.	<p>National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. The plan states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads remain an integral part of our economy and wider transport system.</p> <p>Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>To improve the strategic east west links within the north there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). The east coast and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle.</p> <p>The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the Government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the UK. The Case for the Project Chapter 5 (Application Document 2.2) captures the economic assessment that has been carried out for the Project. The cost of the Project is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic.</p> <p>As part of the RIS2 National Highways are committed to improving public transport where it can, such as by working with local authorities and service providers to make sure that public transport journeys on the Strategic Road Network works for everyone.</p> <p>National Highways believe that delivering this Project will bring far-reaching benefits to those that use and live near the route. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) outlines the benefits and opportunities that the Project intends to deliver. In developing the route National</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Highways has considered and consulted with the local community to ensure that the chosen route bring as much benefit to as many as possible. Achieving these benefits are also part of the objectives set out for the Project and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-connecting currently severed communities and provide better links between settlements along the route, as well as improving access to services such as healthcare, employment areas and education. • Providing improved access to key tourist such as the North Pennines, Lake District and Yorkshire Dales. • Minimising noise levels for people living and working near the route and reduce the congestion currently occurring in the single carriageway sections. To minimise any potential negative impacts on the natural environment and landscapes of the North Pennines and Lake District through sensitive design and where appropriate, mitigation. • To improve strategic regional and national connectivity, particularly for freight hauliers. Heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) account for a 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>quarter of all traffic on the road and any delays to journeys can have a negative effect on business and commerce, including lost working time, loss of perishable goods, and missed shipment slots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and UK Government levelling-up agenda. 	
734	148619		154234	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting prioritising the needs of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders over the needs of motorised transport users, without providing further detail.	<p>Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network, leading to worsening problems on the A66. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>A shared safe cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents between Appleby and Brough.</p> <p>Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plan (Application Document 5.19).</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	
738	148549, 152224, 152945, 152965, 153045, 153059, 153319, 153362, 153366, 153386, 153811, 153961, 154471		150173, 153568, 153864, 153964, 162158	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting traffic control measures including speed limits, speed cameras, traffic lights, diversions around local towns including Kirkby Stephen (A685), HGVs limited to a single lane and appropriate signage, including for local businesses.	National Highways acknowledges your suggestion regarding the provision of traffic related measures around local towns and villages like Kirkby Stephen. The Project we are proposing to deliver has four core objectives which revolve around the A66 route which forms part of the strategic road network. Firstly to provide economic benefits, secondly transport, by improving safety and journey times, community and environment. The Project comprises of eight schemes to improve the A66 between M6 J40 at Penrith and A1(M) J53 at Scotch Corner. The Project would involve improving the junctions on the M6 and A1 as well as improving six separate single carriageway lengths of road to dual carriageway standard and making improvements to the junctions within each of those lengths. The Project scope does not include improvements to the local road network unless required as a direct impact of the Project. These issues should be directed to the local highway authorities. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(PDOR) (Application Document 4.1) and The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for details of the Project's proposals.</p> <p>The existing traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs along the A66 Project extents will be upgraded as part of the works. The provision of new signs for local businesses will be considered at the detailed design stage. We acknowledge the concerns of the consultee regarding speed of traffic on and leaving/exiting the new A66. The new A66, side roads and junctions will be designed to latest standards and speed limits will be enforced by an appropriate signing strategy, however any works to the A685 is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location.</p> <p>The A66 is a high speed road and we would not consider restricting heavy goods traffic to one lane. A large proportion of traffic using the A66 is freight, by restricting them to one lane slow moving vehicles will cause severe delays.</p>	
757	153316, 153833			Traffic, transport, and junctions -	Respondents suggesting investing in and encouraging sustainable modes of transport, including electric powered	National Highways acknowledges your views with regard to the need to reduce reliance on motor vehicles. However, this is a national issue which	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Sustainable transport	motor vehicles and non-car transport solutions.	<p>rests with Central Government Policy. On the A66 Project we are working to the remit given to us by Department for Transport to dual the remaining sections of single carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner. The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone.</p> <p>In terms of electric vehicle charging, the RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the SRN and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023. RIS2 is also fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise freight including finding approaches to move the freight sector away from diesel. National Highways are also working to integrate better with other modes of transport including on improving connections with rail freight terminals. As part of the RIS2 National Highways are committed to improving public transport where it can, such as by working with local authorities and service providers to make sure that public transport</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>journeys on the Strategic Road Network works for everyone.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel . Full details are provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
762	148577, 151481, 151501, 152200, 152948, 153353, 153578, 153877, 153901, 153911, 154197, 154211	Warcop Parish Council		Alternative Route - North - General / no reason given	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section should be selected, without offering further clarification.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route you are putting forward would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
770	149794, 152945, 152975, 153318, 153851, 153877, 153886, 153887, 153895, 153901, 153902, 154255	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 153321, 153964	Alternative route - North - Traffic, transport, and junctions	<p>Respondents suggesting that a northern route alignment would be a better alternative to the proposed scheme on the grounds of traffic, transport, and junction advantages. Respondents state that a northern route would require fewer junctions, bridges, and underpasses. Others suggest that a northern alignment would create less traffic disruption during construction. Respondents suggest that a northern route would allow locals and agricultural vehicles to use the old A66 as an access route.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route being put forward would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, environmental impacts, highway alignments. Junctions, drainage requirements, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives taken forward, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	
771	148577, 149350, 149411, 150176, 150179, 150434, 151330, 151481, 151501, 152200, 152244,	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 151476, 152980, 153129, 153317, 153864, 154185, 154212	Alternative route - North - Environment / wildlife	<p>Respondents suggesting that a northern route alignment would be better for wildlife and the environment. Respondents claim that the route would be less disruptive to habitats and would provide more opportunities for conservation if situated in the North Pennines AONB. Respondents state that noise, light, and visual impacts on properties could be reduced. Respondents also feel that a northern</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152948, 152965, 153380, 153810, 153830, 153832, 153851, 153901, 153902, 153905, 153910, 153913, 153915, 153922, 154207, 154459, 154483				route could be less of a flood risk. Others claim that the existing AONB is currently an AONB only in name and building upon it would not be detrimental to the environment.	<p>stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation</p> <p>Mitigation proposals were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation which presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting. Ongoing engagement with landowners is being carried out to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation plans and details are being refined up to DCO submission to ensure any mitigation is appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project. Full details of the environmental assessment and proposed mitigation are included with the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>Consideration of route further north</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the consultee's request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p> <p>National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. The route alignment was spilt into three sections, east, central and western and the four options considered were compiled from the options for each section. Further detail of the assessment can be found under Section 5.5 of the PDOR.</p>	
775	150434, 152244, 152948, 153798, 153863, 153903,		153864, 154234, 162158	Alternative Route - North - Cost	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section should be selected on the grounds that it would be cheaper to construct.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154197, 154211					<p>AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2)	
777	152200, 153955, 154197, 162155		162158	Alternative Route - North - Modified design	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section could be improved by including a new carriageway between Café 66 and the Sandford Junctions, and a more northern route between Warcop and Brough.	<p>The consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66 cannot be pursued as we need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.	
786	148549, 148580, 148589, 152914, 152923, 153851		153968, 154214	Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting providing facilities for motorhome users and people needing overnight stops along the route, including restaurants, health and hygiene amenities, parking, and other rest facilities.	New service/rest areas for HGV's or motorhomes are not within the scope of the Project. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of supporting new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.	No
797	153901, 154211			Alternative Route - North - Land take	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section would result in using less land that is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as well as requiring less compulsory purchase of property.	The consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66 cannot be pursued as we need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	
809	152227, 152973, 153836, 153886, 153887, 153895, 153901			Alternative Route - North - Traffic - access	<p>Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section would be better for improving traffic flows and accessibility to other local roads including land used by and for the army.</p>	<p>The consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66 cannot be pursued as we need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities. National Highways has been in regular dialogue with the MoD throughout the current design phase and they are content with the proposed means of access to their land.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66. A route to the north would comprise the same dual carriageway cross section and inherent capacity provision and therefore would not improve traffic flows beyond the preferred route.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the Project objectives. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
810	149410, 152227, 152244, 152948,	Warcop Parish Council	162158	Alternative Route - North - Community impact	Respondents expressing concerns that the route is situated in the south which would cause disruption to villages. A number of respondents feel that the	National Highways acknowledges the consultees requests for the Project to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152973, 153836, 153863, 153901, 153903				new road should be to the north, using MoD land.	<p>training ranges to the north of the existing A66. Through the design stage, work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>The autumn 2021 consultation for the Project offered local communities and stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the proposals presented. As a result of the feedback and consideration of further information, two opportunities were taken to change the design along the route of the Appleby to Brough scheme. One of the changes was to move the alignment of the new A66 to the north of Sandford, as requested by local responders, with the proposed junction was also moved. Further details can be found the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1). , section 5.5. These design changes have been further consulted on with impacted stakeholders as part of the supplementary consultation carried out early 2022.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Route Development Report (RDR) for the Project (included as Appendix 3 of the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)), was produced just before autumn 2021 consultation and includes details of the early development of the Appleby to Brough scheme and gives insight into the alternatives alignments considered before the preferred alignment was chosen.</p> <p>National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the alternative route alignment options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>As highlighted above one of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						accommodation works to relocate required facilities.	
812	150434, 152267, 153901			Alternative Route - North - Local economy	Respondents suggesting that an alternative North Route for this section would have a positive impact on the local economy by interfering less with existing local businesses and encouraging tourism to villages further North.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>As highlighted above one of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB;</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the alternative northern route in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>As highlighted above we have not undertaken any assessment work on an alternative northern route so cannot comment if it would have a positive or negative impact in terms of the local economy or tourism.</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 Population and Human Health guidance, is set out in the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 3.2). This assessment considers how the scheme will support Cumbria's Local Industrial Strategy and provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the scheme at a routewide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p>	
814	149781, 149787, 150176, 151474, 151501, 152948,		149376, 149418, 149788, 150183, 151476, 153806,	Alternative route - North - General / no reason given	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should use an alternative route to the north of the proposed route without providing further details.	The consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66 cannot be pursued as we need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153061, 153349, 153810, 153836, 153872, 153890, 153901, 153961, 154207, 154213		153964, 154185, 154454			<p>protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities. National Highways has been in regular dialogue with the MoD throughout the current design phase and they are content with the proposed means of access to their land.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66. A route to the north would comprise the same dual carriageway cross section and inherent capacity provision and therefore would not improve traffic flows beyond the preferred route.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the Project objectives. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
818	153329	Musgrave Parish Council	152983	Engineering design and development - Improve existing route	<p>Respondents suggest that potential improvements to the existing route could be made, including moving the route onto the AONB rather than the south side of the A66 since the AONB land needs improvement.</p> <p>Another suggests that a road to Tebay would be more effective on the grounds that Kirkby Stephen will need a bypass soon.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>As highlighted above one of the key considerations in the design</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route, further into the AONB, would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the alternative northern route in detail in terms of economics, cost of construction or land purchase impacts.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the suggestion of the consultee, however any works to connect to Tebay, in relation to a by-pass of Kirkby Stephen is outside of the scheme scope and no works are planned in this location.</p> <p>National Highways and the Department of Transport has carried out a process of evaluation of options at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Northern Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (NTPRSS) (2014-16). This earlier work concluded that dualling the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was to be progressed to PCF Stage 1, Option identification (refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information).</p> <p>A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the NTPRSS.</p> <p>National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and has concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						assessment work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not progress a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.	
855	148612, 149366, 152208, 153792		153129, 153379, 153806, 153959	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents suggest mitigation measures for the impacts of the engineering design and development of the scheme, including further noise mitigation methods, including road surfacing, barrier materials and earth bank screening; visual screening; earth shaping; tree-planting and for drainage ponds to be located north of the carriageway which will reduce their visual impact.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the suggestions for mitigation. As part of the environmental design, consideration is given to any properties experiencing adverse impacts during or after construction and mitigation measures will be provided.</p> <p>The assessment of the likely significant noise and vibration effects of the construction and operation of the scheme is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects.</p> <p>In relation to the Appleby to Brough scheme the worse case noise levels in the during the pavement construction phase may exceed permitted levels during the road construction phase for a number of properties within the defined noise assessment area. The Contractor will need to determine whether applications under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 are appropriate or required in relation to noise management and what</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>temporary measures may be required. Guidance is provided in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) in relation to permitted noise levels and required mitigation.</p> <p>A number of residential and non residential properties have been identified as being impacted by the operation of the scheme following construction. Mitigation measures in the form of noise barriers or landscape bunds have been included in the proposed works.</p> <p>With regards the mitigation measures you suggest we make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new carriageway surfacing which meets current design standards will be provided across the majority of the scheme extents. The surfacing will provide a smooth running surface, , cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features will be used to reduce noise impacts during operation. • Tree planting will be provided as part of the environmental mitigation works, refer to the Environmental Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8) 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>We acknowledge consultees concerns regarding pond sizes and locations. The proposed positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography, and watercourse outfall depths.</p>	
856	152200, 152945	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 150183, 153864	Alternative route - North - Walking, cycling and horse-riders	<p>Respondents suggesting that an alternative northern route would be beneficial for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders by reducing the number of pedestrian routes diverted or closed due to construction and could create better views for walkers. They suggest that the old A66 could be used for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, and the old A66 could provide safe access for Appleby Horse Fair attendees.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees' request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, we need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66.</p> <p>We acknowledge the request for the existing A66 to be retained for use by local residents. The proposed Project design maintains a local road between Moorhouse Lane and Brough using a combination of the existing A66 single carriageway, and a new local road built to the north of the existing A66. A cycleway being provided the full length of the proposed Project will complete the connection between Moorhouse Lane and the scheme extends beyond Cafe Sixty-Six to the west for non-motorised users.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
857	153877		149376, 150183, 151476, 153864	Alternative route - North - Safety	<p>Respondents suggesting that an alternative Northern route would be a better option due to the potential increased safety it could bring. Respondents state that traffic flow would be smoother on this route due to the need for fewer junctions, resulting in less collisions usually associated with congestion. Other respondents state that the route would be safer during construction as contractors would not be close to live traffic.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route being put forward would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, environmental impacts, highway alignments. Junctions, drainage requirements, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives taken forward, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them. National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66. Application Document 4.1).	
930	149370		153135	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Restrict access	Respondents suggesting restricting access to horse-drawn vehicles and preventing horse-racing on the road.	Horse-drawn vehicles are permitted to use the highway though should be operated and maintained in accordance with standards set out in the Department for Transport's Code of Practice for Horse-Drawn Vehicles. Horse-racing is not permitted on the public highway and is a matter for the Police.	No
992	149367, 149374, 153365, 153862			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting that more should be done to reduce road demand, including increasing use of public transport and trains for goods, and discouraging individual car usage. Respondents state that the Project encourages greater vehicle usage.	All major highway projects are progressed through a standardised project life cycle. The initial phase of the lifecycle is the pre-project phase which identifies and prioritises potential transport issues, shaping, investigating and assessing the viability of solutions to the problems. As part of this Project a range of options were investigated and assessed against engineering, economic, financial, and environmental criteria. The options included alternative highway and non-highway solutions such as the A69 and the rail	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>link between Carlisle and Newcastle. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the lifecycle process and the options assessed.</p> <p>National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
1033	152945			Alternative route - North - Cultural heritage	One respondent suggesting that the scheme should use an alternative route to the north of the proposed route to avoid historic sites.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route being put forward would not conform</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route you are advocating in detail in terms of economics, environmental impacts, highway alignments. Junctions, drainage requirements, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives taken forward, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66. Application Document</p>	
1070	150189, 151520			Engineering design and development - Priority of works	Respondents suggesting that work begins on specific areas of the scheme first, including resurfacing at Coupland Beck.	<p>National Highways acknowledge respondents views on construction sequencing which will be considered further in the detailed design and construction preparation phase.</p> <p>National Highways is currently reviewing the order in which the construction of all proposed schemes across the Project will be built. This decision will be based on a number of factors including efficiency, cost effectiveness and minimising impact on stakeholders.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p> <p>Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the ES Chapter 2 The Project, (Application Document 3.2) (compliance with which is secured in the DCO).</p>	
1075	150465			Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents suggesting alternative spend including creating more rest stops and a service station along the route and opening a museum displaying any archaeological finds discovered during the surveys.	Provision of museum facilities, roadside services, Heavy Goods Vehicles rest areas are outside of the scope of the Project. Lay-bys have been proposed in the preliminary design in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.	No
1076	150465			Engineering design and development - green materials	One respondent suggesting using green materials in the engineering design, including recycled glass and rubber in the tarmac, 'smart paint' on materials	As the design of the Project progresses towards construction the Project team will continue to consider innovative and sustainable ideas to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					the road surfaces and energy generation devices.	incorporate in the construction and operational phases of the Project.	
1092	148616			Engineering design and development - More lanes	One respondent suggesting constructing bridges wide enough to expand in the future.	The comment regarding future proofing of bridges is noted. The scheme needs to be justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future). Any proposed over-provision of structural widths needs to be assessed also in terms of additional environmental impact, additional land requirements and the cost of the scheme. As such, the benefit of future flexibility may not outweigh the disbenefits in other aspect of assessment.	No
1245	153578, 154182		152151, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154183, 154184, 154185	Engineering design and development - Modified design	Respondents expressing concern and propose suggestions for alternative locations for the Brough Hill fair site.	During the development of the Project, National Highways assessed the existing site in terms of location and size and a number of alternative sites meeting the same criteria were considered. Working closely with a number of landowners including Ministry of Defence (MoD) and the Gypsy Community, National Highways considered a number of alternative locations however the majority were rejected on suitability and operational grounds.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The location promoted at the Autumn 2021 Consultation was adjacent to the existing Brough Hill Fair site and had landowner agreement but was initially not acceptable to the gypsy community and concerns were raised during the consultation by local residents.</p> <p>The proposed site would require a considerable degree of mitigation and remodelling, and the gypsy community asked us to pursue other options. We continued to work with them and other local landowners to explore options in the local area.</p> <p>We have carried out further consultations in Spring 2022 on two alternative sites. Please refer to Chapter 7 and Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) for the feedback received and the decisions made on the new proposed site location.</p>	
1246			154185	Engineering design and development - Modified design	Respondent suggesting modification to the access road from Eastfield Farm to the Flitholme junction which would enable movement of sheep on to the range.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees request, however after undertaking ongoing engagement with the affected landowner in this location the Project is not providing an access track and only a fenced grass margin from Flitholme Road to the field directly east of East Field Farm has been included within the scheme design with no through route to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Warcop. The purpose of this grass margin is to allow occasional movement of sheep from north side of existing A66 to fields on the south using the underpass at Flitholme Road.	
1247	153877, 154207			Alternative route - North - Land	Respondents suggesting an alternative route would prevent taking land on the south side of the old A66 at Sandford.	National Highways acknowledge the concern about the agricultural land being taken by the Project on the south side of the existing A66 at Sandford. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites. In Autumn 21, the route promoted between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing carriageway. In order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment has been made. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further supplementary consultation was	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						carried out on this change in Spring 22. Please refer to Chapter 7 and Annex N of the Consultation Report for this item. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.	
1253			154006, 154007, 154009, 154010	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondent is requesting a road from Eastfield Farm to Flitholme junction, which would allow access onto the old A66 to move sheep on to the MoD range, . Road would need to be fenced to control sheep movement. Ideally this road needs to be brought into the farm steading so sheep cannot stray in fields with standing crops in, and passing places would be required to assist with traffic management.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' request and after undertaking ongoing engagement with them the Project is not providing a road. Instead, a fenced grass margin from Flitholme Road to the field directly east of Eastfield Farm has been included within the scheme design with no through route to Warcop. The purpose of this grass margin is to allow occasional movement of sheep from the north side of the existing A66 to fields on the south using the underpass at Flitholme Road.	Yes
1254			153568	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondent suggesting the diverted public right of way from Hayber Lane to the existing footpath will travel along the side of the exit road from Warcop EB junction. We would strongly suggest this footpath is hard surfaced.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding the requirement for a hardened surface along the existing A66 in Warcop. Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation a cycleway has been included in the Project between the western scheme	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>extents and Brough and was subject to further consultation in Spring 2022.</p> <p>For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
46	152203, 152992, 152993, 153319		152991	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, in particular mentioning pedestrian safety near to a school in Brough and near to Croft Cottage.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>All proposals are subject to the road safety audit (RSA) process. The stage 1 RSA carried out during the preliminary design phase did not highlight specific concerns at the locations mentioned in the respondent's feedback. The design will be subject to further road safety audits during the subsequent detailed design and construction stages.</p> <p>Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
47	152992, 152993, 153319, 153863, 153901, 153946		152991, 152994, 154010, 154185	Economics - Local economy - agriculture	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact farming businesses, including dairy, through agricultural land take, in particular Eastfield Farm, Croft Cottage, Fox Tower View, Dacre house, and Hylton Holme.</p> <p>Respondents also expressing concern that the relocation of Brough Hill Fair would bring the event closer to farms, impacting agricultural businesses.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised that the creation of a slip road at the land at Fox Tower View will have a significant detrimental effect on existing agricultural business.</p>	<p>Where possible taking into account other constraints, National Highways has sought to reduce required land take.</p> <p>The comments in relation to West View Farm overbridge and the bridge and slip roads at Fox Tower View are associated with the proposed local access junction at the east end of the scheme.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage. The access off of the new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce impact on the AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road.</p> <p>It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse</p> <p>The location of the bridge and slip roads is determined by the local topography in the area as well as the need to minimise impacts on the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>AONB. The new A66 also ties into the existing A66 at this point and there are constraints with regard to alignment and visibility which have to be considered in relation to the position of the bridge and slip roads.</p> <p>The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is contained in Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>We have refined our mitigation plans since the PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats and species at these locations. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits</p> <p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) identifies in Table 13-27 the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Agricultural land holdings within the Order Limits of the Appleby to Brough Scheme. The name of the farm or the owner are identified in the table with a percentage figure given of the percentage of the land holding of the farm that is affected by the project. The farms affected by land take are: West View, High Green Farm, Coupland Beck Farm, Wheatsheaf Farm, Wilson, Low Bank End and Roseleigh. The proportion of the land taken from the farm varies from 1.57% to 24.7% of the land holding. National Highways has sought to minimise land take from farm businesses but land will be needed, as described in the ES and summarised above. The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (refer to section 13.9) (Application Document 3.2) commits National Highways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. • accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where possible to avoid potential crop loss. • maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. <p>In suitable instances National Highways is open to considering entering into management agreements with landowners in relation to environmental mitigation, however, given the need in many instances for environmental mitigation to be maintained in the long term, not all cases will be suitable for such agreements</p> <p>Furthermore National Highways can compensate for land take if the property is adversely affected by changes implemented as part of the A66 scheme., Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on National Highways' website.</p>	
49	149787, 150434, 152992, 152993,	Musgrave Parish Council	149376, 150183, 150441, 151476,	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on land, in particular that the scheme would lead to a loss of agricultural	We have refined our mitigation plans since the PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153800, 153810, 153848, 153877, 153891, 153899, 153901, 153911, 153913, 153946, 153955		152991, 152994, 153317, 153379, 153383, 153806, 154010, 154234, 154457		land. Respondents mention land near Sandford, Fox Tower View and Flitholme and also express concern that proposed mitigation measures such as drainage ponds, grassland and woodland would result in loss of additional land.	our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats and species at these locations. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits The Environmental Statement (chapter 13 Population and Human Health – Application Document 3.2) identifies at Table 13 27 the. Agricultural land holdings within the Order Limits of the Appleby to Brough. The name of the farm or the owner are identified in the table with a percentage figure given of the percentage of the land holding of the farm that is affected by the project. The farms affected by land take are: West View, High Green Farm, Coupland Beck Farm, Wheatsheaf Farm, Wilson, Low Bank End and Roseleigh. The proportion of the land taken from the farm varies from 1.57% to 24.7% of the land holding. National Highways has sought to minimise land take from farm businesses but land will be needed, as described in the ES and summarised above. The ES (section	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>13.9 of Chapter 13 Population and Human Health – Application Document 3.2) commits National Highways to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. • accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where possible to avoid potential crop loss. • maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible • outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. <p>In suitable instances National Highways is open to considering entering into management agreements with landowners in relation to environmental mitigation, however, given the need in many instances for environmental mitigation to be maintained in the long term, not all</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>cases will be suitable for such agreements</p> <p>Furthermore National Highways can compensate for land take if the property is adversely affected by changes implemented as part of the A66 scheme., Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found on National Highways web site – in the publications sections.</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees' comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement.</p> <p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <p>Valuable Land taken on south side of existing A66</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concern about valuable land being taken by the Project on the south side of the existing A66. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites.</p> <p>In Autumn 2021, the route promoted between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing carriageway. In order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment has been made. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in Winter 2022. Refer to Chapter 7 and Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) for this item. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.</p> <p>Location and size of Drainage Ponds</p> <p>Concerns were raised about drainage ponds at Sandford and near Warcop</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and as a consequence of the changes to the design in these areas National Highways have been able to refine pond locations to reduce land taken for the permanent works.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation The Autumn 2021 Consultation material presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along with details for drainage ponds and a number of these items raised concerns from landowners and local residents.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation proposals which are appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project.</p> <p>Local Access Junction at East End of Project National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage. The access off of the new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce impact on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road.</p> <p>It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and uses including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p>	
50	150414, 150434, 152940, 152992, 152993, 153353, 153361, 153792, 153848, 153863, 153875, 153901, 153913, 153922, 153955, 153960, 154207, 154459	Warcop Parish Council	149376, 149418, 149788, 150183, 152991, 153383, 153864, 153959, 154185, 154219, 154234	Community impact - Property	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on their domestic property (at Croft Cottage, Fox Tower View, Low Broomrigg, Dyke Nook and Warcop). Concerns expressed include negative impacts on property values, privacy and security</p>	<p>The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.</p> <p>Regarding privacy concerns, landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been a key consideration in the design process. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals.</p> <p>An environmental impact assessment (EIA) has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. It is not within the scope of the EIA to consider the impact of the Project on property</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>values. Although the EIA does consider the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has identified both residential and non residential receptors that are likely to be subject to significant noise effects during construction and operation. Where there is potential for significant noise impacts during construction there will be compliance with the control measures detailed in the Environmental Management Plan and a Noise and Vibration Management Plan. During operation an assessment of providing a noise barrier in the form of a fence or earthwork/earth bund has been undertaken where appropriate for any significant noise effects identified.</p> <p>Regarding security concerns, National Highways are committed to maintaining an ongoing conversation about construction with local people, businesses, and Organisations. We regularly monitor the safety of our network and work throughout the year</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						to ensure our motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards. National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.	
91	151456, 151461, 152969, 153048, 153377, 153798, 153835, 153860, 153862, 153912, 154233	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	149779, 153135, 153964	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing concern about accessibility issues of routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. These include general concerns that there is no continuous active travel network, as well as more specific concerns around access to the footpath from Wheat Sheaf Farm to Sandford and from Coupland to Cafe 66. Respondents also expressing concern that local roads are not wide enough for safe cycling.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. A shared cycle/footway has been proposed parallel to the new dualled A66 for Appleby to Brough. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	Yes
108	152200, 152232, 152244,	Cumbria County Council	149779, 151476, 152153	Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing concern about construction disruption for local villages and landowners.	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152945, 154197	Eden District Council				<p>traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that we can construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. The CTMP will ensure any disruption is minimised and will explain how the Project will minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local road through appropriate communication and signage. Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance. An outline of the CTMP is provided at this stage in the form of an expanded essay plan and will be developed in accordance with the terms of the Environmental Management Plan by the contractor and detailed design consultant.</p>	
120	151452, 152945, 153048, 153059, 153319, 153386, 153585, 153811, 153848, 153856, 153931, 153956, 154233	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	152994, 153307, 153948	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing concern that the preferred route alignment will increase congestion in and around the nearby towns of Kirkby Stephen, in particular increased Ministry of Defence, HGV and caravan traffic – including disruption during construction, connectivity concerns, and impact on local junctions.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network. The Transport Assessment states that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% due to the additional capacity provided by the Project. Increased MoD traffic is not envisaged. The modelling shows that on a typical weekday the junction operates satisfactorily with no excessive queues on any approach. As mentioned in our last traffic modelling meeting, we would be happy to share the VISSIM model output	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>video with the council to support discussions with council members.</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties.</p> <p>The feedback also relates to a number of points which are considered below:</p> <p>Disruption during Construction</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of additional traffic using local roads during the construction of the Project. It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p> <p>The planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during the detailed design phase. Further information can be found within the Construction Traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Management Plan (Application Document 2.7, Annex B13)</p> <p>Lack of eastbound connectivity at local access junction</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property due to future HGV and quarry lorry movements. Unfortunately, The Project is unable to provide access to the Eastbound A66 at this location due to the position of the local road between Warcop and Brough on the northern side of the new A66 so all quarry traffic for A66 will have to cross the new structure, travel westbound to Warcop and turn around to travel east on the A66.</p> <p>Impact of local access junction</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p> <p>Kirkby Stephen Bypass</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee; however, Kirkby Stephen is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location. A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the Northern Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (NTPRSS) (2014-16). This earlier work concluded that dualling the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was to be progressed to PCF Stage 1, Option identification (refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information).</p> <p>National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and has concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous assessment work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not progress a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.</p>	
176	150179, 152232, 153309,	Eden District Council	149770, 152980, 154183,	Engineering design and	Respondents expressing concern, in general terms, about the engineering and design aspects of the proposals.	National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153339, 154233, 154243, 154483		154234, 154454	development - General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respondents believe that the junction, slip road, and bridge designs in this stage are overly complicated. 2. Other respondents believe that the Brough bridge and slip road design may not be suitable for its intended use. 3. Respondents say that there are too many junctions in the design. 4. Furthermore, respondents' express concerns with the design of Sandford Road End as being out of keeping with the beauty of the area. 	<p>through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Points 1&2: National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact of the Project and the proposed local access road design (including slip roads and bridges) at the east end of the scheme. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and uses, including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p> <p>Point 3: The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic. The new A66 is designed to current standards and is subject to the road safety audit process at this stage and subsequent stages of design development.</p> <p>Point 4: We acknowledge the concern of visual impacts of the Project on the south side of the existing A66 at Sandford, as well as the concerns regarding the design of the junction. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites. In Autumn 2021, the route promoted between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing carriageway. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in Winter 2022. Refer to Chapter 7 and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Annex N of the Consultation Report for this item.	
179	151501, 153319, 153856, 153911	Eden District Council	151476, 153317, 154010, 154185, 154219	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme may reduce vehicle connectivity to local villages, impact sheep movements, provide disruption during construction, impact the AONB, impact drainage ponds in areas such as Warcop, Great Musgrave, Flitholme and Langrigg and also to farmland.	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties.</p> <p>The feedback also relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with the consultee and agreed to provide a fenced grass margin from Flitholme Road to the field directly east of East Field Farm within the scheme design. The purpose of this grass margin is to allow occasional movement of sheep from north side of existing A66 to fields on the south using the underpass at Flitholme Road. Boundary fencing details to be determined in detailed design stage of the Project. National Highways acknowledge the concerns about construction disruption when the site works commence. The planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during the detailed design phase. 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways acknowledges the request for the existing A66 to be retained for use by local residents. The proposed Project design maintains a local road between Moorhouse Lane and Brough using a combination of the existing A66 single carriageway, and a new local road built to the north of the existing. A cycleway being provided the full length of the proposed Project will complete the connection between Moorhouse Lane and the scheme extends beyond Cafe Sixty-Six to the west for non-motorised users. • National Highways acknowledge the consultees request for an alternative route to the north of the existing A66. However, National Highways need to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. • One of the key considerations in the design development work for Appleby to Brough has been to ensure that the design of the route alignment minimises the impact of 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and potential damage to the AONB. There are two key sets of policy tests to be addressed for such developments that need an incursion into the AONB; notably those applicable to developments within the boundary of such an area, and those applicable to developments outside such areas but that have an impact on them. As the preliminary design of the scheme developed it was found that elements of the Project could not be constructed, following the alignment of the Preferred Route, without some limited construction within the AONB. Alignments were then identified which would be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB and that would be suitable with respect to minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route being put forward would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to the alternatives taken forward, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options for the Appleby To Brough scheme. The details of the assessment can be found within the PDOR (Reference 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage. Conformity with the policy set out the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) is necessary when considering development outside the boundary of the AONB as they highlight that there is a need to have regard to the purpose of AONBs and avoid compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A66. We understand there will be disruption during the construction works which we will try to keep to a minimum, The contractors will be working with locals businesses and other stakeholders to ensure access and the movement of vehiles, machinery plant and livestock is maintained.National Highways note the concerns raised about drainage ponds at Sandford and as a consequence of the changes to the design in these areas National Highways have been able to refine pond design to reduce land taken for the permanent works.	
199	149350, 152152, 152208, 153335, 153365, 153386, 153862, 154211, 154248, 154471, 162160	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	149770, 151465, 153307, 153376, 153568, 153940, 153948, 154007, 154454	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about safety issues relating to the increase in traffic. Respondents specifically cite concern relating access roads and design, retention of old A66, replacement Fair site, and the increase in speed, tight corners and junctions that require turning into oncoming traffic, including horse-drawn traffic.	National Highways note the consultees' comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve safety and connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage. The access off the new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce the impact on the AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road. • National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and uses including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse. • National Highways note the consultees comments on ensuring the signing strategy for the Project 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>is clear and this will be developed during the detailed design stage and agreed between National Highways, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways thank the consultee for their comments on the proposed access design at the western end of the scheme. In order to reduce public health and safety risks where an underpass is shared by agricultural traffic and a public right of way it is widened to 8m, allowing a 6m wide route for vehicular traffic and a 2m fenced route for the public right of way. In order to remove biosecurity issues, Mr Pattersons land access track will come from the new grade separated junction at Sandford to remove biosecurity conflict. HGV speeds have been limited in line with legal limits/observed speeds through inclusion of control parameters within the strategic model that limit the goods vehicle user class depending on road type. National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee, however the A685 and Kirkby Stephen are outside of the scheme extents and no works are currently 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>planned in this location. A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the Northern Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (NTPRSS) (2014-16). This earlier work concluded that dualling the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was to be progressed to PCF Stage 1, Option identification (refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and has concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous assessment work which led to the decision to dual the A66 and not progress a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen. • National Highways acknowledges the request for the existing A66 to be retained for use by local residents. The proposed Project design maintains a local road between Moorhouse Lane and Brough using a combination of the existing A66 single carriageway, 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and a new local road built to the north of the existing. A cycleway being provided the full length of the proposed Project will complete the connection between Moorhouse Lane and the scheme extends beyond Cafe Sixty-Six to the west for non-motorised users; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is contained in Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). 	
225	151452, 153578, 154171, 154182, 154248		153307, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154016, 154183, 154184	Economics - Local economy - farming	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the potential impact of the scheme on the local economy. These respondents specifically express concern over the possible impact on the agricultural industry in the area. Respondents believe that: income may be lost from use of productive agricultural land for the scheme; the quality and price of final products could be diminished due to negative impacts on animal welfare; insurance costs may rise; property values may fall due to road proximity; business operations</p>	<p>Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements. During operation of the new A66, there is the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity may also be a significant effect for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					could become more expensive from the loss of access roads and facilities.	<p>usability of community land and assets.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) set out the findings of an assessment of impacts on the project on local businesses and farms.</p> <p>The environmental assessment carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase (Environmental Statement, Application Document 3.2). Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team has proposed mitigation measures to reduce the effects where required and practicable.</p>	
285	149350, 150434, 152940, 152966, 153796, 153862, 154171, 154243		152151, 152153	Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern for the impact of the scheme on the local economy. Respondents state that the route could disrupt local businesses such as the quarry, New Hall caravan park, and small firms reliant on passing trade. Other respondents state that local connectivity is necessary to ensure that local businesses benefit from the scheme, and that some businesses may need support with relocation.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) assessed the effects on local businesses. The principal findings from this assessment during construction and operation are:</p> <p>Construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the Barn End Caravan Park where there will be a temporary period during construction where the business could not operate but it would be returned to its current use on completion of the works. 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other businesses are anticipated to experience land loss or acquisition as a result of this scheme. At Helbeck Quarry after the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the ES (Application Document 3.2) and secured through the EMP there will be temporary indirect minor adverse impacts due to the construction phase works including dust, noise and vibration and landscape impacts. <p>Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the scheme is envisaged to provide minor beneficial impacts improving journey time reliability and safety, which would in turn serve to improve traffic conditions in the local area for businesses. For example the access to and from Helbeck Quarry will be made safer and more reliable due to the provision of a new junction. <p>The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found on National Highways web site in the publications section.	
310	148577, 149350, 149377, 151331, 153319, 153329, 153356, 153361, 153377, 153380, 153792, 153798, 153810, 153836, 153863, 153875, 153890, 153891, 153901, 153902, 153903, 153905, 153941, 153946, 153955, 154211, 154250, 154255, 154460	Cumbria County Council Musgrave Parish Council Warcop Parish Council	149376, 149788, 150183, 151476, 153864, 153959, 153964, 154234, 154454, 154457	Community impact - People	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on lives and wellbeing of local residents. Respondents express concern that the scheme would be too close to local villages and houses, mentioning Warcop, Flitholme, Langrigg, Sandford and a planned community farm at Dyke Nook.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process, leading to the Preferred Route Announcement in 2021. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information. The preferred Black-Blue-Black route has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. National Highways considers that the preferred route meets all of the key objectives of the scheme. An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.	
315	153045, 153386, 153950, 153954, 154211, 154243		153317, 153321, 153568, 153843, 154010	Alternative route - North	Respondents expressing concern that the alternative Northern route would have detrimental impacts in comparison to the preferred route. Respondents state that expansion into MoD land would risk unearthing ordnance. Other respondents state that a northern route would negatively affect existing habitats in the AONB and move the road far away from existing Infrastructure. Respondents state that the land to the north could	National Highways acknowledges the consultees support for the route being promoted. The environmental mitigation design presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has continued to be developed and engagement has been carried out with affected landowners and further design carried out to finalise the environmental mitigation required for the Project before DCO submission.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>be unsuitable for road building due to its topography and wetland environment e.g. drainage/pond design. Concerns arise around the proposed ponds at Sandford, Warcop and close to Station Road.</p>	<p>We note the responders concerns about drainage ponds at Sandford and near Warcop and as a consequence of the changes to the design in these areas we have been able to refine pond design to reduce land taken for the permanent works. In regards to your concerns regarding the location and size of the ponds on the south side of the new A66, adjacent to Station Road. The responders request has been considered and since the Autumn 2021 Consultation these ponds have been reduced in size. However, moving them to the northern side of new A66 is not possible due to the land to the north being designated to be used for the level for level flood compensation and this flood plain compensation cannot be achieved elsewhere. We acknowledge the request for the existing A66 to be retained for use by local residents. The proposed scheme design maintains a local road between Moorhouse Lane and Brough using a combination of the existing A66 single carriageway, and a new local road built to the north of the existing.</p> <p>We welcome your comments with regards to locating the new A66 alignment to the south side of the existing A66 rather than to the north. National Highways needs to promote a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>With regards to any northern alignment through the AONB we acknowledge there is risk of unexploded ordnances being encountered on the MoD land. The topography and ground conditions will make the detailed design more challenging.</p>	
323	152945, 153318, 153380, 153796, 153810, 153830, 153852, 153887, 153901, 153961, 154243		153129, 153864, 154185	Engineering design and development - General	<p>Respondents expressing general concerns about design of the scheme. Concerns expressed include the number of junctions and bridges in the scheme, that the proposed route would reduce noise and visual impact only in the Wild Boar to Warcop section and the location of drainage ponds.</p>	<p>Further information on the strategy and design of junctions and bridges can be accessed in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. In preparing the design for this scheme between Appleby and Brough we have included, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise and visual impacts during operation. These are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>included along the full length of the scheme where deemed necessary not just on the section between Wild Boar and Warcop.</p> <p>Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the scheme and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
324	152911, 152940, 152973, 153048, 153332, 153380, 153578, 153615, 153862, 154171, 154211, 154243, 162160	Cumbria County Council	153376, 153568, 153843, 153940, 154007, 154010, 154016, 154183, 154184	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents expressing concern about vehicular access in relation to traffic, transport, and junctions. Respondents claim that the proposed diversions during construction could limit access to businesses, particularly Cross Croft industrial estate and Helbeck quarry. Other respondents are concerned that access to residential properties could be restricted, in particular, that the proposed diversions for Warcop, Langrigg, and Appleby restrict access. Respondents also express concern that farmland may be inaccessible, and that proposed access tracks would not be suitable for heavy agricultural machinery. Respondents raise specific concerns with regard to the proposed access arrangements at the west end of the scheme close to Café 66.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic. National Highways will continue to work with affected landowners during detailed design to ensure that requirements with regard to heavy machinery access and access to farmland are adequately addressed both during construction and future operations.</p> <p>The feedback relates to a number of points which are considered below.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee about disruption and access during the construction of the Project for both business and residents. It is intended to keep disruption to a minimum and the planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during the detailed design phase. If there are works required to connect existing properties to the new road network these will be discussed in advance with affected parties and plans put in place to mitigate any issues. Further information can be found within the Construction Traffic Management Plan () The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair needs to be considered as part of the Project and its location has been determined following ongoing engagement and Consultation with the Gypsy Community and Landowners. The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is contained in Chapter 7 and Annex P of the 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local access provision provided for Mains House at the eastern end of the scheme also provides access for a number of other properties in this location to the new A66 westbound carriageway and a connection to the local road linking Warcop to Brough. National Highways acknowledge the consultees request relating farmland access and after undertaking ongoing engagement with them the Project is not providing a road. Instead, a fenced grass margin from Flitholme Road to the field directly east of East Field Farm has been included within the scheme design with no through route to Warcop. The purpose of this grass margin is to allow occasional movement of sheep from north side of existing A66 to fields on the south using the underpass at Flitholme Road. The environmental mitigation design presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has continued to be developed and engagement has been carried out with affected landowners and further design will 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>be carried out to finalise the environmental mitigation required for the Project before DCO submission and will be agreed between National Highways, Statutory Bodies and affected landowners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways thank the consultee for their comments on the proposed access design at the western end of the scheme. In order to reduce public health and safety risks where an underpass is shared by agricultural traffic and a public right of way it is widened to 8m, allowing a 6m wide route for vehicular traffic and a 2m fenced route for the public right of way. In order to remove biosecurity issues, Mr Pattersons land access track will come from the new grade separated junction at Sandford to remove biosecurity conflict. • National Highways note the consultees concern about the design and ownership of the proposed access tracks. The locations have been proposed and agreed with landowners. The construction and ownership details will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways and landowners to discuss and agree details for track designs and accommodation works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Highways note the consultees comments on ensuring the signing strategy for the Project is clear and this will be developed during the detailed design stage and agreed between National Highways, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders. • National Highways thank the consultee for their comments on the proposed underpass design. The proposed underpass will have a headroom of 5.3m. Where an underpass is shared by agricultural traffic and a public right of way it is widened to 8m, allowing a 6m wide route for vehicular traffic and a 2m fenced route for the public right of way; and • National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee, however any improvement to the Eastern Appleby junction is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location. • National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on the future quarry lorry movements. Unfortunately, The Project is unable to provide access to the Eastbound A66 at this location due to the position of the local road between Warcop and Brough on the northern side of the new A66;	
401	150179, 150434, 152227, 152244, 153339, 153349, 153578, 153621, 153629, 153796, 153836, 153853, 153862, 153863, 153901, 153913, 154171, 154179, 154243, 162160	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150441, 152151, 152153, 153340, 154006, 154007, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154183, 154184	Land - Agricultural	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the proposals on agricultural land. Respondents state that too much agricultural land would be lost due to the proposed land take, particularly high-quality grazing land.</p> <p>Respondents state that the loss of grazing land could put young livestock at risk during winter.</p> <p>Respondents express concern that their land would be severed, with no alternative equally productive land available for relocation.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that drainage ponds between Warcop WB and Eastfield Farm could be located north of the A66.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that Brough Hill camp is relocated.</p>	<p>Taking into account other constraints, National Highways has sought to reduce required land take for the Project.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) which supports our DCO application includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land.</p> <p>We are in discussions with landowners and farm operators to try to reduce the impact of the scheme on their ability to manage these businesses including management of stock.</p> <p>Our design has aimed to minimise any severance of land and we have met with landowners to establish where their best and most productive land is and then tried to avoid it where possible. Where we are not able to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Respondents state that the red line boundaries could create third party rights issues.</p> <p>Respondents express concern about land taken on the south side of the old A66.</p> <p>Respondents express concern that the proposed underpass will see the public utilising it while it is regularly used for farm machinery and dairy cows and that a dedicated pedestrian lane should be therefore be provided.</p> <p>Respondents also express concern about changes to access tracks severing field parcels.</p>	<p>avoid and larger parcels of land are severed we have provided access through accommodation works such as bridges or underpasses.</p> <p>Landowners will be compensated for land lost due to the Project and we have written to all impacted landowners to invite them to begin negotiations with us in order to accelerate this process.</p> <p>Third party rights will be dealt with as part of the ongoing negotiations.</p> <p>Environmental Mitigation</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns on environmental mitigation proposals presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation which presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting along with details for drainage ponds and a number of these items raised concerns from landowners and local residents.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out ongoing engagement with landowners to understand land use and implications of environmental mitigation proposals which are appropriate and proportionate to mitigate environmental impacts of the Project.</p> <p>As part of the environmental design consideration has been given to any properties experiencing adverse</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>impacts during or after construction and in appropriate cases mitigation measures will be provided.</p> <p>Drainage Ponds National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding the location and size of the ponds on the south side of the new A66 adjacent to Station Road. The consultees request has been considered and since the Autumn 2021 Consultation these ponds have been reduced in size. However, moving them to the northern side of new A66 is not possible due to the land to the north being designated to be used for the level for level flood compensation and this flood plain compensation cannot be achieved elsewhere.</p> <p>Brough Hill Fair The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is contained in Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).; and</p> <p>Location of Red Line National Highways note the consultees concerns regarding the location of the DCO Order Limits "red line" and small</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>land parcels excluded from it. Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation further work has been carried out in conjunction with affected landowners with a view to reducing impacts on land holdings, in appropriate cases.</p> <p>Valuable Land taken on south side of existing A66</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concern about valuable land being taken by the project on the south side of the existing A66. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites.</p> <p>In Autumn 2021, the route promoted between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing carriageway. In order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment has been made. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in spring 22. Refer to Chapter 7 and Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) for this item. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.</p> <p>Underpass at western end</p> <p>National Highways thank the consultee for their comments on the proposed underpass design. Where an underpass is shared by agricultural traffic and a public right of way it will typically be widened to approximately 8m, allowing a 6m wide route for vehicular traffic and a 2m route for the public right of way.</p> <p>National Highways also acknowledge the concerns of the consultee regarding multiple uses for the underpass at the western end of the scheme and it has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and uses including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project to prevent potential misuse; and</p> <p>Access Tracks</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees concern about the design of the proposed access tracks. The locations have been proposed and agreed with landowners. The construction and ownership details will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways and landowners to discuss and agree ownership details for track designs and accommodation works.</p>	
405	151452, 151481, 152232, 152965, 153027, 153349, 153833, 153901, 154211, 154243, 154255		153964	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the cost of the proposed changes are too high. Some respondents raise concerns about the cost of multiple proposed junctions, while others feel that the costs outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Others are concerned that the project cost has increased to appease the objections of landowners.</p>	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The economic benefits the Project will bring are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional: support the economic growth objective of the Norther Powerhouse and Government levelling up agenda. 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the improvement and long-term development of SRN through providing better national connectivity including freight. • Maintain and improve access for tourism served by the A66. • Seek to improve access to services and jobs for local road users and the local community. <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal, the benefits the Project will bring, and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
409	153309, 153386, 153578, 153796, 153848, 153862, 154171, 154182, 154245, 154248		152151, 152994, 153307, 154008, 154009, 154010, 154184	Community impact - Safety	Respondents expressing concern over potential safety risks to the local community. Respondents expressing concerns about the risk of reduced privacy, risks from vehicles passing close to properties, and risks from visitors to the Appleby Horse Fair using access roads alongside large farm vehicles.	<p>National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and to minimising disruption to the public. A key aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>Regarding comments about privacy, landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been a key consideration of the design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. An environmental assessment has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans are illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>At operation, the proposed scheme will result in a reduction in road traffic accidents and casualties for people travelling along the A66, and accessing/egressing from villages along the route. Assessment of Project impacts on accidents as detailed in '3.07 Transport Assessment' concludes that the project will not only reduce the number of accidents on the A66 itself, but also on the surrounding road network as a result of the increased flow on the A66 removing traffic from other rural links.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.</p> <p>During construction, the Appleby Horse Fair Multi-Agency Strategic Coordinating Group (MASCg) will be liaised with around the timing of works, adequate diversions, and routing of Fair traffic away from the A66 to minimise impacts on journeys to and from the Fair and on the surrounding road network. This principle is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) and will be incorporated into</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Construction Traffic Management Plans.	
410	150434, 153027, 153309, 153578, 153796, 153832, 153848, 153901, 153913, 153943, 153957, 154182, 154233, 154459		152151, 152994, 153307, 153345, 153934, 154006, 154008, 154016, 154183, 154184, 154234	Community impact - Property	<p>Respondents expressing concern that their property, including farmland properties, would be negatively impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>Respondents are concerned that the close proximity of the new route would cause damage to properties and reduce privacy within homes; and that property values would reduce.</p> <p>Respondents state that they will require monetary compensation or assistance in relocating.</p>	<p>An environmental impact assessment (EIA) has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. It is not within the scope of the EIA to consider the impact of the Project on property values. Although the EIA does consider the noise, visual impact and air quality impacts on residential receptors and where the assessment has identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The noise assessment set out in ES Chapter 12 Application Document 3.2) has identified both residential and non residential receptors that are likely to be subject to significant noise effects during construction and operation. Where there is potential for significant noise impacts during construction there will be compliance with the control measures detailed in the Environmental Management Plan and a Noise and Vibration Management Plan. During operation an assessment of providing a noise barrier in the form of a fence or earthwork/earth bund has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>been undertaken where appropriate for any significant noise effects identified.</p> <p>Regarding comments about privacy, landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been a key consideration of the design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals.</p> <p>The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.</p>	
425	149377, 149410, 150162, 150434, 151481, 152200, 152232, 152244, 152945, 152973, 153309, 153578, 153851, 153862,	Warcop Parish Council	149418, 152151, 154010, 154184, 154454	Community impact - People	<p>Respondents expressing general concern that the scheme would negatively impact the health and quality of life of local communities. Some respondents state that the route favours the MoD over local residents and traveller communities.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concerns: the Applicant not engaging sufficiently with the community, citing a lack of attendance at the Warcop Parish Hall meeting attended by the local MP; perceived increased flood risk from the scheme creating distress; sense of</p>	<p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153863, 153916, 153955, 154182, 154233, 154245, 154248, 154459, 154483				privacy lost to increased footfall, and noise and lights from cars; biosecurity risks to livestock; a reduction in property values, and private land lost to construction and future maintenance access.	<p>space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' views in regards to a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges to the north of the existing A66. Through the design stage work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Flood modelling and a flood risk assessment has been carried out as part of the Project. Appropriate flood measures have been incorporated as necessary. Attenuation ponds have been included to provide attenuation and treatment of storm water run-off to meet flood and water quality requirements. Refer to the Flood Risk Assessment within ES appendices (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Biosecurity measures have been considered throughout design development with separated junction accesses included where possible to remove biosecurity risks. The Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) also includes measures for dealing with invasive species and biosecurity measures. This document will be iterative and updated throughout detailed design and construction phases.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local accesses of the scheme would have on their property. These accesses have been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and uses including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p> <p>Permanent land take is only proposed where necessary. Details of the scheme have been provided to the landowners in the form of land interest plans denoting land for permanent acquisition, temporary acquisition, and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>temporary acquisition with permanent rights.</p> <p>National Highways continues to engage with landowners directly affected by the scheme to understand the effects of the scheme on their land interest. Specific mitigation solutions or compensation will be agreed on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges concerns related to changes to property values as a result of the scheme. Property and land directly affected by the scheme is subject to compensation in line with the compensation code and National Highways is in ongoing discussions with landowners on this matter.</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees' concern about the design and ownership of the proposed access tracks. The locations have been proposed and agreed with landowners. The construction and ownership details will be considered at the detailed design stage of the Project and discussions will be held between National Highways and landowners to discuss and agree details for track designs and accommodation works.</p> <p>Regarding engagement with the local community, engagement has been ongoing through the Community</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Liaison Group and with relevant stakeholders including Warcop Parish Council, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council. Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. National Highways' Project team were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application.</p>	
436		Defence Infrastructure Organisation		Alternative route - North	<p>Respondents expressing concern over a route going further north cutting through MoD's range complex which could have a potential negative impact on the Ministry of Defence operations.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns over alternative routes being proposed by scheme objectors to the north of the existing A66 and the effect it would have on MoD operations particularly into the provision of an adequate safety zone</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>around the ammunitions stores and the ability to operate the ranges in a safe and efficient manner.</p> <p>National Highways are promoting the Black-Blue-Black route which has been taken forward with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66. Design work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB, which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy, as well as impact on stakeholders and landowners.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
439		Cumbria County Council		Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the current engineering and design aspects of the proposals fail to provide adequate motorhome or rest facilities. These respondents claim that the existing rest facilities are not fit for purpose and that more needs to be done to improve access arrangements for services and improve parking, which are inadequate relative to expected future traffic demand. Respondents say that Department for</p>	<p>Overnight facilities for motorhomes or HGV users are not within the scope of the Project but our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of supporting new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 NTP Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Transport guidance has identified shortages in provision.		
446	148619, 152995, 153038, 153319, 153386, 153799, 153811, 153835, 154211, 154248, 154459	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority	149770, 153307, 153376, 154183	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing concern relating to the safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders in the proposed scheme. This includes the risks of children crossing busy junctions before and after school and by cyclists using sections of the A66.	A shared safe cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents between Appleby and Brough. The development of design solutions place safety matters first, these are further assured through Road Safety Audit process which independently assessed hazards and concerns to refine design solutions. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	Yes
450	153578, 153848		154006, 154008, 154183	Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	Respondents expressing concern that the proposals could negatively impact the local community by encouraging antisocial behaviour, including fly-tipping. Concerns are also raised about the relocation of the travellers' fair, which respondents state could result in antisocial behaviour and waste near residential properties and the Meadow Bank haulage yard.	National Highways notes the responders concerns regarding the relocated Brough Fair site. The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is contained in Chapter 7, Annex P of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). Permanent fencing locations will be considered during ongoing engagement with impacted stakeholders at the detailed design stage of the Project and further discussions will be held between National Highways and landowners to	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>discuss the proposals. The outcome from the consultation and engagement is that National Highways are proposing the Bivvy Site (on MoD land) as the preferred option for the relocation of Brough Hill Fair. The Bivvy Site is circa 5 acres in size, is adjacent to the current Brough Hill Fair site, and will be remediated so that the existing ground within the full site extents is rolled and compacted to provide a firm, evenly graded surface. Access to the site will be from Station Road.</p> <p>Whilst National Highways recognises the concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority.</p> <p>The responsibility for litter collection for this section of the A66 sits with Cumbria County Council.</p>	
477		Cumbria County Council		Alternative route - Black - Black - Black	One respondent expressing concern over the proposed alternative Black-Black-Black Route, including the potential negative impact of additional Infrastructure such as bridges and local access roads, as well as the impacts on areas of farmland.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns on the proposed alternative Black-Black-Black Route. Following receipt of comments from the statutory consultation and the completion of the preliminary design it has been decided to take the Black-	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Blue-Black scheme forward as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>With regard to the alternatives considered, National Highways carried out a sifting exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1) section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'. The comparison assessed the options on a range of criteria including environmental and landscape effects, safety, land take, demolition, geomorphology, impact on local businesses including farms and the economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) documents the options considered and assessment criteria used to identify the preferred alignment.</p>	
486	153380, 153615, 153901, 153913, 153955,			Community impact - Health	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact the health and wellbeing of local residents, including through noise	An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154245, 154248				pollution, reduced air quality, and the potential for traffic accidents.	<p>carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the scheme and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The assessment of noise and vibration impacts on human health during the construction phase reported in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>identified that residents on the eastern edge of Warcop and in rural properties close to the draft Order Limits are likely to be impacted temporarily by construction noise. This will combine with views of construction activities from rural areas as described in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.2). There are no adverse noise or visual effects on public open spaces or other sensitive community receptors. Individual and combined noise and visual effects may result in a temporary reduction in the perceived quality of the living environment for residents of rural properties. Due to the low population density in the study area, the extent of exposure to these changes will be low and the health effect is assessed as neutral. When operational the scheme will increase the traffic flow on the existing dual carriageway resulting in a significant adverse effect on noise on 16 residential properties on Lady Anne Drive on the southern edge of Brough. This may reduce enjoyment of outdoor space and perceptions of the quality of the local environment for these residents, however due to the small number of properties affected and the low potential for wider effects on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>public realm, the health effect is assessed as a neutral.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). The assessment of air quality impacts on human health during the construction phase reported in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) identified a large construction dust risk potential for high-sensitivity receptors within 100m of the draft Order Limits. Residents in a number of rural properties and farmsteads, Warcop village and Warcop Training Camp will therefore be at risk of adverse impacts on wellbeing from dust effects. However, requirements for dust mitigation set out in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality are considered to remove any significant impacts. The Air Quality assessment has not identified any significant effects on NOx and PM₁₀ concentrations resulting from construction activities. Therefore the health effects of air emissions from construction activities are assessed as neutral. During operation the Air Quality Assessment (ES Chapter 5, Air Quality) has identified small increases and decreases in NOx and PM₁₀ concentrations at receptors close to the affected road network within the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>study area. However, as the air quality across the study area is good and the number of sensitive receptors experiencing changes in air quality is low, no significant air quality impacts have been identified. Therefore, the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows that with regards to road safety, the single carriageway sections of the A66 have been shown to have a 73% higher accident rate than the dualled sections. The document includes a detailed description of the COBALT (Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch) analysis. This shows how the provision of a safer road design for the sections of the A66 upgraded as part of the Project translates into a reduction in accident levels over a 60-year period. When considering both improved scheme sections and existing dual sections, a net saving of 9 fatalities and 83 serious injuries is forecast to occur.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.	
592	153863, 153891		151465, 154234	Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	Respondents expressing concern that the chosen route alignment could cause antisocial behaviour. Respondents state that crime increases in areas close to main roads and slip roads and that the high number of slip roads could lead to crime associated with illegal traveller encampments.	While National Highways recognises concerns relating anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. The new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker more reliable journey times, enabling people to spend less time on the road, which may lead to reduced litter/fly tipping. National Highways is committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.	No
652		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	149770	Construction - Safety	Respondents expressing concern on how the Appleby Horse Fair will be accommodated, coordinated and managed during the construction period of the Project. Respondents suggest National Highways	National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee about disruption and access for the Appleby Horse Fair during the construction of the Project. During construction, the Appleby Horse Fair Multi-Agency Strategic	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					contributing to the Appleby Horse Fair Traffic Management Plan.	<p>Coordinating Group (MASCg) will be liaised with around the timing of works, adequate diversions, and routing of Fair traffic away from the A66 to minimise impacts on journeys to and from the Fair and on the surrounding road network. This principle is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and will be incorporated into Construction Traffic Management Plans (Application Document 2.6).</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) which will include a commitment to minimise disruption during the works. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that any disruption is minimised and will explain how the Project will minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local roads through appropriate communication and signage. Where there are key concerns, such as Appleby Horse Fair, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						deemed necessary.	
gi698	153799, 153822	Cumbria County Council	153321	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme's route alignment on access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.</p> <p>Respondents state that there would be insufficient pedestrian and cycle routes from Appleby to Sandford, Appleby to Warcop Bends, and from Brough to Appleby.</p> <p>Others claim that the scheme lacks provision for horse-rider access to the Appleby Fair.</p>	<p>The de-trunked sections of the A66 provide opportunity for safer routes associated with the Appleby Horse Fair. This de trunked section will offer a safer route for horse riders. The scheme maintains the existing bridleway provision.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	Yes
769	148577, 149367, 150434, 151481, 151501, 151504,	Musgrave Parish Council	149376, 149418, 150183, 154454	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme is too expensive, particularly when compared with alternative Northern routes.</p> <p>Respondents also express concern at the cost of constructing a large number</p>	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153329, 153810, 153830, 153851, 153863, 153875, 153946, 154255				of complex junctions for access to local villages.	<p>impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses</p> <p>The northern route through the AONB would not be in conformity with the key policy tests for the AONB. We have not assessed the northern route in detail in terms of economics, environmental impacts, highway alignments. Junctions, drainage requirements, cost of construction or land purchase impacts. The route would potentially have a major impact on the MoD training camp requiring significant, costly accommodation works to relocate required facilities.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
780	150189, 153309, 154213, 154233			Engineering design and development - Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the engineering and design aspects of the proposals could pose safety risks. Respondents feel that the slip roads would be located too close to residential properties - Croft Cottages.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage. The access off of the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>They also claim that the sharp and steep slip roads which connect to Brough bypass could cause vehicles to collide with residential properties, particularly in the winter.</p> <p>Related to this, they express concern over uncertainty about responsibility for road gritting.</p> <p>The proposal for using the existing roadway at Wild boar Hill is also seen as concerning for residents because the steepness of this area means that construction will require extensive earthworks, and this roadway was already reinforced in the past few years, both of these issues prompting general safety concerns.</p>	<p>new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce impact on the AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road. We acknowledge the concerns of the consultee and the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property. The junction and bridge will be designed in accordance with the latest standards and all designs are subject to safety audits by independent road safety auditors. The design will be refined as we move through the Detailed Design phase of the scheme.</p> <p>Ultimately, it is anticipated that the future maintenance responsibilities (including gritting) on the local access road at the east end of the scheme will be the responsibility of the local highway authority but the process for the handover of such maintenance responsibilities will be discussed further with the local highway authority.</p> <p>The suggested reuse of the existing road adjacent to Wildboar Hill has been assessed and a detailed ground investigation has been carried out that supports the design of the Project proposed and these designs will be further developed and confirmed through the detailed design stage.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
781	153027, 153862, 153931, 154211, 154233		149770, 153135	Land - Other	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the proposed land take on non-agricultural land. Respondents state that the proposed land take is too high, especially for environmental mitigation measures.	National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement. We have refined our mitigation plans since the PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats and species at these locations. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits.	No
804	153386		153568, 153940	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents expressing concern about traffic control measures, including variable speed limits between Brough and Brough Sowerby, which result in inadvertent speeding.	Signage National Highways note the consultees' comments on ensuring the signing strategy for the Project is clear and this will be developed during the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Respondents also comment on road signs being difficult to read in general, and specifically at Warcop junction.	<p>detailed design stage and agreed between National Highways, Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Brough and Brough Sowerby speeding</p> <p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee, however any works to the A685 is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location.</p>	
828	150462, 150465, 151458, 152992, 152993, 153319, 153329, 153365, 153848, 153863, 153902		152991, 153964	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact traffic safety, mentioning the quantity of junctions and slip roads at Warcop and near to Croft Cottage and that increased traffic speeds would reduce road safety.	<p>Design of junctions and slip roads</p> <p>National Highways note the consultees' comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users and agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Croft Cottages</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the consultee and the impact the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on their property. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project to prevent potential misuse.</p> <p>Slip roads</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the consultee regarding speed of traffic on and leaving/exiting the new A66. The new A66, side roads and junctions will be designed to latest standards and speed limits will be enforced by an appropriate signing strategy. The design will also be subject to Road Safety Audit to ensure hazards are minimised for users and maintainers.</p>	
837	152992, 152993, 153848		152991, 153383	Community impact - Safety	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on safety, including concern about vehicle accidents at and near Croft Cottage stating that traffic will move closer to residential properties.	National Highways acknowledge the concerns raised about the impact the Project and the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage at Brough bypass. The access off the new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce impact on the AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users including non-motorised users and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>Regarding close proximity of the road to residents' property, landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been a key consideration of the design. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. An environmental assessment contained in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans are illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Regarding safety concerns, National Highways is committed to maintaining an ongoing conversation about</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction with local people, businesses, and Organisations. We regularly monitor the safety of our network and work throughout the year to ensure our motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards. An assessment of Project impacts on accidents as detailed in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) concludes that the project will not only reduce the number of accidents on the A66 itself, but also on the surrounding road network as a result of the increased flow on the A66 removing traffic from other rural links. The design will also be subject to Road Safety Audit to ensure hazards and minimised for users and maintainers.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.</p>	
853	150189, 153832, 154233			Engineering design and	Respondents expressing concern that design elements of the scheme are unsafe, stating concerns about the east end of the Brough bypass and	East end of Brough Bypass National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee including the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				development - Safety	that there are 4 junctions within a 3.5-mile section of the project.	<p>impact that the proposed local access road design at the east end of the scheme would have on Croft Cottage at Brough bypass. The access off of the new A66 westbound carriageway has been positioned to connect to the new overbridge and reduce impact on the AONB on the northern side of the new A66 and local road. It has been designed to provide access for a number of other properties and users including non-motorised users and agricultural traffic and its use will be controlled by a traffic sign strategy to be developed during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>Number of junctions</p> <p>We note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the scheme which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic. The new A66 is designed to current national design standards</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(DMRB) and is subject to the road safety audit process in this stage and subsequent stages of development.	
877	151504, 152203, 152965, 152992, 152993, 153319, 153389, 153798		149376, 150183, 152991, 153383	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase traffic congestion in the final state and during construction at junctions to and from Brough due to additional traffic using these to access local villages, especially in Kirkby Stephen (A685) and that accidents on the A66 would exacerbate the congestion.	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the Project objectives. Further details of which can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Reference Document 4.1) generally and also section 5.5 'Appleby to Brough'.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner. Upon operation the new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker, more reliable journey times, resulting in less accidents and reduced driver frustration.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) also shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network. During construction of the schemes between Brough and Penrith, the A66 will remain open: motorists travelling between Penrith and Brough are thus unlikely to seek</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>diversion through Kirkby Stephen via the M6, which would add of the order of an additional 35 miles to their journey.</p> <p>During the construction of the Project, we intend to keep disruption to a minimum and the planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during the detailed design phase. The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as required by the EMP (compliance with which is secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and local communities will be managed.</p> <p>Please note that any works to the A685 is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location to this road by National Highways.</p>	
880	150434, 151501, 152992,		149376, 150183, 152991, 152994,	Land - Other	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on land, in particular the loss of non-agricultural land; reduction in AONB;	We acknowledge the concern about valuable land being taken by the Project on the south side of the existing A66 at Sandford. The route	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152993, 153560		153129, 153383		reductions in land value; impact on businesses and how land for mitigation will be managed to prevent unauthorised access and use for camping or fly tipping.	<p>proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has been developed following engagement with Statutory Bodies and affected landowners to understand and reduce impacts on businesses, landowners, residents and designated and protected sites. In Autumn 21, the route promoted between Café Sixty-Six and Moorhouse Lane proposed the construction of the additional carriageway for the new A66 to be built on the southern side of the existing carriageway. In order to reduce impacts on productive land and residents on the south side of the existing A66 a change to the road alignment has been made. The additional carriageway for the new A66 will now be built on the northern side of the existing carriageway rather than the southern side. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in Winter 22. Refer to Chapter 7 and Annex N of the Consultation Report for this item. The impact on productive land on the south side of the A66 will be reduced by this change, however, there will be a greater loss of land from the Ministry of Defence and an established tree belt will be lost.</p> <p>We note the consultees' concerns on the impact of the Project on the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Beauty (AONB), and throughout the design stage, work has been carried out to ensure that the route taken forward minimises the impact of and potential damage to the AONB which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy.</p> <p>Mitigation proposals were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation which presented plans for environmental mitigation including planting. A landscape and ecology management plan is proposed to be part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) this will set out any measure required for the management of mitigation land such as those to prevent unauthorised access and use for camping or fly tipping.</p> <p>The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.</p>	
889	153798			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents expressing concern about the traffic control measures on the scheme. Respondents express concern that the scheme would lack measures to control HGVs, especially on the A685 where there is an HGV ban.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the concerns of the consultee, however any works to the A685 is outside of the scheme extents and no works are planned in this location.</p> <p>The scheme will be designed to latest standards and speed and vehicle limits</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						will be enforced by an appropriate signing strategy.	
890	150176, 153798, 153875, 153946		149376, 149418, 150183	Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing concern about traffic disruption knock-on effects during construction of the scheme due to the location of the new road in close proximity to the existing road.	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have develop the draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. The CTMP will ensure that any disruption is minimised and will look to minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local road through appropriate communication and signage. Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>It is a requirement for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p>	
1001	151456			Alternative route - Black - Black - Black	One respondent expressing concern that the Black-Black-Black Route would cause disruption around Lowgill Beck.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns on the proposed alternative Black-Black-Black Route. Further information on the options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) The Black-Blue-Black route has been taken forward.</p> <p>In relation to concerns around Lowgill Beck. The environmental assessment that has been carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						adverse effects, propose mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the scheme would affect wildlife and habitats and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects.	
1002	151456		153129	Alternative route - Black - Black - Orange	Respondents expressing concern about the Black-Black-Orange Route and that it would negatively impact Brough, Musgrave Hill and Lowgill Beck, through increased noise and impacts on wildlife and farmland.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns on the proposed alternative Black-Black-Orange Route. Further information on the options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). The Black-Blue-Black route has been taken forward. The environmental assessment that has been carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. A noise assessment has been carried out which includes the impacts of construction noise. These levels are reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the scheme would affect wildlife and habitats and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects.</p> <p>The Orange route around Lowgill Beck, Brough and Musgrave Hill would have created a route through existing farmland to the south of the existing A66 and would have created a new traffic corridor with a potential to impact existing wildlife and the beck through the need for an additional structure over it. By keeping with the Black route in this section we maintain the route within it existing corridor and remove the potential impacts that would be associated with the new corridor that the Orange route would have created.</p>	
1244			153968	Engineering design and development - Engineering - design	Respondent expressing concern that Castle Hill Road is included in the project as it is a quiet residential land and should not be developed as a through road.	Castlehill Road is not becoming a through road although it will become the new access to the MoD replacement playing field. The proposal is to resurface Castlehill Road and also add passing bays to allow two vehicles to pass safely.	No
1248			153135	Land - Other	Respondents expressing concern on future landowner maintenance	National Highways note the concerns of the consultee on future maintenance	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					liabilities for any Infrastructure as a result of the A66 changes.	liabilities, these typically remain with National Highways for their Infrastructure. Accommodation works Infrastructure that is the responsibility of a landowner will be agreed in advance and will be provided on a "like for like basis". The total compensation agreed for a landowner claim will reflect not only the market value of the land they are losing, and any detrimental effect on the value of their retained interest but also disturbance costs. Disturbance costs reflect any additional costs the landowner may suffer as a direct consequence of the works and this will cover the maintenance of accommodation works, where they are their responsibility. This is covered off through a commuted sum and agreed between the parties which is paid to landowner to reflect the additional cost of this maintenance.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Bowes Bypass – Environment’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
570	153316		152985, 153039, 153040, 153050, 153133	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern relating to the environment and air quality, including concern that there would be an increase in air pollution during the construction and operation of the Project. Concerns include impacts on a nearby campsite.	<p>The ES sets out, broken down into topic, a detailed assessment of the impacts of the Project on the environment, in accordance with relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)).</p> <p>All human receptors with relevant exposure (locations at which members of the public are likely to be exposed for a period of time appropriate to the averaging period of the objective, in this case the annual mean objective) including residential properties, schools, hospitals and care homes, are regarded as having high sensitivity to changes in concentrations of ambient air pollutants. The impact of the Project on these human receptors, within 200m of the ARN, has been considered in the assessment within ES Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Campsites are not specifically considered. The air quality assessment concludes that there are no likely significant effects for air quality during construction or</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>operation.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105 (the relevant guidance). Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on-site and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p>	
588		Durham County Council	153136	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Durham County Council expressing support for the proposed scheme as it would not have an adverse impact on the cultural heritage of the area. Respondents specifically mention that the church in Bowes would not be impacted.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme. Where impacts are identified, measures to minimise impacts and provide mitigation where appropriate are included within ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
940			153940	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	One respondent, the Eden Valley Railway Trust, would like to be considered for recovery of any heritage materials from Bowes Station and its associated buildings / structures if they	National Highways has noted the request by Eden Valley Railway Trust and will notify the Principal Contractor that the Trust would like to be a possible recipient of salvaged material	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					are to be destroyed.	from Bowes Station. We also welcome the Trusts involvement in the recording exercise.	
1116		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent suggesting that there is potential for unrecorded cultural heritage resources within the ecological mitigation area and attenuation pond to the west of the village.	When the potential ecological mitigation was developed for the PEI Report, this was as a worst-case scenario based on the Autumn 2021 Consultation design to ensure all mitigation was accounted for when developing the Order Limits. Further surveys and trial trenching have been carried out and the extent of mitigation has been much reduced. Therefore the extent to which buried archaeological resources would be impacted has also been reduced. Where impacts are identified, measures to minimise impacts and provide mitigation where appropriate are included within the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
596	150473, 153036, 153965	Durham County Council	149381, 149393, 149395, 153940	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on cultural heritage sites, specifically Bowes Conservation Area, archaeological sites and listed buildings. Comments refer to heritage artefacts at Bowes Station and an iron age field system that could be impacted by mitigation planting proposed by the scheme. Concern is also raised in regards the location of a water collection reservoir and its	ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the impact of the Project on archaeology and heritage assets including archaeological sites and listed buildings. The assessment concludes there will be no significant impact on the Bowes Conservation Area. The proposed balancing pond (noted by the respondent as a water collection	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					location on early earthworks.	<p>reservoir) at the western end of the scheme has been sited to avoid known heritage resources. The type and location of mitigation required for cultural heritage resources has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of a Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>This draft mitigation strategy proposes to record heritage artefacts from Bowes Station and the iron age field system.</p> <p>Post Autumn 2021 Consultation, the design has been refined and proposed ecological mitigation has been developed in tandem with the cultural heritage team. Where avoidance of historical artefacts is not possible, they will be recorded prior to construction.</p>	
1117		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing concern that the conservation area at Bowes has not been captured in the PEI Report nor the Figures, and needs to be rectified and assessed appropriately in the ES.	We thank the respondent for bringing to our attention the exclusion of reference of the Conservation Area at Bowes in the PEI Report, this is rectified within ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the Bowes Conservation Area is considered within the assessment.	Yes
567	153797, 153965	Durham County Council	149386, 149393, 152485,	Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on the landscape and visual	The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
			152985	Landscape / visual	amenity, specifically mentioning the proposed new bridge at Stone Bridge farm.	<p>landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. Mitigation measures including planting, boundary treatments and landform are based on those elements that pre-exist in the current landscape type. This ensures an appropriate response, in keeping with the landscape character.</p> <p>The Project landscape architects, and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform.</p> <p>The revised access arrangement to Stone Bridge Farm has required the removal of roadside trees. These will be reinstated where practicable. The access overbridge lies 250m to the east. The landform around the bridge has been designed to fit with the surrounding landscape character.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are secured through the EMP, Application Document 2.7 and an indication of how such measures would be implemented is provided within Environmental Mitigation Maps, Application Document 2.8.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						Effects (Application Document 3.2). For this scheme there are no significant residual landscape effects. Two visual receptors are identified as experiencing a residual significant effect, VP7.7 from The Street looking north and VP 7.7b from the Public Right of Way No. 6 looking south.	
1019			153040	Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Light – Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressing concern relating to light pollution, without providing further details.	<p>The Project's design has been developed and refined to minimise as far as is practicable the potential for visual (light) impacts. This includes the use of cuttings, environmental bunds and screens.</p> <p>All the potential impacts are set out fully in ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual. The Project will not have any additional lighting. Existing lighting will be replaced with more modern units with less light spillage, reducing the overall light pollution.</p>	No
948	153901			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents suggesting, in general terms, that National Highways should work with local communities along this route to ensure that local wildlife habitats are protected.	The PEI Report was prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 consultation. For example stakeholder feedback provided by local landowners on the Environmental Mitigation Maps presented at PEI Report has been used to refine and update the updated Environmental Mitigation Maps	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						presented as part of the ES (Application Document 2.8). The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are reported in the ES. The information in the ES will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate during the Examination of the Project. A second iteration of the EMP will be prepared prior to construction and detail how habitats will be protected during construction. Habitat Management Plans will also be prepared during detailed design for areas of newly created habitat as part of the Project. The EMP and Habitat Management Plans will be consulted on, giving statutory bodies an opportunity to input and feedback..	
546	153365, 153613, 153797, 153965, 154144		152259, 152985, 153606	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern that scheme would negatively impact habitats, and that mitigation would result in maintenance difficulties as mitigation is across field boundaries and that there is insufficient provision for animal bridges.	The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project, at construction, operation and maintenance stages. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, greening of proposed overbridges, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, animal bridges, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The outline monitoring, maintenance and management measures for up to 30 years following completion of ecological mitigation measures are set out within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (an annex to the EMP). Within the LEMP, maintenance of newly created habitats is set out and consideration of features such as field boundaries has been considered, where appropriate.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
523	153634, 154014		153138	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / Road drainage and water	Respondents suggest that water supplies at West End Farm for agricultural plots should remain unaffected by the Project and that the drainage system needs to be properly connected. Respondents also suggest that a hydrologist survey is carried out prior to any works to ensure private natural springs are protected.	<p>The PEI Report feedback is noted and welcomed and the identified springs have been included as potential receptors within the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Impacts of the Project (e.g. from cuttings) on groundwater receptors are considered within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendices.</p> <p>Should assessments indicate that the springs could potentially be impacted by the works, appropriate surveying by the Principal Contractor will be carried out to confirm that the receptors have not been disturbed during construction. Should works result in disturbance of the supply, appropriate mitigation will be implemented or an alternative source supplied. This is secured within the EMP, Application Document 2.7 which accompanies this application.</p> <p>During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage. Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever possible, should this not be possible alternative solutions will be sought.</p>	Yes
514	153036,		150457,	Environment -	Respondents expressing concern	National Highways acknowledge the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
	153365, 153613, 153634, 154014, 154144		150463, 153040, 153133, 153138, 153572, 153610, 153632, 154239, 154263	general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / Road drainage and water	relating to flooding and drainage. Concerns include drainage issues on the existing road and nearby land; a detrimental impact on local water supplies; the location and size of the proposed pond; and the siting of balancing pond west of Stonebridge Farm. Respondents also query whether sufficient consideration has been given to the impact of climate change.	<p>consultees concerns regarding pond sizes and locations. The proposed positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation, whilst minimising the risk of flooding. The design of all drainage features includes an appropriate uplift to worst case storm events to allow for the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Surveys of water supplies will be carried out at detailed design. Should any potential impacts be anticipated to water supplies alternative sources will be provided.</p> <p>Chapter 14 the ES (Application Document 3.2) presents a full impact assessment in relation to the road drainage and the water environment. The chapter describes the baseline conditions of the existing water environment in the study area and the methodology used to assess potential impacts during the construction and operational phases of the Project, before presenting the results of these assessments and any further mitigation measures or monitoring deemed necessary. It considers the potential effects on the quality and quantity of surface and ground waters,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>geomorphology and flood risk that may result from construction activities, operational road drainage and accidental spillages.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed drainage system incorporates pollution control measures as directed by DMRB standards. Predominantly this is in the form of wet ponds with sediment forebays supplemented by swales and silt traps where required by calculations. The detailed drainage design and maintenance strategies will be developed at the next Project design stage and Lead Local Flood Authorities will be consulted throughout the Project to ensure the solution is agreeable to all.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
317	150161, 150169, 153852, 154181		153132	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	Respondents suggesting that tree planting and rewilding proposals could be altered to accommodate the respondents feedback. Respondents state that more trees should be planted alongside the route to maintain the AONB of the area. Respondents suggest that mature trees should be retained wherever possible. Others suggest that that provision could be provided for deer crossing points.	The landscape-led approach to this Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the AONB and is in accordance with stakeholder feedback The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting and the retention of mature trees. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife. Relating to deer specifically, a review of the roadkill data and biological records combined with field surveys carried out at Bowes Bypass did not identify the requirement for a deer specific crossing points within this scheme as set out within ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and supporting Appendices (Application Document 3.4). The landscape-led approach has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) and secured by implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
659	154144,		153336, 154206	Noise	Respondents suggesting that noise mitigation measures should be included to reduce noise pollution on this scheme Respondents believe that noise barriers should be erected, specifically at the eastern and western approaches to Bowes village.	A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the scheme and is presented in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). A significant adverse effect at one residential receptor is identified at the eastern side of Bowes with no sustainable mitigation measure identified as suitable to be implemented. As a result a residual significant adverse effect is identified in this location. The remaining receptors within Bowes are not predicted to be subject to significant effects.	No
660	154144		149381, 149386, 150457, 152985,	Noise	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase noise pollution during construction and operation of the Project with greater	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7 and Section 8) outlines forecast traffic flow changes, including locations	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
			153040, 153336		vehicles and HGVs, which would negatively impact residents.	<p>showing traffic flow increases for each scheme in the Project. The Transport Assessment also describes the proposed construction phases in Section 11.</p> <p>Section 7 (Forecast strategic network performance) shows an increase of 39% AADT on the A66 at Bowes Bypass with the Project in 2044. Forecast HGV flows in 2044 with the project increase by between 14 and 23 per hour during the day compared to without the project (see table 7-5 and 7-6 in Section 7).</p> <p>Section 8 (Forecast local network performance) shows that there is a decrease in traffic on the A67 (-9%) as the improved (faster) A66 attracts more longer distance east west traffic from the A67 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington. There is an increase of 430 AADT increase on the unnamed link between Bowes and Lartington.</p> <p>It is noted within the Transport Assessment (Chapter 11.7) that there is predicted to be an increase in traffic on the unmarked road north of Bowes (+68 vehicles per day which represents a 14% increase) during construction scenario D. This increase is not identified as significant and it should be noted that this is a worst case</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessment</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced a EMP, (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed.</p>	
1155			153132	Noise	Respondent expressing concern that the removal of mature trees will create a large noise issue for the Bowes Hutchinson's C of E (Aided) Primary School and the children attending the school and that this will be made worse if 40 year old trees are replaced with saplings.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation including at Bowes Hutchinson's C of E (Aided) Primary School, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The operational assessment identifies a predicted increase of < 3dB in short and long-term on the playing field (north of school buildings) and a < 1dB increase at school buildings,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>therefore, no significant adverse effect as a result of traffic noise from the Project is identified at the school.</p> <p>All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable. However it should be noted the Project noise assessment does not take account of any potential noise attenuation from trees, as generally woodland is not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation. This therefore ensures that the noise impact assessment baseline represents a worst case for which to determine potential impacts and significant effects, as well as any noise mitigation requirements. The removal or provision of trees in this area would therefore not impact upon the result of the operational noise impact assessment</p>	
1157			153039 154206	Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme should take into account the current noise baseline and that the west end of Bowes road has been recently re-surfaced.</p>	<p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The noise impact assessment has been informed by noise survey baseline surveys and the ES Chapter identifies each monitoring location, the duration of the survey period and baseline noise levels. In addition engagement has been carried out with pavement engineers to understand the current surfacing works and any impact</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						this may have on operational noise levels has been considered.	
1159			153133	Noise	Respondent expressing concern that the scheme would increase noise pollution which would negatively affect amenity areas including campsites.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Sensitive receptors include campsites, which if identified as being subject to a significant effect during the Project operation are reported in ES Appendix 12.4. The study area has been defined in line with DMRB guidance and by engagement with relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 6.2) also provides an assessment of the effects of the Project on amenity and local businesses.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The commitments set out in the EMP are secured through a Requirement in the draft DCO.	
1160			152259, 152485	Noise	Respondents expressing concern that the removal of mature trees will adversely impact noise levels.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>All trees and existing woodland is to be retained where practicable. It should be noted however that the Project noise assessment does not take account of any potential noise attenuation from trees, as generally woodland is not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation. The removal or provision of trees in this area would therefore not impact upon the result of the operational noise impact assessment. This therefore ensures that the noise impact assessment baseline represents a worst case for which to determine potential noise mitigation requirements.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures to be implemented in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						features to reduce noise impacts during operation.	
932	149367, 152258, 153365, 153797, 153871, 153965		152983	Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase traffic, and therefore CO2 emissions, which is contrary to climate change commitments, and that alternative transport options have not been considered instead of the scheme.	<p>The impacts on traffic levels associated with the Project are shown in the Transport Assessment Chapter 7 and 8 (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Section 7 (Forecast strategic network performance) shows an increase of 39% AADT on the A66 at Bowes Bypass with the Project in 2044.</p> <p>Section 8 (Forecast local network performance) shows that there is a decrease in traffic on the A67 (-9%) as the improved (faster) A66 attracts more longer distance east west traffic from the A67 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington. There is an increase of 430 AADT increase on the unnamed link between Bowes and Lartington.</p> <p>The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in ES Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2) and considers the traffic modelling undertaken for the Project. In the context of the UK carbon budget targets, it is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						Consideration of alternative options , as well as other non-highway modes that would successfully meet the Project objectives are discussed in Project Development Overview Report Chapter 3, Summary of Previous Route Options Assessments (Application Document 4.1).	
949	153901			Community Impact	Respondent suggests, without being specific, that National Highways work with local communities along this route and implement what is best for the environment.	<p>There are opportunities for all parties to express their view and concerns on the proposals. Issues can be raised through consultation and engagement and also after the DCO application is submitted, through representations to the Examining Authority (an independent body who will examine the application and make a recommendation to Government on whether the Project should be consented).</p> <p>Post consent there will also be opportunities to comment on proposed construction and detailed design measures. National Highways is committed to delivering social value and this is embedded into the Project, with consultation carried out with local communities to understand community needs.</p>	No
1055		Natural England		Landscape and visual effects	Natural England expressing concern relating to landscape and visual effects as outlined in the PEI Report, including concern that a small section of this	The landscape-led approach to this Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					route would impact an AONB, without providing further details.	<p>balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. The AONB is not be significantly affected by the works. There will be some changes to the southern boundary but these are not significant and will be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall landscape design principles.</p>	
1158			153336	Population and Human Health	Respondent expressing concern that the scheme would increase noise	ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration has identified a number of receptors in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
				/ Noise	pollution during construction and operation impacting on health and well-being.	Bowes that would be above the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) during construction. No residential or other sensitive receptors would be above SOAEL during operation, although one work premises in Bowes would exceed SOAEL. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the Project on human health including with regard to potential noise impacts. A temporary negative health effect is identified due to increased annoyance and reduced enjoyment of the public realm and open space during construction. No adverse health effects are identified in relation to operational noise.	
515			153138	Road Drainage and the Water Environment	<p>Respondent requesting more information regarding drainage, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) confirmation of repositioning the ditch to the east of the enclosure of a respondent's property; ii) where the water from the north of the A66 would drain to; iii) alternative options for the proposed pond location. iv) One respondent expressed concern about the position of the ditch as it would be difficult to manage unless separated from their field. 	<p>i) The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>ii) All water from the north of the A66 will drain south into the River Greta. This is detailed in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>iii) National Highways acknowledge the consultees concerns regarding pond sizes and locations and the proposed positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from consultation and engagement whilst minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>iv) The detailed drainage design and maintenance strategies will be developed at the next Project design stage and Lead Local Flood Authorities will be consulted throughout the Project to ensure the solution is agreeable to all.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Bowes Bypass' scheme and National Highways regard (All except EIA)

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
228	148548, 148621, 152923, 153316, 153910		154239	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce traffic congestion. Respondents state that the junction improvements would improve traffic flow, and that the route would divert traffic away from local villages.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
522	153316, 154014, 154213		152485, 153132	Land - Land take	Respondents expressing support for the scheme due to the proposed land take. Respondents state that the land take would be kept to a minimum, and that this would reduce potential negative impacts on residential and community properties.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Scheme and for the provision for Brough Hill Fair.	No
526	148550, 148564, 148566, 148569, 148572, 148578, 148583, 148585, 148588, 148590, 148600, 148603, 148604, 148613,	Durham County Council	149381, 151490, 153132, 153138, 153336, 153381, 154199	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing their support for the scheme in general terms, without providing specific details.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	148626, 148637, 149351, 149352, 149370, 150460, 150462, 151474, 152243, 152268, 152911, 153084, 153335, 153377, 153386, 153829, 154014, 154218, 162144						
578	148615, 148640, 149415, 150456, 150462, 152945, 153035, 153316, 153911, 153939	Durham Constabulary	153948, 154239, 154263	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would improve safety for motorised traffic. Respondents state that the dualling of the road and improvement of junctions would reduce the number of accidents caused by sudden deceleration. Others feel that accessing the A66 could become safer, and that westbound traffic in particular may see the risk of collisions reduced. Respondents support the	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of communities and resident's journeys.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					scheme for closing the dangerous Stonebridge Farm junction.		
711			153632	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Do not build cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	A respondent expressing their support for the scheme on the grounds that it does not include extensive cycle path, footpath, or bridleway additions. This respondent states that cycle path provision is already adequate.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
923	151458, 152968, 153316, 153558		151465	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme due to the possible vehicular access improvements it could bring. Respondents state that the scheme would improve the existing junction layout and usability. Others support the proposed second eastbound carriageway and its accompanying slip roads. Respondents also expressing support on the grounds of the improved access the scheme could bring to Teesdale residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
934			153959	Traffic, transport and junctions - Commuting	One respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it may reduce commuting times.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
951	153799			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	A respondent expressing support for the scheme due to the possible improved access it could bring for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Respondents support the provision of a cycle route which would provide access to Scotch Corner from Penrith whilst avoiding the A66.	crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	
1012	148568, 152922, 152989, 153035, 153043			Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the scheme due to the proposed design of this section. Without being specific, respondents express support for the route design. Others state that the A67/A66 junction design would be a sensible improvement to the current road layout.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
1042			152485	Construction - Disruption	A respondent expressing support for the construction of this scheme stating that they understand the potential noise pollution, vibration, smell, and air pollution would be expected for an infrastructure project of this scale.	National Highways acknowledges the qualified support and National Highways can confirm that we have carried out EIA and report in the ES on the likely significant environmental effects of the Project and have made recommendations on mitigation to avoiding and minimising such adverse effects. Principal Contractors undertaking the works will ensure the safety of the workforce, road users and stakeholders at all times, with noise, vibration, smells and air pollution all incorporating into managed control measures.	No
1050	152251			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	One respondent expressing support for the scheme due to potential improvements in safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. They state	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					that the footpath diversion to the east of Bowes would improve safety.	crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	
557	149374, 153365, 153833, 153839, 153871, 153906, 153965		153601	Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition toward the Bowes Bypass section of the route in general terms without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the Scheme in principle. National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of National Highway's Project Control Framework (PCF) stages 1 and 2. It has continued the evaluation of route alignments for some Schemes more recently in 2021 (the findings of which were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation). The outcome from these assessments and the further development of the design for the DCO Application demonstrates that: i) the A66 dualling delivers the greatest level of strategic benefits (compared with alternative highway interventions), with particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out both the need for the Project and for the schemes (including Bowes Bypass) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) which describes the process of developing the design of Bowes Bypass scheme	
326	150189, 153613, 153841, 153906, 154243, 162144		152983, 153031, 153062, 153138, 153632	Engineering design and development - East Bowes	<p>Respondents expressing concern that access to agricultural land would be restricted, making journeys longer, and a decrease in productive farmland. Suggestions include creating better connectivity between roads.</p> <p>Re-location of proposed bridges so that farmland is not impacted.</p> <p>Extending the access road beyond East Lowfields.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed the need for further information on why bridges are required or how the scheme would directly impact their property as current plans suggest a possibility of that happening.</p>	<p>Removing direct accesses off the A66 provides a significant safety benefit to all users. However, all these accesses must be re-provided and at Bowes, the proposed solution is via an access track that provides access north and south of the A66 and connect to Bowes junction via The Street.</p> <p>On the northern side of the A66, properties that currently have a direct access onto the eastbound carriageway of the A66 will connect to the track and travel across the A66 via an overbridge. A bridge across the A66 to connect into Bowes is required because not all properties have an alternative access onto the A67 to the north.</p> <p>On the southern side of the A66, those properties that have an access onto the westbound carriageway of the A66 will be connected to a track that provides a connection into Bowes. The</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>track connects into Bowes as the new junction at Bowes with the A66/A67 will provide access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66, and a connection to the A67.</p> <p>Following consultation feedback and liaison with landowners, the overbridge has been moved eastwards and the design refined to minimise land-take.</p> <p>Consultation feedback, coupled with a Road Safety Review, has resulted in the boundary of the Project extending eastwards beyond East Lowfields Farm, to include the direct access into Bowes Cross Farm. The access track from Bowes will be extended east to incorporate Bowes Cross Farm. The direct access and central reserve gap at Bowes Cross will be removed, providing a safety benefit to drivers on the A66 and those accessing and egressing Bowes Cross. Further consultation was carried out on this matter in spring 2022. Refer to Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report for further information.</p> <p>Any existing access into a land-plot will be replaced. Details of the access locations on the track will be further developed during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
521	153613, 153614, 153634, 154014		152485, 153060, 153132, 153138, 153601, 153606, 153610, 153632, 154005, 154206, 154263	Request for further information	<p>Respondents requesting further information about the scheme. Respondents have questions regarding: the land take and red line boundary; the design of Clint Lane bridge; construction timescales; land access; traffic data; impact surveys; and alternative design options. Others request information about mitigation measures, specifically regarding flooding, noise pollution, tree planting, and grassland creation.</p>	<p>The Order Limits in our DCO Application is the land we need to construct the Project and associated infrastructure. The development of the design for the Project and the land required for the proposed design is set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). Other land required for mitigation may be returned to the landowners under a management agreement.</p> <p>Details such as bridge design, including that of Clint Lane bridge, construction phases and timetables will be carried out as part of the detailed design in the next phase of the Project, which is due to commence in summer 2022 shortly following the submission of this DCO application. Detailed design is expected to be complete by autumn 2023.</p> <p>Access to land north and south of the A66 which currently uses Clint Lane Bridge will be maintained throughout construction, and we will continue to work with landowners and other local people in this regard.</p> <p>Further information on the traffic data and traffic impacts of the project is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Details on the surveys carried out to inform the EIA are set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and the alternative design options considered for each scheme are set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). The Environmental Assessment considers all environmental impacts, and includes a Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 14.2, Application Document 3.4) that has been informed by detailed flood modelling. The Environmental Statement describes the assessment, the impacts identified and the mitigation required.</p> <p>Details of our mitigation measures are set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). The EMP includes detail of all mitigation identified in the Environmental Statement that must be implemented during construction and operation of the Project. Specially measures are included to reduce noise and disturbance to local residents, ensure the drainage from the new road does not cause flooding elsewhere and objectives that the final environmental mitigation scheme must achieve. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>show one way in which the landscape and ecology mitigation required could be delivered within the Order Limits. The Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) also set out key design principles that the environmental mitigation scheme must comply with.</p> <p>The EMP includes the requirement for a number of management plans that must be produced in detail by the Principal Contractor. Annex B includes essay plans or drafts of these management plans and, along with the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments in the EMP itself, sets out what measures must be implemented. These management plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex B1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (measures for the provision and management of landscape and ecology mitigation, including tree planting and creation of grassland) • Annex B5 Noise and Vibration Management Plan (noise mitigation measures) • Annex B7 Ground and Surface Water Management (water management, including management of flood risk during construction) 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
564	148549, 148589, 149361, 152914, 152923, 153316, 153826, 153828, 153910, 154144, 154485			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting engineering design and development improvements in relation to motorhome and rest facilities. Respondents suggest that motorhome users should be provided an Aire-style facility. Others suggest that free and safe HGV rest sites be provided at 15 mile intervals. Respondents suggest that HGV and motorhome sites could be located at the former Bowes railways station, or to the east of Bowes.	A new service area for HGV's or motorhomes is not within the scope of the Project. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.	No
565	153316		154263	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents suggesting ways that vehicular access could be improved as part of the scheme. Respondents state that vehicular access to Clint Lane bridge should be maintained, and that access routes for agricultural vehicles should be created. Others suggest that the scheme should include a Barnard Castle eastern bypass to improve accessibility, and that the slip road from the A66 to Stone Bridge Farm could be retained.	Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements. Underpasses have been sized to accommodate agricultural vehicles. A new Clint Lane Bridge will be constructed as part of the works, in its current location. National Highways is aware of the feasibility study into a possible bypass east of Barnard Castle; however, as it was determined by Durham County Council that the bypass east of Barnard Castle would not be progressed further, this was not considered when developing the design.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The option of retaining a slip road from the A66 to Stone Bridge Farm has been discounted on safety grounds due to the proximity of the main diverge slip road into Bowes and the confusion and potential risk this would cause to road users.	
566	153316, 153901			Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents suggesting that National Highways need to work with, and listen to, the local communities along the Bowes Bypass section of the Project.	<p>There has been regular engagement through a Community Liaison Group and individually with relevant stakeholders, including all the host local authorities and town and parish councils. This has included engagement with Durham County Council and Barnard Castle Town Council.</p> <p>Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. The National Highways Team and specialists involved in the technical work were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals. Further detail of the consultation and engagement process and the outcome from this process is set out elsewhere in this Consultation Report. The engagement will continue with all the key stakeholders on matters such as the detailed design of the Project, following the submission of this DCO application.	
579	153316, 153829, 154198		154239	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting that the scheme could be improved with traffic control measures relating to traffic, junctions, and transport. Respondents specifically mention that better signage would be needed at Bowes junction. Others suggest that signage diverting HGVs away from unsuitable roads in Barnard Castle, and towards Rokeby	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the Project objectives. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					junction, should be included in the scheme.	<p>An overview of the scheme justification is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>The design of provided junctions will allow the merge and diverge of traffic on and off the A66 and will not require traffic control measures.</p> <p>Rokeby junction will continue to be the signed route for HGV access from the A66 into Barnard Castle. National Highways welcomes the suggestion regarding improved signage. Details on signage will be considered at the next stage of detailed design for new or existing junctions within the works extents</p>	
664	149367, 149374, 153365, 153797, 153833, 153839, 153871			Traffic, transport and junctions - Sustainable transport	<p>Respondents suggesting that sustainable transport should be explored as part of, or an alternative to, the scheme. Respondents suggest that rail transport should be promoted instead of road building, specifically mentioning the existing rail route in Bowes. Others suggest that active transport and public transport should be invested in as an alternative to the scheme. Respondents suggesting that reducing vehicle use on roads should be prioritised over the construction of this section of the Project as a way to achieve net zero targets.</p>	<p>National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith which could be upgraded as an alternative. . The Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Strategic Study (at Stage 0) considered a number of different interventions for transport solutions across the Pennines, including non-highway modes, as set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
684	153634		153132, 153138, 153601, 153632	Land - Land take	<p>Respondents suggesting that the land take of the scheme should be amended. They state that the land take could be reduced, land should be returned after construction, and that non-productive land should be used. Others suggest that access routes to land holdings should be replaced, and that farm buildings, walls, and gates should be replaced as a form of mitigation. A respondent suggests that walls should be used instead of</p>	<p>Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report), the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting has been significantly reworked and refined. This has accommodated feedback received at the PEI Report stage from stakeholders where possible and appropriate, and information from surveys carried out since the PEI Report was produced. Updated ecological and landscape</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>embankments on the scheme to reduce the need for agricultural land.</p>	<p>mitigation plans, which illustrate how the ecological and landscape mitigation could be developed, are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). All landowners who are impacted by the Project and environmental mitigation land requirements have been written to by the Project team.</p> <p>We are working with all landowners through our dedicated public liaison officers to ensure they can continue to operate farms and other businesses and any buildings, walls or gates are maintained or replaced.</p> <p>We will be considering suggestions for shallow embankments in some locations to integrate the scheme within the surrounding landscape. The locations for these are identified in the Project Design Principles (Document 5.11) which sets out objectives for the design to integrate the scheme into the landscape, but also to maximise the amount of land that can be returned to its previous use. This work will be informed by the further development of the landscape and ecology management plan, an outline of which is presented at Annex B1 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The design of embankments and retaining</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						walls will be further developed as part of the detailed design process, post DCO submission.	
715	150172, 153389		153632	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents make suggestions about alternative facilities or ways to spend money. Respondents state that a bridge would not be needed as part of this scheme. Others suggest that a Kirkby Stephen bypass be created, and that Banks Gate could benefit from investment to prevent snowy weather conditions blocking access.	<p>National Highways note the consultees comments on the proposed design of the Project which has been developed through ongoing engagement with landowners, statutory bodies, and other interested parties. The route proposed at the Autumn 2021 Consultation has evolved from the option promoted at the preferred route stage as a consequence of these ongoing discussions and engagement and seeks to improve connectivity for through traffic, local traffic, non-motorised users, and agricultural traffic.</p> <p>Bridges structures are proposed as part of the scheme and are provided to allow vehicular movements over or under the A66, to re-connect severed access routes and the Public Rights of Way Bridleway 309/003, Footpath 309/004 and Footpath 309/033.</p> <p>National Highways has carried out a process of evaluation of options at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Strategic Study (NTPRSS, 2014-16). This earlier work concluded that</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>dualling the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was to be progressed to PCF Stage 1, Option identification (refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information).</p> <p>A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the NTPRSS. Although it was recognised that the by-pass would provide some localised journey time reliability and environmental benefits, the scale of these benefits would be much smaller than the more extensive intervention, associated with the full dualling of the A66. The NTPRSS concluded that the A66 full dualling option delivered particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, which smaller interventions, such as the Kirkby Stephen by-pass could not deliver to the same level. National Highways has considered the request for a Kirkby Stephen by-pass and has concluded that there has been no change in circumstances that affects the outcome from the previous work which led to the decision to dual the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66 and not take forward a by-pass at Kirkby Stephen.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	
717	151462, 151484			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	<p>Respondents suggesting that the scheme should make better provision for active travel routes. Respondents suggest that safe active travel routes, that are segregated from the road, should be included in the proposals.</p>	<p>The project objectives include improving active travel routes. The following specific improvements are included in the Bowes scheme.</p> <p>Footpaths severed by the previous dualling of Bowes bypass are reconnected as part of the Project. As part of the proposals, the gap in the central reservation for Bowes Cross Farm and Hulands Quarry (which are currently use as unsafe pedestrian crossing points) are closed, and the footpath is diverted to the accommodation overbridge to the west in order to provide a safe crossing facility which is grade-separated. The existing footway is to be retained under Bowes junction, and the signed National Cycle Route will be retained over the new Clint Lane bridge.</p> <p>The amended PRowS at this location will be separate tracks, segregated</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>from the A66 by grassed areas or landscape bunds.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
803	153634		153031, 153133	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents suggesting a series of engineering design and development measures that could be introduced to mitigate the impact of the scheme. Respondents suggest that screening, bunding, and quieter road surfaces should be used. Others feel that any lost or displaced walls and fences on agricultural land should be restored following construction.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The noise assessment is underpinned by modelling which considers factors such as traffic speed, wind, and topography.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The design includes the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. Surfacing specifications will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The landscape and visual assessment of the scheme can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 3.2). The assessment identifies potential visual impacts construction and operation. Landscape mitigation for the Project has sought to ameliorate or offset impacts where possible.</p> <p>Any details in relation to boundary fences and segregation features will be developed at the detailed design stage. All boundary treatments will comply with the requirements of the Project Design Principles document. (Application Document Ref. 5.11), with specific reference to landscape character project-wide design principle LC08.</p>	
839	153613		153060, 153133	Community impact - Properties	<p>Respondents making suggestions for how to mitigate the impact of the scheme on properties. Respondents state that financial compensation should be provided both for the loss of land and potential loss of materials on their land such as fencing stocks. Others state that NH should discuss fencing and walling requirements in advance when accommodation structures will be placed on their property.</p>	<p>The environmental assessment carried out does not consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase (Environmental Statement, Application Document 3.2). Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team has identified mitigation measures, as set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Document: 3.2) and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Special measures are included to reduce noise and disturbance to local</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>residents, as are objectives that the final environmental mitigation scheme must achieve. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) show one way in which the landscape and ecology mitigation required could be delivered within the Order Limits. The Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) also set out key design principles that the environmental mitigation scheme must comply with.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to liaise and engage with landowners when it comes to fencing and walling requirements during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Order Limits in our DCO Application is the land we need to construct the Project and associated infrastructure. The development of the design for the Project and the land required for the proposed design is set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). Other land required for mitigation may be returned to the landowners under a management agreement.</p>	
898	149369, 149407, 150175,		153138	Walking, cycling and horse-riders -	Respondents suggesting that improvements could be made to cycle paths, footpaths, and bridleways as	The project objectives include improving routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. The followinbg	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
151470, 151484, 151486, 152906, 153388, 153799, 153839, 153860, 153939, 153963, 162148				Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	<p>part of the scheme. Respondents suggest that the disused rail line south of the A66 be used for non-motorised traffic, and the creation of a continuous route between Bowes and Brough. Others state that a cycle path could be created between Kirkby Stephen and Penrith. Respondents suggest that safe crossing points should be prioritised for non-motorised users and that walking routes should be designed to cater to potential tourists.</p>	<p>specific improvements are included in the Bowes scheme.</p> <p>Footpath 6 at Bowes is currently severed by the existing A66 Bowes Bypass. The proposed design reconnects the footpath via a new accommodation underpass to the east. The NCN 70 cycle route and Pennine Way Bowes Loop is retained on the existing alignment, albeit running over a new Clint Lane Bridge.</p> <p>Footpaths 12 and 6 have been severed by the previous dualling of Bowes bypass. As part of the proposals, the gap in the central reservation for Bowes Cross Farm and Hulands Quarry (which are currently use as unsafe pedestrian crossing points) are closed, and the footpaths is diverted to the accommodation underpass to the west in order to provide a safe crossing facility which is grade-separated.</p> <p>In all cases safe crossing points are prioritised to remove unsafe at-grade crossing of the A66. The enhanced facilities will be to the benefit of both local users and tourists alike.</p> <p>With regards the disused railway line being considered for a non-motorised link between Bowes and Brough, this is outside the scope of this Project. Alternative funding sources may be</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>available to achieve this link in the future.</p> <p>With regards to the comment asking for a cyclepath from Kirkby Stephen to Penrith, National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (TPRSS) (2014-16). A by-pass for Kirkby Stephen was one of the options considered as part of the TPRSS but this was not taken forward so any related WCH upgrades from Kirkby Stephen are outside of the scope of the current Project.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
941	153388			Economics - Local economy	Respondents suggest creating and encouraging the use of walking routes to the south and west of Barnard Castle to support the local tourism economy.	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Further information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and full details are shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p>	
996			153133	Economics - Cost	A suggestion that National Highways should cover the cost of any re-siting of infrastructure is needed as a result of the works, including the campsite.	<p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. The environmental assessment that is being carried out will consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team will propose mitigation measures to reduce the effects where required and practicable. Where the scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
997			153132	Construction - Disruption	Respondents requesting construction disruption be kept to a minimum due to the Bowes Hutchinson's C of E (Aided) Primary School outdoor classrooms being nearby.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise, vibration and air quality during construction and operation including at Bowes Hutchinson's C of E (Aided) Primary School, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration and ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). The ES also covers wider assessment on Human Health and impacts on community assets in Chapter 13 Population and Human Health.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise and air quality, will be managed. Measures to reduce disturbance through noise and vibration will be included in and implemented through a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP). The required measures are included in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Table 3-2 of the EMP) and an outline of the NVMP is included at Annex B5. The EMP also sets out measures to prevent impacts arising from air quality changes, dust and other aspects of the construction</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>that could affect the users of the school. An Air Quality and Dust Management Plan is also secured via the EMP, and an outline is provided at Annex B6. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will also be produced to ensure disruption to local roads (including around local schools) is prevented where reasonably practicable, and an outline is provided at Annex B13.</p> <p>The operational assessment identifies a predicted increase of < 3dB in short and long-term on the playing field (north of school buildings) and < 1dB increase at school buildings. In accordance with the methodology followed (as set out in DMRB), this would not lead to a perceptible change to the noise environment and no significant adverse effect as a result of traffic noise from the Project is identified at the school during operation.</p>	
1082	148619			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	A respondent suggesting that providing for the needs of road vehicles should not be at the detriment of walkers, cyclists, horse-riders, and other non-motorised users.	Walking, riding and cycling are important aspects of the Scheme. All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing; this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Segregated crossing of the dual carriageway for PRow at Bowes Cross Farm to Hulands Quarry is proposed. The existing footway is to be retained under Bowes junction, and the signed National Cycle Route will be retained over the new Clint Lane bridge.</p> <p>For further information see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p>	
1359			153606, 153632	Request for further information - Field acquisition	Respondents requesting further information about the acquisition and intended use of two fields opposite of Stone Bridge Farm.	Existing flood modelling shows an area of land that is susceptible to flooding. This area of land that is at risk of flooding is contained within the area outlined in the DCO Order Limits, as shown on Figure 14.9 Operational Flood Risk of the ES (Application Document 3.3). The addition of an eastbound carriageway will take up some of this low-lying ground and the Scheme seeks to ensure that the existing flooding situation is not exacerbated by the new carriageway. The low lying field areas, identified on the DCO general arrangement drawings, will be taken to provide the necessary flood water storage. For	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						further information, refer to ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment.	
1360			153138	Land - Accommodation Access West	Respondents suggesting alternative access arrangements and reinstatements of removed accesses at the western part of the Bowes Bypass scheme. This includes access to farms, access from Clint Lane Bridge to the east of the bridge and to the north of the A66.	Direct field accesses onto the A66 will be closed for safety reasons as the Project looks to remove right and left turning traffic onto and off the A66 at uncontrolled access points. Alternative access will be provided via the local road network or via new access tracks or potentially via existing fields within overall land holding. Accesses to the fields to the north of the A66 which are accessed from Clint Lane bridge are being replaced by new access tracks. National Highways will continue to liaise and engage with landowners when it comes to accommodation works and access requirements during the detailed design stage..	No
1361			153133	Engineering design and development - Earthworks	A respondent suggests that retaining walls could be used instead of embankments on the scheme to reduce the need for taking agricultural land.	The permanent land required to construct and operate the scheme is considered to be reasonable and has been determined through multi-disciplinary design and assessment, including engineering and environmental considerations. Inclusion of a retaining wall in lieu of a cutting or embankment may be considered in the detailed design, however it may not necessarily reduce land take due to other considerations	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						such as mitigation, maintenance access etc. In particular, embankments can play an important role in integrating the Scheme within the landscape.	
316	153084, 153316, 153365, 153613, 153826, 153828, 153910, 154181, 154198	Bowes Parish Council	152985, 153031, 153050, 153062, 154239	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access to and from Low Road	Respondents expressing concern relating to traffic safety including limited space for HGVs and farm vehicles, traffic having to travel at narrow roads by the river the Sills, suggesting that the off ramp for west bound traffic should remain open for HGV drivers without having to go into Bowes Village twice in one visit. Respondents suggesting that better signage is provided at Bowes Junction.	National Highways are aware that some residents and businesses located in Bowes have requested that the existing slip-road into Bowes village remains open. The option to retain the westbound off-slip and provide a new Bowes junction was considered but has not been taken forward for safety reasons. The distance between the off-slip and the slip-road at the new Bowes junction would be less than the recommended separation distance for slip-roads on the strategic highway network. Having two junctions in close proximity would require additional signage and could cause confusion to drivers. There is also the requirement to replace the lay-by, which is another decision point for drivers on this section of the A66. To meet minimum safety requirements, a lay-by is required in this area. It was therefore concluded that two slip-roads and a lay-by could not be accommodated on this section of the network, and only one slip-road and a lay-by could be provided.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The traffic impacts of the two possible slip-road locations were considered. If the existing slip-road is retained as the only access into Bowes, it is expected that in the long-term, the traffic along The Street and through the village would impact more people compared to the proposed junction. This is because all traffic exiting the A66 would need to travel along The Street to access other routes. In comparison, concentrating traffic at the new junction with the A67 would remove traffic interchanging with the A67, or u-turning on the A66, from The Street. Demand for traffic interchanging at the junction could increase as National Highways look to reduce the number of central reserve gaps on the A66 for safety reasons. The number of vehicles wanting to u-turn or access the A67 at Bowes junction is forecast to be greater than the number of vehicles that require access to properties and businesses on The Street.</p> <p>It was therefore concluded that the consolidating the slip-roads at the new Bowes junction (A66/A67 junction) is both the safest design option and would minimise traffic impacts through the village.</p> <p>The traffic signage at the junction of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the A66 and A67 will be reviewed during the detailed design with the view to providing clearer guidance to road users.	
321	150201, 151477, 151495, 153330, 153389, 154144, 154181		153031	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the scheme in regard to traffic, transport, and junctions, particularly possible congestion impacts.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concern that local roads unsuitable for heavy traffic would experience congestion.</p> <p>Respondents state that Startforth, Barnard Castle, and Bowes junction could be particularly impacted.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concern that HGV congestion could increase significantly, and that traffic modelling data used for the proposals could be inaccurate and fail to account for hazardous weather conditions.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concern about impacts at junctions near the Stone Bridge Farm.</p>	<p>A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7). The modelling is predicting a decrease of traffic on the A67 through Startforth and Barnard Castle as drivers see the advantages of a faster, free flowing A66. For local roads the traffic will increase over time, but the flows are reasonably low and should not cause congestion. There is a slight increase in traffic forecast at the Bowes junction which is partly due to an increase in flow on the unnamed link between Bowes and Lartington. This link has low flows forecast in both with and without project scenarios (daily flow of 650 without the project and 1,100 with the project, compared with an indicative capacity of 22,000 vehicles).</p> <p>In terms of junctions near to Stone Bridge Farm, access to and from the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66 via The Street (east side of Bowes) will be stopped up as part of the proposals which will reduce traffic on The Street east of Bowes.</p> <p>There is likely to be a slight increase in HGV traffic using the junction at Bowes in order to access the weighbridge at MJ Close and Son. This is due to the stopping up of The Street at its junction with the A66. Currently an average of 28 vehicles per day are reported to use the weighbridge therefore the changes on The Street are unlikely to cause HGV congestion.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7) provides further information on the impact of the scheme on the local highway network. The aspiration is by providing a dual carriageway link throughout the extents of the A66 Project this provides more resilience for when accidents occur. Traffic including HGV's is then less likely to need to use the local road network unless they are accessing specific properties or businesses.</p> <p>Traffic data has been collected in line with TAG guidance. TAG Unit M1.2 states that "surveys should typically be carried out during a 'neutral', or representative, month avoiding main</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and local holiday periods, local school holidays and half terms, and other abnormal traffic periods.” Traffic conditions during hazardous weather events is considered abnormal and does not represent typical conditions. As such, the traffic data collected is considered to be an accurate representation of typical conditions. Data collection is described in detail within the Transport Assessment Chapter 4.	
322	148619, 150175, 151495, 153035, 153315, 153316, 153388, 154181	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority	153572	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concern around the safety of the proposed scheme for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents express, in general terms, that the scheme could jeopardise pedestrian safety. Respondents state that the existing footpaths are dangerous to use, particularly for horse riders. Respondents also state that school children entering Barnard Castle from Grangefields, and Startforth Park could be put at risk if no adequate crossing facilities are provided. Other respondents expressing concern about the possible closure of Clint Lane bridge.</p>	<p>The project objectives include improving routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders from both a connectivity and safety perspective. The following specific improvements are included in the Bowes scheme. Footpath 6 at Bowes is currently severed by the existing A66 Bowes Bypass. The proposed design reconnects the footpath via a new accommodation underpass to the east. The NCN 70 cycle route and Pennine Way Bowes Loop is retained on the existing alignment, albeit running over a new Clint Lane Bridge. Footpaths 12 and 6 have been severed by the previous dualling of Bowes bypass. As part of the proposals, the gap in the central reservation for Bowes Cross Farm and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Hulands Quarry (which are currently use as unsafe pedestrian crossing points) are closed, and the footpaths is diverted to the accommodation underpass to the west in order to provide a safe crossing facility which is grade-separated.</p> <p>In all cases safe crossing points are prioritised to remove unsafe at-grade crossing of the A66. The enhanced facilities will be to the benefit of both local users and tourists alike.</p> <p>The A66 Project looks to address the pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the Project but cannot address any issues at Barnard Castle, Grangefields or Startforth Park which lie well beyond the Project extents. The proposed A66 dualling should improve the current situation with regards to safety concerns on the A67 as the scheme causes a decrease in traffic on this route past Startforth Park, forecast to be 290 vehicles per day, as discussed in Chapter 8.1 of the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7). This reduction occurs as more long-distance traffic will use the improved A66 rather than the A67.</p> <p>The existing Clint Lane Bridge is to be replaced by a new bridge in the same location that will be designed to cater for all users. Construction phases and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>timetables will be carried out as part of the detailed design in the next phase of the Project, which is due to commence in July 2022 shortly following the submission of this DCO application. Detailed design is expected to be complete by July 2023. Access to land north and south of the A66 which currently uses Clint Lane Bridge will be maintained throughout construction, and we will continue to work with landowners and other local people in this regard.</p> <p>The project objectives include improving routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. The following specific improvements are included in the Bowes scheme.</p> <p>Footpath 6 at Bowes is currently severed by the existing A66 Bowes Bypass. The proposed design reconnects the footpath via a new accommodation underpass to the east. The NCN 70 cycle route and Pennine Way Bowes Loop is retained on the existing alignment, albeit running over a new Clint Lane Bridge.</p> <p>Footpaths 12 and 6 have been severed by the previous dualling of Bowes bypass. As part of the proposals, the gap in the central reservation for Bowes Cross Farm and Hulands Quarry (which are currently</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>use as unsafe pedestrian crossing points) are closed, and the footpaths is diverted to the accommodation underpass to the west in order to provide a safe crossing facility which is grade-separated.</p> <p>In all cases safe crossing points are prioritised to remove unsafe at-grade crossing of the A66. The enhanced facilities will be to the benefit of both local users and tourists alike.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
325	153316, 153339, 153613, 153841, 154243		153572, 153632	Engineering design and development - Access facilities	Respondents questioning the need for new bridges for access to the A67, and the accommodation underpass west of the main junction. Other respondents expressing concern about the access to land at the north near at Low Broats, mentioning that either the underpass is not sufficient for farm machinery or that the proposed scheme has no provision for access to that land.	At grade crossings of the A66 from field gates at opposing sides of the road would not be achievable under the proposed dual carriageway proposals. Access to fields will be via the local road network or via dedicated access road running parallel to the A66 from the local road network. The proposed accommodation bridge to the east of the main junction will help link land parcels north and south of the A66, including land near Low Broats.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The bridge will also function as a crossing point for a diverted Public Right of Way, allowing safer crossing of the A66.	
513	154014		149386, 149393, 150463, 152985, 153031, 153040, 153066, 153632	Community impact - Property	Respondents expressing concern over property value impacts due to the proposed road and proposed proximity of East Bowes overbridge.	National Highways notes the respondent's concerns regarding the proposed A66 improvements in particular the construction of the East Bowes overbridge. The environmental assessment carried out considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase (Environmental Statement, Application Document 3.2). ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual and the associated Appendix 10.6 Schedule of Visual Effects (Application Document 3.4) and Viewpoint figures 10.8.701 – 10.8.713 (Application Document 3.3) set out the assessment of visual effects. Residents of eastern end of the Street (Viewpoint 7.7 – looking north east) will experience a significant adverse visual effect during construction and at Year 1 of Operation prior to planting establishing. The Significance of effect reduces to moderate at Year 15 as planting becomes established. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration concludes that with embedded design mitigation, including low noise road	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>surface, there will be no likely significant effect.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outlines how the proposed planting and environmental mitigation could be applied. Woodland edge planting is proposed to soften visual effects.</p>	
525	154014		152259, 152485, 153060, 153132, 153133, 153601, 153606, 154005, 154239	Land - Other	Respondents suggesting that stock fencing on their land should not be impacted by the project and if it were to be that it is reinstated with no cost to the owners.	Accommodation works required to existing land parcels/property as a result of the scheme will be discussed and agreed with the impacted landowner.	No
556	153316, 153613, 153829, 153906		149395, 150463, 152985	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on access to other roads or to properties. In particular, respondents expressing concern with access to farm properties lost from old A66, making journeys much longer; potential for new access to be inappropriate for large machinery and transporting livestock; construction and diverted traffic causing disturbances and physical damage to access roads; permanent road closures cutting off communities and businesses, including the village of Bowes.	<p>Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements. Underpasses have been sized to accommodate agricultural vehicles.</p> <p>The Project aims to reduce crossing manoeuvres of the A66 including right turns into and out of priority junctions with the aim of improving road safety. It is accepted that in some instances this will result in slightly longer routes for some traffic using sides roads on the A66. The junction strategy for the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Respondents mention specific examples for Bowes, including concerns about the potential impacts of slip road and access road closures on local traffic flows. Additionally, respondents expressing concern that the improved Bowes junction will confuse HGV drivers, resulting in them travelling on the A67 where HGVs are prohibited.</p>	<p>Project has ensured that grade separated junctions are provided at suitable intervals to keep journey times to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Construction methods and phasing have been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the draft Environmental Management Plan, (Application Document 2.7)..</p> <p>Traffic modelling work has been carried out to understand the impacts of temporary diversions during construction. In terms of temporary diversion routes, the Project will be looking to minimise the use of these and when required they are more than likely to be implemented overnight. Construction plans, diversions and closures will be finalised during detailed design.</p> <p>Discussions with Logistics UK (LUK) and the Freight Transport Association (FTA) have been undertaken regularly throughout the current design phase to obtain their comments on our proposals, including the improvements</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>at Bowes. LUK the FTA and our designers to not believe HGV drivers will be confused with the new junction arrangements at Bowes.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network. The modelling is predicting a decrease of traffic on the A67 as drivers see the advantages of a faster, free flowing A66. For local roads the traffic will increase over time, but the flows are reasonably low and should not cause congestion.</p>	
569	153316			Traffic, transport and junctions - Impact on infrastructure	Respondents expressing concern relating to traffic and the impact on existing infrastructure, including concern that roads left disused following the scheme, such as the Street, could end up in a state of disrepair with limited incentive to maintain them.	<p>It is proposed that the Street remains a locally adopted public highway and as such maintenance will be the responsibility of Durham County Council.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network.</p>	No
585	148619, 152251, 152969, 153388, 153860, 154218		152985	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing concern relating to the accessibility of walking, cycling, and horse-riding routes. Respondents express concern that there has been insufficient provision made for these routes and that access to existing routes would be restricted,	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing; this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					specifically mentioning Cotherstone Moor.	<p>overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. This being the case, access to existing routes including the mentioned Cotherstone Moor will not be restricted due to the project.</p> <p>A segregated crossing of the dual carriageway for PRow at Bowes Cross Farm to Hulands Quarry is proposed. The existing footway is to be retained under Bowes junction, and the signed National Cycle Route will be retained over the new Clint Lane bridge.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
661			152985, 153133, 153138, 153632, 154206	Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern that scheme would deter tourists and negatively impact local economy. Respondents also expressing specific concerns over small businesses and impact on holiday cottage lettings.</p>	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in the Environmental Statement</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 3.2). Specifically ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) assess the impacts on businesses, including holiday cottage lettings and other tourism related businesses.</p> <p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. Where the scheme infringes on individual business, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on the National Highways' web site.</p>	
714			153632	Economics - Local economy - farming	One respondent expressing concern relating to the local economy and farming businesses, including concern that the agricultural land take would lead to a detrimental impact on the profitability of agricultural businesses.	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) details the agricultural land holding impact assessment undertaken for the Project. The assessment considers agricultural land within the Order Limits of the Project where land is required either permanently or temporarily in order to deliver the Project and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>identifies potential significant effects on agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. Where the scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on the National Highways' web site.</p>	
931	153797, 153965		152485, 152985, 153050, 153336	Community impact - People	Respondents concerned about the local community impact including disruption from construction traffic through residential areas; the impact on local people of removing established green areas; severance of communities and noise pollution.	An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared as part of this DCO (Application Document 2.7). The purpose of the EMP is to set out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the Environmental Statement and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental legislation. This will be further developed by the Principal Contractors before construction of the scheme starts. The EMP sets out measures to control lighting, dust,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>noise, spillage. It also includes measures to manage the movement of construction traffic on the road network, as does the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). Refer to Annex B13, within the EMP, Application Document 2.7) for further information. The CTMP will consider potential for severance as a result of the works and will include appropriate diversion routes, signage and measures to ensure local residents retain access to their properties throughout construction. The EMP includes a commitment that the Principal Contractor shall have an open dialogue with the local community, including a method of logging enquiries with the team.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (ES) sets out, broken down into topic, a detailed assessment of the impacts of the Project on the environment, in accordance with relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017).</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 6.2)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on human health including with regard to potential noise impacts and changes to traffic through construction and operation.</p> <p>Within this scheme, a small area of registered common land, associated with Bowes Moor Common Land, which is of very high sensitivity, is anticipated to be subject to temporary land take. The small area of common land required for the scheme, which is on the south side of the existing A66 at the southern landing point of the existing Clint Lane overbridge, comprises highway, including the former bus turning circle, and a grassed verge. This land will be required for the duration of the construction phase as it will be used as a site compound. The impact on the site will be major adverse but temporary as the common land will be reinstated to its existing use upon completion of the works with replacement land proposed to be made available approximately 150m to the west.</p> <p>The remainder of effects on all other community and tourism/recreation receptors are indirect and relate to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						potential effects associated with accessibility (e.g., severance or increased access issued) and more general construction effects (e.g., noise effects). No significant effects are likely.	
935	149367, 153833		149393, 153050	Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme is too expensive and a poor use of public money.	The existing A66 is a key national and regional strategic link; it carries high levels of freight traffic, as well as being an important route for tourism and providing vital connectivity for nearby communities. There are no direct rail alternatives for passenger or freight movements along the corridor. Despite the strategic importance of the A66, the route between the M6 at Penrith and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner is only intermittently dualled. The route also carries local slow moving agricultural and non-motorised traffic making short journeys which can have an impact on other users, especially on the single carriageway sections. The A66 is also an important route for tourism, providing access to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Yorkshire Dales and the Lake District National Park. The mix of road standards, together with the lack of available diversionary routes when incidents occur, affects road safety, reliability, resilience, and attractiveness of the route. If the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity and threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse agenda. The Project forms part of the UK Government's 'Project Speed' announced as part of A New Deal for Britain, which aims to bring forward proposals to deliver public investment projects more strategically and efficiently. Project Speed aims to ensure that the right things are built better.</p> <p>The cost is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including journey time reliability from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>The Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the overall need and case for the Project in terms of the transport case and identifies the benefits that it will bring for users. It also sets out the Project's Economic case, including its value for money,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						which along with the Transport case is considered an important and relevant matter in decision making.	
938	148591, 153315		152985, 153132	Construction - Disruption	<p>Respondents expressing concern about construction works and its impact on journey times due to diversions, speed limits and lane closures. Respondents also express concern that the construction phase would last for a long period of time as well as a concern that insufficient information has been provided about potential road diversions.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, noting the point about speed limits, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important, and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>To construct the Project, traffic management will be carefully considered as part of the works phasing to ensure congestion is limited whilst enabling the construction works to be carried out safely. During detailed design Principal Contractors will look to engage early with councils, stakeholders and landowners about possible diversion routes and discuss</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigation measures to be implemented.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 3.8), compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout the majority of the works. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion route.</p> <p>It will explain how the Project will minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local roads through appropriate communication and signage.</p> <p>Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p> <p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases. Construction of the Bowes Bypass scheme is expected to take around 2 years. At this stage, National Highways has programmed for this to start in 2024, this is subject to change.</p>	
939	153315			Construction - Timescale	One respondent expressing concern relating to the construction timescale, including concerns that insufficient information has been provided	Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					regarding the time period that construction would take place.	take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases. Construction of the Bowes Bypass scheme is expected to take around 2 years. At this stage, National Highways has programmed for this to start in 2024, this is subject to change. Indicative construction methods and phasing have developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the construction timescale for the Project is documented within the Environmental Management Plan, (Application Document 2.7).	
1026	153036			Construction - Difficult construction	Respondents expressing concern over the complexity of the construction at Clint Lane Bridge, and that the ground behind Bowes Village is unsuitable for construction.	National Highways and its consultants that are designing the new Clint Lane bridge are competent and experienced at designing structures of this type. The bridge design is not expected to be complex at this location. The design solution will look to minimise any delays and disruption particularly for users of the A66. Any required closures of the A66 will look to be done overnight. A safety review of the A66 cross section underneath Clint Lane Bridge has since concluded that the overbridge will need to be replaced to allow a cross section in accordance	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>with current National Highways design standards.</p> <p>The replacement overbridge will be designed to cater for all users. Further consideration of the design will be given at the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>During construction of the replacement overbridge, the crossing of the A66 will be temporarily closed to enable the bridge to be demolished and re-built.</p> <p>Regarding suitability of the ground behind Bowes Village for construction, ground investigations have been carried out across the Project to identify the ground conditions in the vicinity of the main works. Further targeted investigations will be carried out during detailed design including at locations where new structures are required.</p>	
1027			152985	Community impact - Health	Respondents expressing concern relating to the impact of the scheme on health, including concerns that smoke, dust, and pollution from construction work would have a detrimental impact on the health of local residents.	<p>Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on-site and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. ES Chapter 5 Air Quality has not identified any significant effects on NOx and PM10 concentrations at sensitive receptors in Bowes resulting from construction activities and the health effects of air emissions from construction activities, reported in Chapter 13, are assessed as neutral.</p>	
1146	150460, 153036, 153084, 153826, 153828, 153910,	Bowes Parish Council	152485, 153060, 153062, 153138, 154206,	Engineering design and development - Clint Lane Bridge	Respondents expressing concerns about Clint Lane Bridge. The concerns include safety and width of the bridge, that the bridge should be made pedestrian only and others saying it should allow vehicular access.	National Highways acknowledge concerns raised by the consultee with regards to the safety of the bridge. A safety review of the A66 cross section underneath Clint Lane Bridge has since concluded that the overbridge	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154218, 154485		154267, 154455		<p>Respondents request information on the construction and design plans including for demolition and replacement of the bridge, access, environmental, noise and mitigation measures and impacts on Dotheboys Hall.</p>	<p>will need to be replaced to allow a cross section in accordance with current National Highways design standards.</p> <p>The replacement overbridge will be designed to cater for vehicular and non-motorised users. Further consideration of the design will be given at the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>During construction of the replacement overbridge, the crossing of the A66 will be temporarily closed to enable the bridge to be demolished and re-built. Users of the existing bridge will be temporarily diverted via Clint Lane and Bowes village. This may result in an increase in traffic through Bowes village during construction. There will also be an increase in noise from construction activities during the bridge demolition and construction.</p> <p>Impacts, including landscape and visual effects, noise and vibration, and impacts on cultural heritage are considered in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The noise assessment is underpinned by modelling which considers factors such as traffic speed, wind, and topography.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.</p> <p>The landscape and visual assessment of the scheme can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The assessment identifies potential visual impacts construction and operation. Landscape mitigation for the Project has sought to ameliorate or offset impacts where possible.</p>	
1147	153084, 153604, 153826, 153828, 153910, 154485	Bowes Parish Council	153133	Traffic, transport and junctions - Bowes junction layout	<p>Respondents expressing concern about traffic and safety, specifically for the Bowes junction layout.</p> <p>Respondents are concerned about the consecutive junctions/roundabouts being within a short distance along the A67 and vehicles entering the wrong carriageway which could result in an increase in traffic accidents. One</p>	<p>Junction spacing has been considered as a result of the addition of the east facing slip roads at Bowes Junction. A Road Safety Audit has also been carried out, commensurate with the stage of the Project and recommendations have been incorporated into the design at Bowes. A ghost island right turn arrangement</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>respondent suggests moving the slip road onto the A66 further south and closer to the A66. This would improve safety as motorists would identify which slip road to enter. One respondent concerned that if the slip road is closed it will result in the Street not being maintained properly in the future.</p>	<p>has been proposed on the A67 between the eastbound off slip and west bound on slip to improve safety of turning movements. On the southside of the junction, the westbound off slip joins the access road to Bowes Village at a sufficient distance away from the A67 junction. A suitable signage strategy will be developed at detailed design to reinforce the correct turning movements and to mitigate the risk of vehicles entering the wrong carriageway.</p> <p>The safety case for the scheme is included within the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) includes details of the Road Safety Audit.</p>	
1148	153841			Traffic, transport and junctions - Hulands Quarry	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to traffic and safety around the Hulands Quarry entrance, where large vehicles would continue to move slowly and pulling out towards the entrance, whilst others would try to avoid them. Respondents suggest considering safer access for the quarry entrance.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge the consultee feedback and following a Road Safety Audit of this section, a decision was taken to extend the improvements east to include the A66 junction with Hulands Quarry.</p> <p>The access into Hulands Quarry from the A66 would become left in/left out only, and the central reservation on the A66 would be closed. This change was recommended by the Road Safety Audit to improve safety, by removing right turning traffic crossing the A66</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>dual carriageway and improve the ability for vehicles to slow down and speed up when accessing and egressing the quarry.</p> <p>Further consultation was carried out on this matter in spring 2022. Refer to Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report for further information.</p>	
1149	153841			Traffic, transport and junctions - Farm access	Respondent expressing concern relating to traffic and the closure of access to farm and land entrances, with farm vehicles having to travel significantly longer to access the land which could increase the risk of accidents for themselves and other drivers as farm vehicles move slower.	<p>The Project is removing any direct accesses onto the A66. Removing jaccesses on the A66 provides a significant safety benefit to all users.</p> <p>Every direct access / junction that will be closed by the scheme will be re-provided. At Bowes, access will be provided via a new private access road that connects to the Bowes junction. The removal of direct accesses onto the A66 could result in longer journey lengths for those who previously had a direct access, depending on their destination. However, removing the need for vehicles to enter and exit a dual carriageway via a priority junction is considered to be a significant safety benefit of the Project.</p>	No
1150	153335			Traffic, transport and junctions - Low Road	Respondent expressing concern relating to traffic at Low Road as eastbound vehicles turning right on to it would face accelerating trucks which	The design shows that access to/from The Street would be stopped up, and vehicles would not be able to turn right into The Street from the A66. The proposed design consolidates the slip-	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					could lead to accidents as the vehicles would be entering a live lane.	roads at the new Bowes junction (A66/A67 junction) as this is both the safest design option and would minimise traffic impacts through the village. See General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) for further information.	
1151	153316, 153814		153031, 153040, 153336	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic modelling	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to traffic, transport, and junctions in terms of the wider traffic modelling in the Bowes scheme. Concerns are regarding increased traffic moving to the A66 when the project is finished; HGV congestion increasing significantly; traffic modelling data used for the proposals could be inaccurate; A66/A67 junction could increase traffic from and to the central County Durham and Darlington. One respondent was concerned about the A66/A67 junction and subsequent A688 connection at Barnard Castle being the only primary A66 connection in their area. Another respondent would like to see data of how traffic, particularly HGV traffic will be reduced by abstraction onto an improved A66.</p>	<p>Department of Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future; this information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. The model uses current traffic flow data obtained from automated and observed traffic counts. Further information on the traffic data and traffic impacts of the Project, including in the geographies noted here around Barnard Castle and Bowes is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). In summary, there is a decrease in traffic on the A67 at Barnard Castle (-9%) as the improved (journey times) A66 attracts more longer distance east west traffic from the A67/A688 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington and further towards Durham. There is a slight increase in traffic on the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>unnamed link between Bowes and Lartington due to the westbound traffic remaining on the A66 for longer. The low flows on this link result in the degree of saturation remaining very low in both DM and DS scenarios.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment Report shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% on the A66 due to the Project. The Transport Assessment (Chapter 8) also provides further information on the forecast traffic flow changes due to the Project including difference plots (includes roads that show traffic flow increases and reductions).</p> <p>The junctions proposed as part of the project help to maintain a good level of connectivity with the A66. Alternative primary junctions near to the A67 which are upgraded as part of the project include the junction at Cross Lanes (approximately 5km east of Bowes) and the junction at Rokeby (approximately 7.5km east of Bowes).</p> <p>Traffic data has been collected in line with TAG guidance. TAG Unit M1.2 states that "surveys should typically be carried out during a 'neutral', or</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						representative, month avoiding main and local holiday periods, local school holidays and half terms, and other abnormal traffic periods." As such, the traffic data collected is considered to be an accurate representation of typical conditions. Data collection is described in detail within the Transport Assessment Chapter 4.	
1152	152258		152985	Traffic, transport and junctions - Environmental Impacts	Respondents expressing concerns about air quality including fumes, smell, dust, noise and air pollution as well as disruption and vibration due to increased traffic. A respondent suggests road usage should be reduced because of climate change and that it would be preferable to look for alternative transport options such as reopening railway lines.	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise (during both construction and operation) have been assessed. This is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). In order to reduce noise effects, the scheme design includes the use of lower noise surfacing, cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. The assessment identifies that one dwelling at Stone Bridge farm is expected to experience a significant adverse effect and one non-residential receptor on the western outskirts of Bowes is expected to experience a significant adverse effect. A noise barrier will also be implemented within the highways boundary to the east of the scheme, to prevent changes in traffic increasing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>noise to properties to the north of the existing A66.</p> <p>Full details on the Air Quality impact assessment for the Project can be found within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). The air quality assessment concludes that there are no likely significant effects are concluded for air quality during construction or operation.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which sets out how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The Environmental Management Plan will be a certified document, ensuring that the commitments within it will be implemented. This includes measures to prevent dust and air pollution, to limit disturbance from noise and vibration and to manage traffic during construction to minimise disruption to local communities.</p> <p>There are no direct rail alternatives for passenger or freight movements along</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the east-west corridor covered by the Project.</p> <p>To improve the strategic east west links within the north there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. The east coast and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle. The Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Strategic Study (at Stage 0) considered a number of different interventions for transport solutions across the Pennines, including non-highway modes, as set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
1215	153604			Land - Ivy Hall Farm	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impacts on Ivy Hall Farm specifically the location of the balancing pond which they suggest is moved further south near the river; that the access road is placed in a way that minimises land take; the suggestion of alternative land for environmental mitigation.</p>	<p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme including required mitigation measures. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The pond is designed with a specific capacity based on predicted rainfall for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>a specific worse case event. The location of the pond is defined by the topography of the land and location of nearest outfall as well as the capacity requirement. The design and location of the pond and its associated access road will be reviewed at detailed design. We will continue to work with all impacted landowners to help mitigate impacts on their property.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2).</p> <p>We have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. The completed surveys</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have been used to inform the ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Document Reference 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment. As a result of this review the mitigation requirement for species rich grassland in the vicinity of Ivy Hall Farm has been significantly reduced.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Document Reference 2) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>All landowners will be compensated for land lost due to the Project and we have written to all impacted landowners to invite them to begin negotiations with us in order to accelerate this process.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'Cross Lanes to Rokeby - junctions - Environment' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
37		Historic England	154035	Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the scheme because it would minimise potential negative impacts on the Rokeby Park and Gardens, and St. Mary's Church.	National Highways welcomes the support for the scheme. The potential impacts of the scheme on the historic Environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2)	No
552		Durham County Council		Air quality	Durham County Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would not cause significant increases in air pollution, as defined by DRMB Standards.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The impacts of the Project on air quality are reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).	No
793	154252			Tree planting / rewilding	One respondent expressing support for inclusion of tree planting in the scheme on the grounds that this would benefit the Environment.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the planting measures proposed by the scheme.	No
958	153316, 153898			Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the black route on the grounds that it would not further encroach on Rokeby Park and could support regeneration of ancient woodland that has already been damaged or destroyed.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. The potential impacts of the scheme on the historic Environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
1118		Historic England		Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing no preference for either the black or blue option as they both include the same junction layout west of Cross Lanes with	We thank the respondent for their comments. The potential impacts of the scheme on the historic Environment are reported in ES Chapter 8	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					regards to impacts on known cultural heritage resources.	Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	
386	153901	Durham County Council Forestry Commission		Wildlife / habitats	Respondents suggesting that the scheme should consider wildlife and habitats, including protecting ancient woodland and ensuring that compensation schemes benefit habitats and biodiversity.	The Project has fully considered potential impacts on wildlife and habitats. In particular in respect of ancient woodland and veteran trees, a thorough assessment has been carried out as detailed in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). This Chapter sets out full details of appropriate field surveys, impact assessment and associated mitigation. Veteran trees and ancient woodland have been retained where practicable. The Project has explored opportunities for maximising Environmental enhancements and these have been implemented where practicable. As part of the Project, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees, hedgerows and wetland, where appropriate/suitable, to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These habitats will be in keeping with the local area and have been carefully designed to enhance habitat connectivity and the biodiversity value of the local area. Mitigation measures are secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 3.2). National Highways is committed to maximise	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>The Environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss.</p>	
590	151456, 153633	Durham County Council		Cultural heritage	<p>Respondents suggesting further design measures could be considered for the blue route to mitigate Historic England's concerns. Including improvements to Rokeby Park and Garden by improving visual and physical links to the estate and replanting appropriate native and managed species.</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise the significant support for the blue route this route could only be taken forward if there was evidence of sufficient public benefit to outweigh harm on the heritage interests, complying with national policy and hence supported by Historic England.</p> <p>The preferred black route option brings benefits to the historic Environment</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>through reduction of severance between St Mary's Church and the Old Rectory and the likely reduction of impact risk at the Gate Piers to the southwest corner of the park. The updated traffic modelling also identifies that the black route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66. In terms of wider public benefits, it is not considered there are any additional benefits that exist for the blue route over and above the black route. The principal consideration in preferring the black junction is the impact on the Grade II* Rokeby Park Registered Park and Gardens (RPG), as the blue junction would lead to fragmentation of the RPG site.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of the RPG has been considered throughout route development. Options which would result in land take within the plantation have not been taken forward as they would be too damaging to the historic Environment. Following engagement with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets and provides further details on proposed mitigation measures. The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of a Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Throughout the development of the Project National Highways has engaged with Historic England and continues to work closely with Historic England. The latest positions between both parties are set out in the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England (see Statement of Commonality, Application Document 4.5).</p> <p>Whilst it is appreciated that the Rokeby junction would require walkers to divert via the junction to cross the new dualled A66, adding a distance of approximately 700m to their journey,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the proposals are designed to provide a safe crossing point for walkers and connect Public Rights of Ways (PRoWs) together, which are currently severed. The proposed Rokeby junction brings together several PRoWs in the area for onward journeys, and further, provides a safe crossing point, which does not currently exist. Full consideration of and proposals for existing and new routes with public access are set out within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7) considers construction impacts on PRoW.	
707	150169, 153901, 153982, 154215	Environment Agency		Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents suggesting Environmental mitigation measures to protect wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>i) Respondents suggest that: watercourses should be replaced; crossing points for wildlife be provided; and that a 30-metre buffer zone between the road and ancient woodlands should be enforced with protection of tree roots.</p> <p>ii) Others state that National Highways should avoid raising the ammonia and nitrogen levels in the soil of ancient woodland habitats.</p>	i) A full Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out including a detailed assessment of the potential risks to wildlife and habitats and surface water, is set out in ES Chapter 6 (Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Document Reference 3.2) and its technical appendices (Document Reference 3.4). The Road Drainage and the Water Environment assessment considers that where there is any modification to watercourses from baseline conditions, a like-for-like replacement	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>iii) Suggestions are also made that the consultation should be carried out on proposed ecological mitigation measures.</p>	<p>is proposed. As part of the Project a minor realignment of one watercourse is proposed.</p> <p>The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and likely significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design through engagement with key stakeholders. Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. In accordance with standing advice from Natural England and the Forestry Commission¹, the recommended buffer zone of at least 15m between the Project and areas of ancient woodland has been incorporated to avoid root damage.</p>	

¹ Natural England (2022) 'Guidance – Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions' [Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/107114/Ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions.pdf) (Accessed February 2022)

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>ii) The air quality assessment within Chapter 5 of the ES (Application Document 3.2) follows DMRB LA 105 guidance and considers the impact of the Project on designated sites, including ancient woodland, within 200m of the Affected Road Network. ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2), details the assessment of significant effects on designated sites due to nitrogen deposition, including ammonia, and uses a change threshold of 1% of the lower critical load. The ES reports no likely significant effects as a result of air quality on designated habitats including ancient woodland.</p> <p>iii) Proposed ecological mitigation designs have been developed through engagement with key stakeholders. There will also be additional opportunities for feedback from statutory consultees during the detail design stage.</p>	
794	154469, 153859			Landscape / visual	One respondent suggesting improvements to the landscape and views, specifically mentioning that the cedar tree at the Old Rectory be preserved.	Since the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail. The Order Limits include the Old Rectory and immediate grounds. Mitigation measures developed between the Landscape and Heritage teams	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						include the removal of alien screen planting around the Old Rectory, allowing the built form group to be recognised, while retaining the mature trees planted as part of the designed parkland landscape. Refer to ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2), ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) for further details. Planting mitigation measures are secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
1077	151450			Cultural heritage	One respondent suggests using unused land at the Rokeby plantation for road expansion.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>this RPG has been considered throughout Project development. The junction option which would have resulted in land take within the plantation has not been taken forward due to direct impacts upon the RPG and non-compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). It was determined that even with appropriate mitigation the setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated. This option was therefore not taken forward.</p> <p>The Project therefore progressed with the black route, please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for further information in regards the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p> <p>Following engagement with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>An indication of how this mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and these measures are secured through</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
1080	150169			Tree planting / rewilding	One respondent suggesting that tree planting or rewilding be included in plans for the scheme, particularly along the side of the road. The respondent requests that these be at least 10 metres deep.	The Project landscape and ecological planting, as outlined illustratively on the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8), has been developed to mitigate Environmental effects. As a consequence, the planting presented varies in depth and species composition across each scheme. The planting has been designed to include a mix of appropriate native tree and shrub species. Safety concerns in terms of proximity of trees to the roadway has also been considered during the design process and where space allows the design provides for a transition between species rich grassland, woodland edge and woodland planting.	No
1123		Historic England		Cultural heritage	Historic England commented that in order to promote the eastern junction at Rokeby, National Highways will need to articulate that there is a clear and justified public benefit outweighing the harm to the highly designated heritage assets (as set out in paras. 5.131 – 134 of the NPSNN. Historic England further comments that the evidence for this may yet come forward to permit National Highways to	National Highways thanks Historic England for their comments. The eastern junction option has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the RPG (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					weigh up whether an exceptional case has been made to allow them to proceed with an option which has a greater level of harm to the historic Environment.	<p>fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. National planning policy, paragraph 5.131 of the NNNPS states that: "Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced, and their loss has a cultural, Environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification...Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including...grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional."</p> <p>If there were to be substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>It was considered that the eastern junction alternative at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO application including the alternative eastern Rokeby junction would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the western Rokeby junction was identified, as part of the black route as the preferred solution</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route (the black option) ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p>	
1124		Historic England		Cultural heritage	Historic England commented that it is required to consider impacts on the historic Environment holistically. In this context it commented that it needs to look at potential impacts to heritage assets in Barnard Castle, namely NHLE 1002353 (Barnard Castle Bridge) and NHLE 1007505 (Barnard	National Highways thanks Historic England for their comments. A full assessment of the Project in terms of potential impacts on cultural heritage are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). An assessment on traffic impacts of the Project is also set out in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Castle) which are both scheduled monuments. Historic England commented that section 10.4 of the submitted Traffic Report indicates that there could be a preference for car traffic to use the Moorhouse Lane route to access Barnard Castle. The respondent further commented that whilst Figure 13-30 does indicate a preference for cars to use Moorhouse Lane, the traffic is not predicated to increase over Barnard Castle Bridge or past the Castle into the town, instead it appears suggests a small decrease. On this basis, Historic England commented it does not believe that changes to traffic patterns will lead to a harmful impact on the highly designated assets within Barnard Castle. Historic England commented it therefore does not believe that this represents a significant historic Environment factor which could influence the choice of junction options at Rokeby. Historic England further commented that it does however recommend that the impacts are understood and assessed appropriately in the cultural heritage section of the ES to ensure that all effects are fully understood to ensure that this is valid.</p>	<p>Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). This outlines traffic impacts for each Project scheme in Section 8.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1125		Historic England		Landscape / visual	Historic England suggesting that once the old A66 is de-trunked a slower road could result in opportunities to enhance the setting of the listed church and registered designated landscape. A slower road past the church would enable more users to visit the assets. It would also improve its setting and other designated assets associated with the RPG.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme. National Highways has continued to undertake assessment work and engage with Historic England throughout the pre-application period to share latest data and positions. Associated matters are captured within the latest Statement of Commonality and Statements of Common Ground (Application Document 4.5).	No
1197	153583			Cultural heritage	Respondent suggesting the approach supported by Historic England to avoid an area of plantation at Rokeby on the grounds of historic preservation is not warranted.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information. The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of this RPG have been considered throughout Project development. The junction option which would have resulted in land take within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>plantation has not been taken forward due to direct impacts upon the RPG and non-compliance with NPSNN. It was determined that even with appropriate mitigation the setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated. This option was therefore not taken forward.</p> <p>The Project therefore progressed with the black route, please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for further information in regards the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p> <p>Following engagement with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>An indication of how this mitigation could be delivered is shown within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p>	
23	151489, 152242, 152968, 154368			General / not specified	Respondents expressing general concern that the scheme would cause Environmental damage.	The PEI Report on which consultation was carried out, presented a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project on the Environment. Since the publication of the PEI Report, further surveys, assessments,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and archive research have been carried out to inform the ES. The ES has been prepared in accordance with industry guidance and good practice and is a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the Project on the Environment. The ES also includes consideration of cumulative effects. Please refer to the ES for full details of how the Project will impact upon the Environment (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	
26	149409, 150198, 150422, 150426, 150435, 151453, 151488, 151498, 151503, 152207, 152240, 152928, 152950, 152971, 153311, 153324, 153342, 153346, 153371, 153575, 153576,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153831, 154127	Air quality	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts on air quality caused by the construction, increased congestion, and longer journey times. Respondents expressing concern regarding Startforth and Barnard Castle in particular.	The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for construction air quality impacts as well as increased traffic emissions arising from the Project during operation. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). In relation to Startforth (which is situated on the A67) and the A67 through Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that:	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153794, 153820, 153826, 153904, 154368					<p><i>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Silks, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</i></p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>An assessment of the potential construction phase impacts from vehicle movements has been carried out as part of the ES and no likely significant effects are concluded for air quality, with no exceedance of the relevant Air Quality Objectives predicted in Startforth and Barnard Castle in particular (refer to ES</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Chapter 5, Air Quality, Application Document 3.2, for further information).	
1424	154368, 153576, 149373, 153558, 153826, 153868, 153828, 153841, 153371, 153344, 153342, 153074, 152968, 152950, 152928, 152207, 152229, 150435, 149400, 150426, 150198, 151503, 151495	Durham County Council Forestry Commission Historic England Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153831, 154035, 154127	Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern that Historic England have not sufficiently shown substantial harm would be caused by the blue route (eastern junction) and that the black route (western junction) may cause more harm in particular to the Old Well Inn, Blagraves House, Bowes Museum, Grade I listed County Bridge in Barnard Castle, and the Grade I listed Market Cross and Buttermarket, The Bank and the Church of St Mary as well as the Grade II* registered park. They state that the gateway effect to Rokeby Park has been compromised and that the park is a communal resource of International or National importance.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information. The eastern junction option (blue route) has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the RPG (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated. National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. National planning policy, paragraph 5.131 of the NNNPS	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>states that: "Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced, and their loss has a cultural, Environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification...Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including...grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional."</p> <p>If there were to be substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>It was considered that the eastern junction alternative at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>was a risk that a DCO application including the alternative eastern Rokeby junction would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the western Rokeby junction was identified, as part of the black route as the preferred solution.</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route (the black option) ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p> <p>The preferred black route option brings benefits to the historic Environment through reduction of severance between St Mary's Church, and the Old Rectory and the likely reduction of impact risk at the Gate Piers at the southwest corner of the park. The updated traffic modelling also identifies that the black route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66.</p> <p>In terms of wider public benefits, it is not considered there are any additional benefits that exist for the blue route over and above the black</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>route. The principal consideration in preferring the black junction is the impact on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG, as the blue junction would lead to fragmentation of the RPG site.</p> <p>A detailed setting assessment has been carried out and is detailed within the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) which sets out the effect of the Project on heritage assets.</p> <p>No significant heritage impacts are identified as a result of the Project at Old Well Inn, Blagraves House, Bowes Museum, the Grade I listed County Bridge in Barnard Castle, The Bank, the Grade I listed Market Cross and Buttermarket.</p>	
1425			154035	Landscape and visual Noise	<p>Respondents note that the height of the road will result in the Project being too visible and noisy in the Rokeby Park area. Respondents also believe this has not been fully captured within the assessment presented and an appropriate weighting exercise of the impact of proposals has not been carried out.</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including noise and visual impacts.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Impacts in relation to noise are set out in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and the visual impact assessment for the Project is set out in ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>In relation to the concern in regards the visibility of the Project in the area, since the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail. Mitigation measures developed between the Landscape and Heritage teams include the removal of alien screen planting and retention of the mature trees planted as part of the designed parkland landscape. No significant residual impact is identified to the landscape character designation in this area.</p>	
1426			153831, 154035	Cultural heritage	Respondents raise concern that no proposal to repurpose the Old Rectory has been made.	The Order Limits include the Old Rectory and immediate grounds. It is not proposed to repurpose the Old Rectory, however, mitigation measures developed between the Landscape and Heritage teams include the removal of alien screen planting around the Old Rectory, allowing the built form group to be recognised, while retaining the mature	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						trees planted as part of the designed parkland landscape. Refer to ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2), ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) for further details.	
1427		Durham County Council		Cultural heritage	Durham County Council note that the black route would be adjacent to a grade II listed mile marker, the grade II listed Cross Lanes Farmhouse and the grade II listed Dent House Farm. They also note that the grade II listed milestone at the entrance to Tutta Beck Farm and the grade II listed Tutta Beck Cottages derive their setting through the current line of the A66 and the Project would adversely impact this.	<p>The two listed miles stones are within Order Limits and will be directly impacted by the scheme and have therefore been identified as experiencing a significant effect within the cultural heritage assessment. The Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) identifies a mitigation strategy of recording and removing these assets (should they be in situ), storing and replacing post construction.</p> <p>A detailed setting assessment has been carried out and is detailed within the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) which sets out the effect of the Project on heritage assets.</p> <p>No significant heritage impact is identified as a result of the Project at Dent House Farm, Cross Lanes Farm House, Tutta Beck Farm and Tutta Beck Cottages.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1391	153577, 153312, 153311, 153342, 149373	Durham County Council Historic England		Cultural heritage / Traffic and Transport	Respondents expressing concern that the chosen route would have a negative impact on St Mary's Church and the protected RPG due the increase of traffic and vibrations from car and HGV traffic.	The impact of the scheme on St Mary's Church and the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG has been considered throughout route development. A detailed setting assessment has been carried out and is detailed within the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) which sets out the effect of the scheme on heritage assets. No significant impact is identified at this location. Where appropriate the noise and vibration assessment for the scheme has also considered impacts on cultural heritage assets (Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2)) and no significant impacts are identified.	No
1392	153577, 153575, 153618, 153558, 153170, 153826, 153820, 153930, 153367, 153378, 153346,		154035	Cultural heritage	Respondents raise concern that the blue route has been discounted on the grounds of impact to the Church plantation which they note has already seen significant tree felling and, due to severance, does not serve as a public footpath to Rokeby Church.	The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of this RPG have been considered throughout route development. Options which would result in land take within the plantation has not been taken forward due to direct impacts upon the RPG and non-compliance with the NPSNN. It was determined that even with appropriate mitigation the setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	151522, 153391, 153342, 153049, 152947, 152912, 152928, 152242, 152148, 152226, 152205, 152233, 152231, 152207, 150200, 150198, 150431, 151467, 151494, 151459, 150143, 151495, 150426, 149392, 150202, 150415, 150405,					<p>direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated. This option was therefore not taken forward.</p> <p>The Project therefore progressed with the black route, please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for further information in regards the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p> <p>A public footpath runs to the north of the church from Barnard Castle Lane however it is noted that the path within the plantation is a private estate path. The public footpath is not within the Order Limits and access will therefore be maintained via this route.</p> <p>Following engagement with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>An indication of how this mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150157						
1397	153382, 150427, 150418, 150200, 149400, 151457, 150163			Cultural heritage / Traffic and Transport/ Noise and Vibrations	Respondents raise concern about the negative impact of vibrations from increased road traffic on older and more fragile historic pieces of infrastructure including the County Bridge and The Bank in Barnard Castle.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. The Transport Assessment shows that traffic on the A67 through Barnard Castle (travelling across County Bridge and on the Bank) is likely to decrease. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.</p> <p>A detailed setting assessment has been carried out and is set out within ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) which describes the effect of the scheme on heritage assets. No significant impact is identified at the County Bridge or at The Bank.</p> <p>Where appropriate the noise and vibration assessment for the Project has also considered impacts on cultural heritage assets (ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2)) and no significant impacts on cultural heritage assets are identified.</p>	No
1393			154035	Cultural heritage	Respondent raises concern that the preferred route should not impinge on	A detailed assessment if the impact of the Project on cultural heritage assets	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					the Gate Piers at the southwest corner of the Grade II* Rokeby Park.	has been carried out and is reported within ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). The Project brings benefits to the historic Environment in this area through reduction of severance between St Mary's Church and the Old Rectory and the likely reduction of impact risk at the Gate Piers at the southwest corner of the Grade II* Rokeby Park. No significant impact heritage impact on the Gate Piers is identified as a result of the Project.	
1394			154035	Cultural heritage	Respondent raises concern there may be roman deposits within embankments which may be impacted by proposals.	ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. This includes consideration of roman deposits encountered during construction of the Project. The type and location of mitigation required for cultural heritage resources has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of a Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This draft mitigation strategy proposes to record heritage artefacts such as roman deposits within embankment	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						areas if discovered during construction.	
1395			154035	Cultural heritage	Respondent raises concerns that proposals will render the Old Rectory non-viable as it would maroon the building blighting future viability.	National Highways acknowledges the concern over the impact of the Project in this location. National Highways has worked closely with Historic England to develop a route which provides the least impact on historic Environment and does not require the demolition of the Old Rectory. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets and no significant impact is identified at the Old Rectory. Mitigation measures developed between the Landscape and Heritage teams include the removal of alien screen planting around the Old Rectory, allowing the built form group to be recognised, while retaining the mature trees planted as part of the designed parkland landscape. Refer to the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) for further details.	No
1396	154236, 154193, 153804, 153371,			Traffic and Transport	Respondents raise concern that proposals do not consider the character of Barnard Castle and note the route includes a temporary HGV route to the town. Respondents note	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) outlines local traffic impacts for each scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. Appendix F of the Transport Assessment shows the diversion	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
153316					<p>that consideration has not been given to ensuring vehicles travelling west on the A66 through Barnard Castle do not worsen impacts in the town and note particular concern regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p>	<p>routes that are currently proposed during construction of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme. This identifies that HGV traffic will be posted via an alternative route, away from Barnard Castle Bridge and the A67.</p> <p>It is noted within the Transport Assessment (Chapter 11.7) that there is predicted to be an increase in traffic on the A67 (+2400 vehicles per day which represents a 28% increase) within Barnard Castle during the construction of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby Scheme (construction scenario D). This increase is not identified as significant and it should be noted that this is a worst case assessment, and National Highways continues to consider implementing measures to maintain current journey times on the A66 during construction such that these diversions are not required.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts. Within the EMP, the Principal Contractor carrying out the construction works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan with the aim of minimising disruption during the works.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Given the temporary nature of the impact and with this mitigation in place there are no significant effects identified regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety during construction.</p> <p>During operation, the Transport Assessment identifies that the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67. There are no significant effects identified in regards pedestrian and cyclist safety during operation.</p>	
1398	149404, 152240			Population and Human Health Alternatives Land	Respondents raise concern that the preferred route selection considers that parkland is more valuable than farmland.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including impacts on agricultural land.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>Both eastern and western junction options were identified to have similar impacts upon agricultural land holdings. In addition, design development between the Autumn</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>2021 statutory consultation and DCO application has resulted in an overall reduction in proposed permanent acquisition of land.</p> <p>The principal consideration in the preference for the black route (with a western junction at Rokeby) is the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park and non-compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). The eastern junction will create harm to the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park.</p> <p>If there were to be substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>Whilst impacts on some key views of the eastern junction could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the eastern</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						junction would still lead to additional fragmentation of the site.	
1399	154368			Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern that the wider harm to historic assets has not been considered and that the assessment has focussed on the impacts to the RPG.	<p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.</p> <p>The study area considered comprises a buffer that extends 1km from the Order Limits. This buffer was selected on the basis of professional judgement and experience and reflects the fact that, by their nature, linear road schemes would sit within a landscape and are likely to be visible for short stretches of their overall length. As such, they are highly unlikely to alter the setting of heritage resources beyond 1km to a degree that would result in either a significant adverse or beneficial . This study area was agreed with Historic England and Local Authority Conservation Officers.</p> <p>All designated heritage resources within the 1km study area are considered within the Cultural Heritage assessment. In addition, where designated resources such as registered park and gardens (RPG) straddle the limit of the study area, any designated heritage resources that are associated within them that could</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						experience effects are also included in the assessment. No significant cultural heritage impacts are identified within this scheme.	
1400	154368, 154485, 154488, 154464, 154479, 154463, 153896, 153371, 151522, 153075, 153046, 153035, 150158, 151485, 151478, 150167			Cultural heritage Transport	Respondents expressing concern regarding increased traffic within and on Barnard Castle and potential impacts on historic structures such as the County Bridge, Pierce Bridge, Abbey Bridge and the Town Bridge and raise concern that this has not been assessed.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.1) identifies the local traffic impacts around Barnard Castle due to the Project. This shows that traffic on the A67 through Barnard Castle (travelling across County Bridge) is likely to decrease. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.</p> <p>The Project is identified to have a negligible impact on traffic flows crossing the River Tees at Piercebridge. The bridge is part of the B6275 that runs in a north-south direction towards Barton Interchange and traffic volumes on this section of road are forecast to be almost the same in both with and without Project scenarios.</p> <p>The volume of traffic travelling southbound across Abbey Bridge is expected to increase due to the Project. However, northbound traffic is expected to reduce by a greater amount. The speed limit increase on the A66 makes it more attractive for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>vehicles to continue along the A66 for longer whilst the proposed new junction alignment at Rokeby Park means traffic must travel slightly longer compared to the scenario without the Project if using the C165 from the A66 east towards Barnard Castle. This results in a net reduction in traffic travelling across Abbey Bridge due to the Project (Section 8.1 presents a diagram showing the reduction in traffic in this location).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. This assessment considers cultural heritage assets within 1km of the Project. All of these assets are outside of the study area and no significant heritage impact is therefore identified.</p>	
1401	154485, 154019, 154467, 153618, 154018, 153898, 153930, 153083,			Cultural heritage - Alternatives	<p>Respondents also express concern over the prioritisation of the preservation of the Rokeby estate and church, expressing that preserving this heritage site which they view as in poor condition should not come at the expense of dismissing the blue route. Respondents also express concern that as a result an assessment has not been carried out of the preferred route</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including cultural heritage.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153075, 153047, 152918, 152971, 152133, 152226, 151478, 150415				impacts on Barnard Castle and Startforth	<p>(Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>The eastern junction option (blue route) has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the Grade II* Rokeby registered park and garden which is a nationally designated asset.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. National planning policy, paragraph 5.131 of the NNNPS states that: "Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced, and their loss has a cultural, Environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification...Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including...grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional."</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>If there were to be substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>It was considered that the eastern junction alternative at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO application including the alternative eastern Rokeby junction would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the western Rokeby junction was identified, as part of the black route as the preferred solution.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.</p> <p>The study area considered comprises a buffer that extends 1km from the Order Limits. This buffer was selected on the basis of professional judgement and experience and reflects the fact</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>that, by their nature, linear road schemes would sit within a landscape and are likely to be visible for short stretches of their overall length. As such, they are highly unlikely to alter the setting of heritage resources to a degree that would result in either a significant adverse or beneficial effect beyond 1km. This study area was agreed with Historic England and Local Authority Conservation Officers.</p> <p>All designated heritage resources within the 1km study area are considered within the Cultural Heritage assessment. In addition, where designated resources such as registered park and gardens (RPG) straddle the limit of the study area, any designated heritage</p> <p>Barnard Castle and Startforth are outside of the cultural heritage study area and therefore no significant effect is identified.</p>	
1402	154342			Cultural heritage / Air Quality	Respondents expressing concern regarding the impact of increased pollution at heritage sites such as listed buildings.	<p>Air quality standards which the Project is considered against are based on the protection of human health and ecosystems/habitats and do not consider the potential impact of air quality on building structures.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2)</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>has been updated following updates to the traffic model and Project design and considers construction and operation effects.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, as a result of the Project, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter.</p>	
1403	154236, 153367, 153073			Traffic and Transport / Air Quality	Respondents raise concern that the black route would result in risks to health and safety through increased traffic and pollution for residents in Barnard Castle and Startforth and along local roads such as Low Road.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). In relation to Startforth (which is situated on the A67) and the A67 through Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that:</p> <p><i>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</i></p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>Section 8.1 in the Transport Assessment identifies the local traffic impacts around Bowes due to the Project. Figure 8-16: shows, forecast year Do Minimum flows while Figure</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>8-17: forecast year Do Something flows.</p> <p>Due to the stopping up of the priority junction onto Low Road; the expected traffic levels on Low Road would drop to a negligible level to those just accessing M.J. Close & Son and the other farm properties.</p> <p>Vehicle movements associated with M.J. Close & Son would effectively double through Bowes Village and along Low Road. However, this is offset by removal of all other through traffic currently accessing Bowes Village via Low Road as they would access via the new junction with the A67.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) considers construction and operation effects of air quality impacts on human receptors.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105.</p> <p>Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria.</p> <p>No likely significant effects are concluded for air quality, with no exceedance of the relevant Air Quality Objectives predicted during the operational phase of the Project.</p>	
1404	151456, 152139, 152242, 153063			Cultural Heritage/ Population and Human Health Alternatives	<p>Respondents suggest that the encroachment of the preferred route on the RPG should be balanced with the public safety the alternative route (blue) would provide.</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential impacts of the Project including public safety.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>The eastern junction option (blue route) has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the RPG (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. National planning policy, paragraph 5.131 of the NNNPS states that: "Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced, and their loss has a cultural, Environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification...Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including...grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional."</p> <p>If there were to be substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>It was considered that the eastern junction alternative at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO application including the alternative eastern Rokeby junction would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the western Rokeby junction was identified, as part of the black route as the preferred solution</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route (the black option) ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p> <p>In regards safety of the Project, the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) has identified changes in road traffic accident rates, which have been reported in the health assessment, ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). The majority of changes are positive,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						reflecting a reduction in accident rates. Some areas of existing dual carriageway will see negative effects due to slightly higher accident rates resulting from increased traffic flows. Overall, the number of deaths and injuries will reduce significantly.	
292	153371, 154215, 154216, 154368	Durham County Council Forestry Commission	153831, 154035	Wildlife / habitats	Respondents state that not enough care and assessment has been given in regards potential Environmental impacts of the scheme on wildlife and habitats. Respondents express concern about the loss of habitats to construct the route would have a negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity. Woodlands and habitats specifically mentioned include those at Jack Wood, Rokeby, Thorsgill Park and Mortham Wood.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project based on the available information known at the time of autumn 2021 statutory engagement. Since this time, all required field survey work to inform and identify likely significant impacts as a result of the Project have been completed. Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) of the ES, provides a full, detailed and robust impact assessment, carried out in accordance with industry guidelines and good practice, and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. This includes potential adverse impacts on Jack Wood Ancient Replanted	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Woodland and Rokeby Park and Mortham Wood Local Wildlife Site located out of but in close proximity to the Order Limits, and Thorsgill Wood Ancient Replanted Woodland located approximately 735m to the north. Set out within the ES is a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation, where required, associated with these woodlands (Chapter 6 Biodiversity Application Document 3.2). This includes consideration of construction and operation impacts relating to compaction of soil, air quality, noise and pollution pathways, amongst others. The chapter concludes no significant adverse impacts on ancient woodland sites and designated sites as a result of the Project once outlined mitigation measures have been implemented.	
292	153371, 154215, 154216, 154368	Durham County Council Forestry Commission	153831, 154035	Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concern that construction and operation of the scheme would compact and pollute soil in the area, affect groundwater, increase air pollution and increase noise pollution, and that these would all negatively impact wildlife.	Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) of the ES, provides a full, detailed and robust impact assessment, carried out in accordance with industry guidelines and good practice, and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites and receptors potentially impacted by the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Project. This includes addressing the impacts of the Project on woodlands, soils, groundwater, air pollution, noise pollution and their effects on wildlife. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts on habitats and species and would seek to employ best-practice methods for dealing with groundwater, air pollution, noise pollution and their potential adverse impact on biodiversity receptors.	
296	151503, 152207, 152928, 153371, 153576, 153794, 153826, 154368	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish Council	153831, 153857, 154035	Landscape / visual Cultural Heritage	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would damage the landscape and visual amenity, due to the junction being built on high ground, and the use of tarmac and balancing ponds. Respondents expressing concern in particular over the potential negative impact on the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church, Jacks Wood, and rural views from the Cross Lanes Farm Shop.	The proposed route has been designed with care and sensitivity, especially in relation to the rich history of the area. The Project team have worked with and continue to work closely with, local people, communities and organisations such as Historic England to understand potential impacts on cultural sites and aim to preserve the unique character and artefacts in the area. An assessment of the effects of the Project on the historic Environment is provided in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and no significant impact is identified at St Mary's church.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. Since the PEI Report the location and number of balancing ponds has been rationalised. An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). ES Chapter 10 has used representative viewpoints to convey the visual context of the study area and likely views of the Project including topography. The viewpoints have been agreed within Technical Working Groups and represent a range of close, middle and long-distance views from varying receptor groups, including residents, recreational users, motorists and tourists. Reference to important heritage assets (such as listed buildings) have been made throughout the baseline and assessment sections of the ES. Heritage assets are not assessed separately (within the Landscape and Visual Effects chapter) but instead their contribution to landscape character is considered and an assessment of effects on</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>landscape character made on that basis</p> <p>Ancient woodland and veteran trees have been retained where practicable. This includes Jack Wood Ancient Replanted Woodland located in close proximity to the Order Limits.</p> <p>Four of the 13 assessed visual receptors for the scheme retain a significant adverse impact after mitigation. None of the 24 landscape character designations, including Rokeby Park have a residual significant impact. The area in which Cross Lanes Farm Shop is located is covered by viewpoints 8.1 and 8.2 both of which are identified to experience a significant residual visual effect.</p>	
395	151457, 152488, 152928, 153371	Forestry Commission	153131, 153831, 153857	Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern that narrow, local roads such as the Sills are prone to flooding.</p> <p>Respondents also expressing concern over the flooding of agricultural land from drainage ponds into Tutta Beck.</p> <p>Respondents also raise concerns that the Project would result in changes to the water table and pollution of groundwater and surface water.</p>	<p>Flood modelling has been carried out as part the design process and appropriate mitigation measures included within the Project, please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>The results of the flood modelling for the Project indicate there will be no increased risk of flooding as a result of the Project to Tutta Beck and the Sills.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Impacts of the Project on groundwater receptors are considered within the ES chapter on Road Drainage and the Water Environment 14 (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendices (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>As reported in ES Chapter 14, the outline highway drainage design includes measures to manage the quality of surface water runoff. Structures are assessed using standard guidance methodologies to ensure water quality characteristics and spillage risk are within acceptable limits taking in to account the sensitivity of the receiving groundwater and watercourses.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.	
464	149409, 150415, 151328, 151509, 151523, 152253, 152260, 152971, 153049, 153071, 153073, 153082, 153315, 153618, 153826, 153898, 153982, 154144, 154195, 154236, 154262, 154342, 154465, 154472, 154473, 154477, 154481, 154485,		153893	Air quality	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on air quality. These respondents suggest that longer journeys and increased congestion, particularly in Barnard Castle and Bridgegate, would exacerbate air pollution, which could have adverse health impacts on residents and on ancient woodland. Respondents also express concern that the scheme would prevent the area achieving clean air targets. Respondents mention carbon particulates and nitrogen as particularly concerning pollutants from the route.	As part of the Application, the Project has prepared a traffic model to assess the effects on traffic as a result of the Project. The traffic modelling identifies that the Project will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). In relation to Bridgegate (A67) through Barnard Castle the TA states that: <i>'While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved</i>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154487, 154489					<p><i>A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.</i></p> <p>The air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) considers construction and operation effects.</p> <p>The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, as a result of the Project, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter. In determining likely significant impacts, the assessment methodology considers not only the predicted change, i.e., impact, in local air pollutant concentrations at sensitive human receptors, but also the predicted concentration, which is</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>compared to the relevant air quality objective. The compliance risk assessment, which also forms part of the air quality assessment, has been used to determine the Project's likelihood of preventing the UK complying with the Air Quality Directive in the shortest timescales possible. The compliance monitoring sites are only located in Penrith for the Project. The Project is not anticipated to impact compliance with the EU limit value.</p> <p>The air quality assessment considers the impact of the Project on designated sites, including ancient woodland, within 200m of the Affected Road Network. The assessment of significant effects on designated sites due to nitrogen deposition, including ammonia, uses a change threshold of 1% of the habitat's lower critical load.</p> <p>No likely significant effects are concluded for air quality, which includes both human health and designated ecological habitats and no exceedances of the relevant Air Quality Objectives are predicted during the operational phase of the Project for nitrogen dioxide or particulate matter (PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5})</p> <p>The impact of carbon emissions as a result of the Project are considered in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ES Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2).	
465	152253, 153826, 153828, 154485	Durham County Council	153831, 153893, 154035	Landscape/ Visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative landscape and visual Environment impacts of the scheme. These respondents express particular concern that the preferred route would move away from the roman road's ridge alignment and views of Rokeby Hall and Park would be lost for road users.</p> <p>Others state the proposed route would have adverse visual and Environmental impact upon Rokeby Grange and Cottage and Cross Lanes Organic Farm and that local topography has not been taken into account.</p> <p>Respondents also raise concern in regards the removal of woodland as they state many developments in Barnard Castle have also removed vegetation.</p>	<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The Project landscape architects, and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. In some instances, the design has included increased heights of bunds to remove the need for acoustic barriers and remain in keeping with the local landscape character. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). The topography of the area including at Cross Lanes has been considered and as a result the link road between Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane runs from a high point on Moorhouse Lane to a point at grade behind Cross Lane Organics Farm in the space between it and the existing road.</p> <p>While specific impacts on the setting of heritage assets are included in ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) landscape impact incorporates the elements that combine to create the character of the landscape. This includes inter alia landscape features, geology, heritage assets, human habitation, and connections.</p> <p>All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable. Landscape mitigation for the Project has sought to replace lost features such as woodland where practicable and to ameliorate or offset impacts on landscape character. Landscape planting design for the Project includes a range of measures designed to complement the local landscape character using species of local provenance with appropriate consideration of climate change</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>resilient species. The measures will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Woodland planting • Woodland edge • Linear belts of trees and shrubs • Blocks of mixed species native woodland • Scattered trees • Scrub • Hedgerows • Hedgerows with trees • Individual trees • Species rich grassland. <p>The implementation of the mitigation strategy, using the palette listed above will ensure that the landscape and visual impacts are mitigated, retaining the landscape character.</p> <p>The designed landscape of Rokeby Park has a relationship with the A66 journey where road users travelling east emerge from a wooded corridor and experience the gateway and parkland beyond. Mitigation planting reinforces this experience, making sure these views are retained.</p> <p>Rokeby Grange and Rokeby Cottage currently have a clear view of traffic travelling along the A66. The proposed junction and rerouted main road will be</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>higher but will have significant woodland screening, both along the roadside, reinforcing the line of the Roman Road, and on the junction itself there will be no residual adverse effects on these receptors.</p> <p>Four of the 13 visual receptors assessed for the scheme retain a significant adverse impact after mitigation. None of the 24 landscape character designations, including Rokeby Park have a residual significant impact.</p>	
1405	152990	Durham County Council		Landscape/ Visual 2 Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative landscape and visual Environment impacts of the scheme noting that the scheme would require mature tree removal which provide screening and noise pollution mitigation from the road to residents. Respondents also note that the scheme would be within an Area of Higher Landscape Value (AHLV) and would only be permitted where it conserves, and where appropriate enhances, the special qualities of the landscape, unless the benefits of development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Respondents also query who would be responsible for invasive plant management.</p>	<p>It should be noted the noise impact assessment for the Project does not consider existing vegetation and the noise attenuation this may provide as generally woodland is not effective in providing substantive, consistent noise mitigation. This therefore ensures that the noise impact assessment baseline represents a worst case for which to determine potential noise mitigation requirements. The removal or provision of trees in this area would therefore not impact upon the result of the operational noise impact assessment.</p> <p>All existing woodland is to be retained where practicable.</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). The ES considers impacts on both the AONB and AHLV within the existing context where both designations are already affected by the existing road corridor. The assessment concludes that the scheme at Rokeby responds positively to Durham Local Plan Policy 39, conserving the special qualities of the designated landscape.</p> <p>Measures for dealing with invasive species are incorporated in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
1406	150143			Population and Human Health Alternatives Land	Respondent expressing concern that the preferred junction option would result in larger areas of land take within agricultural land.	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including impacts on agricultural land.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>Both eastern and western junction options were identified to have similar impacts upon agricultural land holdings. In addition, design development between the Autumn 2021 Consultation and DCO application has resulted in an overall reduction in proposed permanent acquisition of land.</p> <p>The principal consideration in the preference for the black route (with a western junction at Rokeby) is the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. The eastern junction will create harm to the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. Whilst impacts on some key views of the eastern junction could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the eastern junction would still lead to additional fragmentation of the site.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						considers the potential effect of the scheme on agricultural holdings.	
468	149409, 152139, 152971, 153071, 153073, 153315, 153982, 154236, 154464, 154485		152990	Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern over potential Environmental noise effects from the scheme. These respondents suggest that induced traffic, the speed of vehicles on the route, the height/topography of the route and the length of the route, would all contribute to additional noise from the scheme. Respondents also state that induced congestion, particularly in Bridgegate, Startforth and Barnard Castle, would contribute significantly to noise in the area. Respondents suggest that this added noise could have an impact on the serenity of the area, as well as on local residents.</p>	<p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The assessment includes consideration of CPRE areas of tranquillity.</p> <p>The assessment is underpinned by noise modelling which is based on the traffic modelling carried out for the scheme (Transport Assessment, Application Document 3.7) which considers various factors including traffic flows, speed of traffic, percentage of Heavy Good Vehicles (HGV), road elevation as well as local topography. These factors have therefore been taken fully into account when developing the three-dimensional noise model as part of the assessment of noise impacts. Details of the noise model are presented in section 12.4 Assessment Methodology of the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>The traffic flows across the A67 (from Bowes to Barnard Castle) which pass the community of Startforth on the western side of Barnard Castle, are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>predicted to decrease from approximately 2,713 vehicles per 18hr in the Do-Minimum 2029 Opening Year (without the Project), based on Annual Average Weekly Traffic (AAWT) to approximately 2,285 in the Do-Something (with the Project) Opening Year 2029. As such, noise impacts at the nearby receptors are predicted to experience negligible change for which effects are assessed as not significant.</p> <p>Similarly, the traffic flows across the A67 around Bridgegate within Barnard Castle, are predicted to decrease from approximately 6,617 vehicles per 18hr in the Do-Minimum 2029 Opening Year (without the Project), to approximately 6,173 in the Do-Something (with the Project) Opening Year 2029. As such, noise impacts at the nearby receptors are predicted to experience negligible change for which effects are assessed as not significant.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced a EMP</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the Environment, such as noise, will be managed.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). Whilst traffic flows on the A66 increase with the Project, the impact on local roads varies. In relation to Bridgegate and Startforth (A67) through Barnard Castle the TA states that</p> <p><i>'While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</i></p>	
471	151456, 153056,		152983	Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern regarding the potential negative	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153365, 153797, 153839, 153871, 154018, 154144, 154228, 154236, 154342, 154485				<p>climate impact from the scheme. Respondents state that increased traffic and construction vehicles would generate carbon emissions, which is unsustainable and would offset any perceived benefits of the black route. Respondents also state that the route would go against the Government's climate change commitments.</p>	<p>during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. The climate impact arising from different route options formed one element of the route selection process. As noted within the PEI Report it was concluded that no route options resulted in a significant adverse effect on climate.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the applicable national policy statement, the NPSNN.</p> <p>National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of Government carbon reduction plan targets. This assessment is reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2), and outlines the measures taken to avoid and mitigate carbon emissions through the design of the Project . The assessment of climate impacts is considered with regard to the legally binding UK carbon target and carbon budgets.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. It is noted within the Transport Assessment (Chapter 11.7) that there is predicted to be an increase in traffic on the A67 (+2400 vehicles per day which represents a 28% increase) within Barnard Castle during the construction of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby Scheme (construction scenario D). This increase is not identified as significant and it should be noted that this is a worst case assessment, and National Highways continues to consider implementing measures to maintain current journey times on the A66 during construction such that these diversions are not required.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts. Within the EMP, the Principal Contractor carrying out the construction works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan with the aim of minimising disruption during the works.</p> <p>Given the temporary nature of the impact and with this mitigation in place there are no significant effects identified in regards pedestrian and cyclist safety during construction.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
474	151494, 153896, 154485			General / not specified/ Traffic	Respondents expressing general concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on the Environment on the grounds that it would increase traffic flows, without providing further information.	<p>National Highways has carried out traffic modelling throughout the development of the scheme to inform its design and to understand its likely effects. The methodology and results of the traffic modelling is reported in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The Environmental impact assessment carried out for the Project is underpinned by the Project transport modelling and considers the Environmental impact of construction and operational traffic movement, identifying how potential adverse effects will be mitigated where required. The Environmental impact assessment is contained within the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4). Whilst traffic flow on the A66 increases with the Project, the impact on local roads varies. On Bridgegate and Startforth (A67) through Barnard Castle the TA states that:</p> <p>'While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67."	
500	149409, 150199, 150426, 151342, 152207, 152950, 153324, 153342, 153371, 153576, 153794, 153826, 153904	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153831, 154035, 154127	Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of noise pollution from the scheme, indicating that additional traffic from construction and operation, from both car and HGV traffic, would contribute to noise in the area. Respondents expressing concern that noise from the B6277 would negatively impact enjoyment of the natural Environment in this area. Respondents expressing concern that idling cars in congested areas such as Barnard Castle would generate significant noise levels which would negatively impact residents' quality of life, and potentially their mental and physical health.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without it (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). The Transport Assessment states that:</p> <p><i>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills (B6277), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</i></p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The noise modelling carried out for the Project is underpinned by the scheme transport modelling and considers construction and operational traffic movements.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced a EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the Environment, such as noise, will be managed.</p> <p>National Highways notes the concerns over the potential impact of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>scheme on physical and mental health. ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration has identified a number of receptors in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby area that would be subject to significant adverse effects, although it is noted that these receptors are all located in close proximity to the existing A66. Where sustainable, additional mitigation in the form of noise barriers is proposed subject to liaison with key stakeholders. Where relevant, receptors eligible for noise insulation as per Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 are presented in the report. Details of noise insulation are presented in section 12.10 Assessment of likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Project has been designed to minimise residual adverse effects as much as practicable and sustainable to do so, through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles. All design and embedded mitigation measures for noise and vibration impacts, e.g. the road alignment, cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise, are reported within the ES Noise and Vibration Chapter in section 12.9 Essential mitigation and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>enhancement measures as well as Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology (Application Number 3.2).</p> <p>Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3) provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on mental and physical health outcomes at the population level. Due to the low population density in this location and the small number of affected receptors, the effect of increased noise on population health has been assessed as neutral.</p>	
533	151522, 153365,		153831, 153857, 153893, 154035, 154209	Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential for flooding and drainage issues in the scheme. Respondents express concern about flooding in Tutta Beck, Cross Lanes Organic Farm and Shop, Sills Road, Gill Lane, and on agricultural land which would border the construction site. Others suggest that climate change could result in unpredictable flooding in the area, and that the proposed access routes may be prone to flooding.</p>	<p>Flood modelling has been carried out as part the design process and appropriate mitigation measures included in the proposals, please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4. This assessment includes consideration of future climatic conditions.</p> <p>The results of the flood modelling for the Project indicate there is no increased risk of flooding as a result of the Project to Tutta Beck, Cross Lanes Organic Farm and shop, Gill Lane, Sills Road or agricultural land.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1407	153608, 152139	Environment Agency		Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents expressing concern in regards the impacts of construction on current drainage pipes. Respondents request further details in regards the drainage for the scheme.</p> <p>Respondents also raise concerns about the impact of culverting on biodiversity.</p>	<p>During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage, secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever practicable, should this not be practicable alternative solutions will be sought. Please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4 for further information in regards the Project drainage proposed.</p> <p>All new watercourse crossings are designed to facilitate the free passage of aquatic and riparian species as set out within the Project Design Principles (Application Reference 5.11). Where existing culverts are to be replaced, they too are designed to facilitate the free passage of these species. Sensitive watercourse crossings such as Trout Beck and other watercourses supporting species of conservation value will be open span to minimize the biodiversity impact.</p>	No
1408	154342			Flooding / drainage – junction	Respondent raises concerns that the alternative eastern junction is considered better from a	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Alternatives	<p>drainage/flooding perspective as whilst it would introduce an additional pond and outfall, it has the significant benefit of not introducing a trapped cutting which the preferred option requires. The respondent states the eastern alternative junction is better during the construction phase due to the works being carried out further away from Tutta Beck and the resultant reduction in risk of negatively impacting water quality. They also state that the operational impact on climate change and increased flood risk is considered better for the eastern alternative junction due to the ability for the junction drainage to flow freely, avoiding the risk of underpass flooding which is present in the baseline junction.</p>	<p>and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>Impacts upon road drainage and water Environment are likely to be similar for both the western junction and the eastern junction alternative however it is noted that the western junction is closer to a watercourse. Following mitigation however the western junction is not identified to impact water quality within Tutta Beck, and the outline drainage system has been designed to allow for free flow of water with no increased flood risk identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The principal consideration in the preference for the black route (with a western junction at Rokeby) is the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. The eastern junction will create harm to the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. Whilst impacts on some key views of the eastern junction could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the eastern junction would still lead to additional fragmentation of the site.</p>	
709	153982			Light / Landscape and Visual	Respondent expressing concern over potential dust, noise and light pollution, run-off containing pollutants, as well as	National Highways will seek to avoid and reduce construction impacts on wildlife. This includes avoiding and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					to damage to tree roots.to Jacks Wood and other woodland/ecological habitat.	reducing potential adverse impacts during construction and operation on Jack Wood Ancient Replanted Woodland located in close proximity to the Project (see ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) for further details). The final scheme will not be lit. Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the Project is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Temporary construction stage lighting will be designed to be sensitive to wildlife. As part of the DCO application, National Highways has produced a EMP (Application Document 2.7) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the Environment, including wildlife, will be managed.	
710	150460, 153339, 153365, 153797, 153826, 153828, 153982, 154195,	Environment Agency	152990, 153857, 153893, 154209	Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern for the potential Environmental impacts of the scheme relating to wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>i) Respondents express concern for the loss of and damage to ponds and watercourses, which they suggest</p>	The application for the Project includes an Environmental impact assessment which is a comprehensive assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on the Environment. This includes an assessment of potential impacts on wildlife and habitats.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
154215, 154216					<p>would be damaged from run-off pollution from the route.</p> <p>ii) Respondents express concern at the lack of habitat connectivity, citing the lack of wildlife bridges. Respondents also express concern over the need to control rabbit populations.</p>	<p>i) Potential impacts on habitats including ponds and watercourses are set out in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>As reported in ES Chapter 14, the outline highway drainage design includes measures to manage the quality of surface water runoff. Structures are assessed using standard guidance methodologies to ensure water quality characteristics and spillage risk are within acceptable limits taking in to account the sensitivity of the receiving groundwater and watercourses.</p> <p>Where necessary, this results in additional or enhanced treatment measures being included in the highway drainage design. This is reported in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2), which also sets out the design measures that National Highways proposes to mitigate adverse effects on the water Environment during both operation and construction. These measures are secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) within the DCO application.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>ii) ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats (which includes greening of proposed overbridges), badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the within the DCO within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>National Highways note the concerns of the consultee on future maintenance such as rabbit population control measures. Rabbits are not protected, or a notable species nor are they listed as an invasive species – so there is no legal requirement or obligation for the ES to cover</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						measures to control rabbit populations as part of the mitigation measures proposed.	
751	153371, 153794, 153826	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154127	PEI Report/Traffic/Air Quality	Respondents expressing concerns relating to the PEI Report. These respondents state that impacts of increased traffic on the B6277 and the lower part of Barnard Castle have not been considered within the PEI Report and that the PEI Report overlooks concerns such as air pollution that may make the black route look less desirable.	<p>The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation provided a preliminary assessment of the Project's potential significant Environmental effects. The PEI Report provided an appropriate and robust assessment of the Project to inform statutory engagement.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed to fully assess the effects of the Project on the Environment. The EIA is reported in the ES and is submitted as part of the DCO application. The information in the ES will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate during the Examination of the Project.</p> <p>The air quality assessment within the PEI Report used data provided from the traffic model and provided a robust assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on air quality and followed the requirements for the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality (Highways England, 2019). The PEI Report identified that it is likely that a number of sensitive receptors in close proximity to all junction options would</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>experience minor changes in air quality (both positive and negative due to the shifting alignment) and no human or ecological receptors were predicted to experience any significant adverse effects or pollutant concentrations above the Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>The PEI Report noted that the traffic and air quality modelling would be reviewed in accordance with latest data, and the final assessment presented in the ES. The impact of the Project on sensitive receptors (human and designated sites) within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) has been assessed in full within the ES. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The Project has carried out updated traffic modelling to understand the potential movements of traffic as a result of the construction and operation of the Project. This includes consideration of traffic flows on the B6277 and the lower part of Barnard Castle. For the black Option, forecast daily traffic flows on the B6277 – ‘The Sills’ would increase by 480 vehicles, or 41% compared to the Do Minimum (Without the Project). However, this is a similar to the increase of 397</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						vehicles, or 34% for the blue option compared to the Do Minimum. Traffic flows on the A67 through Barnard Castle will drop as a result of the Project for Rokeby junction. This is because the improved (faster) A66 attracts more longer distance east west traffic from the A67 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
806	149367, 149372, 149373, 149405, 152233, 153035, 153391, 153820, 153826, 153828, 153868, 153921		152983	Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact on the climate, through increased traffic and longer journeys, which would increase CO2 emissions and is contrary to climate change commitments.	The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the NPSNN. National Highways recognises the concern raised regarding climate change. National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). The assessment of climate impacts is considered with	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>regard to the UK legally binding carbon target and carbon budgets). The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction.</p> <p>The climate assessment is underpinned by the traffic modelling detailed within the Traffic Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) which outlines local traffic impacts for each scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). It notes that whilst traffic flows on the A66 increase with the Project, the impact on local roads varies. The following is reported in the TA:</p> <p>'There is an increase in traffic on the B6277 Moorhouse Lane, and a decrease on Barnard Castle Road (C165). This is because the traffic that</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>accesses Barnard Castle from the A66 east has easier access to the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and less easy access to Barnard Castle Road, compared to the existing situation due to the proposed junction arrangements at these locations. The speed limit increase on the A66 makes it more attractive for vehicles to continue along the A66 for longer whilst the proposed new junction alignment at Rokeby Park means traffic must travel an additional 2.3km compared with the without-Project if using the C165 from A66 east towards Barnard Castle.'</p> <p>'While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</p> <p>The Combined Modelling Appraisal (ComMA) (Application Document 3.8 Section 5.7) provides journey time analysis for the full A66 corridor which shows a forecast journey time reduction of between 11 and 13 minutes in 2044 with the Project</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>compared to without the Project. The local impacts detailed in the TA (provided above) show slight reductions in traffic on the A66 through Barnard Castle and on some other roads such as Newgate and Westgate Road. Journey times would therefore not be expected to worsen on these roads. The increased traffic on Moorhouse Lane is not forecast to cause significant journey time delay as it has an indicative road capacity of 22,000 (Annual Average Daily Traffic – AADT) and traffic on this road is forecast to increase from 990 (AADT) without the Project to 1,500 (AADT) with the Project.</p>	
959	153826			<p>PEI Report/ Population and Human Health Noise Air quality</p>	<p>Respondent expressing concern that the PEI Report does not mention potential risks of the scheme, in particular to health and safety due to increased likelihood of accidents and potential increases in air and noise pollution.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the concerns over the potential impact of the Project on physical and mental health. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) has identified the effects of the scheme on human health outcomes, including both negative and positive health effects associated with traffic noise emissions, and no health effects (neutral) associated with air quality. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) has identified changes in road traffic accident rates, which have been reported in the health assessment.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The majority of changes are positive, reflecting a reduction in accident rates. Some areas of existing dual carriageway will see negative effects due to slightly higher accident rates resulting from increased traffic flows. Overall, the number of deaths and injuries will reduce significantly.</p> <p>Impacts in relation to noise are set out in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and impacts in relation to air quality and pollution are set out in Chapter 5 Air Quality.</p>	
1119		Historic England		Cultural heritage	Historic England expressing concern that the on-line option would require the demolition of the Vicarage, a multiperiod building thought to date to the late 18th / early 19th century. The building forms part of the group of buildings associated with the church and Rokeby Park.	National Highways acknowledges the concern over the impact of an online route in this location. National Highways has worked closely with Historic England to develop a route which provides the least impact on historic Environment providing an offline route which does not impact on the setting of St Mary's Church or require the demolition of the Old Rectory (Vicarage).	No
1121		Historic England		Landscape / visual Cultural Heritage	Historic England t expressing concern that the eastern junction for both alternative routes sever Church Plantation - part of the Rokeby Park and Gardens original design - from the rest of the park. They harm both the setting and significance of the	National Highways acknowledges the concern over the impact of an eastern junction for the red and blue options. National Highways has worked closely with Historic England to develop a route which provides the least impact	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>landscape through: increased highways infrastructure (signage, lighting, safety barriers and fencing, road markings, etc.); increased visibility of vehicle movement seen from and in conjunction with the heritage assets (even with the comprehensive engineering design); the physical presence of an underpass junction within and immediately adjacent to the registered park and garden altering landforms that are seen from within and in conjunction with the designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>on historic Environment providing an offline route which does not impact on the setting of St Mary's Church or require the demolition of the Old Rectory.</p> <p>The eastern junction options at Rokeby have not been taken forward by the Project. The principal consideration in the preference for the black route (with the western junction at Rokeby) is the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. The eastern junction will create harm to the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. Whilst impacts on some key views of the eastern junction could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the eastern junction would still lead to additional fragmentation of the site.</p> <p>The ES includes a landscape and visual impact assessment of the Project which considers the impacts on landscape character which includes the important heritage assets (ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual, Application Document 3.2). The assessment identifies slight residual impacts on Rokeby Park and its setting, which are not significant. The significant benefits of removing traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						from between the historic buildings group is also noted and forms part of the considerations within the landscape and visual assessment.	
1187	153794, 153826	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'		General / not specified/ Traffic	Respondents expressing concern in regards the scheme increasing traffic congestion with the areas of Startforth and Barnard Castle.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 8 21: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year Do Something Flow (Changes from Do Minimum)). In relation to Startforth (which is situated on the A67) and the A67 through Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that:</p> <p><i>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</i></p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.	
1188		Durham County Council		General / not specified/Material Assets and Waste	Durham County Council expressing concern in relation to the sterilisation of Mineral Safeguarding Sites and significant effects as a result of aggregates imported to site.	<p>The ES, Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2.) identifies that the Project will encroach into a Carboniferous Limestone Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) due to the new adjacent eastbound carriageway to the south between the B6277 junction at Cross Lanes and the existing Tutta Beck Cottage access. This will include significant engineering interventions, namely new junctions at Cross Lanes and Rokeby.</p> <p>The new junction at Cross Lanes will also lie within the boundary of the Boldron Cross Lanes, a proposed unallocated mineral site and may have an impact on future development.</p> <p>The Project has been refined to reduce the overall footprint of the Cross Lanes and Rokeby junctions, thus minimising encroachment into the MSA and will also consider the potential for the extraction of aggregates before construction as far</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>as practicable. However, a moderate adverse likely significant effect has been identified for the sterilisation of a mineral safeguarding site for both the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme and Route wide as per DMRB LA110 which states significance as sterilisation of ≥ 1 mineral safeguarding site.</p> <p>Further details in regards the potential impacts of the Project on MSA and on Mineral Safeguarding Sites (MSS), including the potential for sterilisation, is detailed within ES Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2.)</p> <p>The Project will consume large quantities of key materials such as aggregates, concrete, asphalt and mortar, increasing the demand on the existing UK supply chain. At present it is assumed that all existing aggregate based material will be incorporated into fill materials on the Project, subject to suitability and any hazardous content. Additional aggregate based materials will be sourced from local quarries, based on supply and demand.</p> <p>National Highways will consider the practicality of aggregates extraction in advance of the Project and consult with Durham County Council on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme as an attempt to minimise impact to Carboniferous Limestone MSA.</p> <p>With the growing demand for construction products and the ever-increasing pressure to reduce the Environmental impacts of depleting natural resources, there is a significant percentage of construction materials that are produced from recycled material. The Principal Contractor will seek opportunities to support a circular economy by achieving a target of at least 31% of aggregates imported to the site comprising a re-used/recycled content.</p> <p>This commitment is included within the EMP (Application Document Number 2.7).</p> <p>The non-waste Environmental effects associated with the transportation of materials (including the quantification of the movement of fill materials) are addressed in the relevant Environmental topics of the ES such as Chapter 7 Climate Change and Chapter 5 Air Quality.</p>	
1190	154368			Air quality / Geology and Soils / Population and Human Health	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts on air quality and crop yields.	The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) this follows statutory guidance and policy requirements and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						therefore does not consider the impact of air quality on crop yields. The direct impact of the Project on agricultural land is considered within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). Whilst not specifically related to crop yields, no likely significant effects are concluded for air quality, with not exceedances of the relevant Air Quality Objectives. Through the implementation of mitigation measures in the EMP, no likely significant effects are predicted to occur from construction dust.	
1191	153794, 154368	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'		Air quality	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts on air quality and health referencing the significant cost to the NHS of air pollution related respiratory illness.	The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is also provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment, which is full and robust, identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on factors that influence health, including Environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance and access. The effects on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where practicable.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for construction air quality impacts as well as increased traffic emissions arising from the Project.</p> <p>During construction there is potential for significant but temporary air quality impacts on residents within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN). However, we are committed to measures that will help minimise impacts such as protecting air quality by implementing a Dust Management Plan.</p> <p>The existing air quality along the A66 is generally good and the ES considers and assesses how the Project could impact upon the local air quality. As reported in Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) while there may be an increase in the volume of traffic using the A66 following our planned improvements, the local road network can expect to see lower levels of air pollution.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Information on local traffic flow forecasts with and without the project are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8). Section 11 of the Transport Assessment also describes the impact of construction on traffic flows.	
1193	154368	Durham County Council		Air quality	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts of poor air quality as a result of the scheme on wildlife and nature conservation sites requesting further information within the ES.	<p>The PEI Report presented a preliminary air quality impact assessment. Since PEI Report, the Project has continued to undertake a full suite of surveys and analysis, which is presented in the DCO Application, including in the ES. The Air Quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) considers construction and operational effects of the Project. It has been updated using the latest traffic model and Project design data (refer to The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7)).</p> <p>Where significant impacts on sensitive receptors within 200m of the ARN are identified, mitigation measures to limit the impact of construction vehicle emissions are included in the Project's EMP (Application Document 2.7), submitted as part of the DCO supporting information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A detailed assessment of potential impacts on European designated sites as a result of the Project is also provided within the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5). Both reported no significant effects on designated habitats as result of potential adverse air quality impacts.	
1194	154368			Air quality	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts on air quality noting that an increase of air quality pollution would be in conflict with government policy.	The air quality impacts of the Project during construction and operation have been assessed in full and are reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). This assessment was carried out with reference to all relevant statutory and policy requirements as well as relevant guidance and good practice principles. National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Document Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). The assessment of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>climate impacts is considered with regard to the UK legally binding carbon target and carbon budgets.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction.</p>	
1195	149428, 150415, 152260, 153170, 153618, 154144, 154195, 154262, 154485			Noise/ Alternatives	<p>Respondents expressing concern over potential Environmental noise effects from the scheme stating the preferred route would impact more residents than alternatives.</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential Environmental impacts of the Project including noise and vibration.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>At Rokeby, the black-black evolved version of the Project was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation as</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the preferred alternative as part of the black route. Within the PEI Report, it was identified that the preferred option would result in changes to traffic movements local to Barnard Castle increasing the number of areas impacted by noise. However, noise modelling also identified that slightly more people would benefit from reduced traffic disturbance than would experience an increase.</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The noise and vibration results of construction and operation of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme are presented in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Number 3.2) specifically in section 12.10 Assessment of likely significant effects. The report includes the assessment of likely significant effects of the preferred route which results in much lower number of likely significant adverse effects than those identified within the PEI Report.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation	
1196	153826			Noise/ Population & Human Health	Respondents expressing concern over potential Environmental noise effects from the scheme and impacts on mental health.	National Highways notes the concerns over the potential impact of the scheme on physical and mental health. ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration has identified a number of receptors in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby area that would be subject to significant adverse effects. The noise and vibration results of construction and operation of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme are presented in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration. Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3) provides an assessment of the effects	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						of the scheme on mental and physical health outcomes at the population level. Due to the low population density in this location and the small number of affected receptors, the effect of increased noise on population health has been assessed as neutral.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Cross Lanes to Rokeby’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
22		Durham County Council		Engineering design and development - Mitigation	A respondent expressing support for the scheme design, in particular mitigation measures for drainage and coastal areas.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
502	148568, 148604, 149352, 149370, 150456, 150460, 150462, 151343, 151467, 152207, 152240, 152968, 153055, 153315, 153316, 153377, 153378, 153829, 153904, 154237, 154472, 162144	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153131	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing general support for the scheme, including support for the planned design and the Project in principle and support for the dualling and improved road layout. Some respondents state that any improvements in this area are welcome.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
561	152264, 153377, 153386, 153950	Durham County Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme as it would reduce congestion. In particular, respondents mention the rerouting of HGVs at Barnard Castle, and ensuring continuous traffic flows at Cross Lanes. Respondents also expressing support for the reduction in traffic generally, specifically mentioning the B6277, as helping towards the reduction in congestion.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
574	148620, 153907	Durham County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds of improved access for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Particular locations mentioned include the Rokeby Junction, and the grade-separated junction at Cross Lanes.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
575	148621, 149378, 149782, 150190, 150431, 150432, 150456, 151462, 152989, 153316, 153558, 154213, 154217	Durham County Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the scheme as it would improve access relating to traffic, transport and junctions. Respondents state that the existing junction at Rokeby is difficult to navigate when travelling westbound, and that the underpass/overpass would improve connectivity for eastbound traffic. Respondents also state that access to Barnard Castle would be more direct, with fewer difficult right-turns.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
576	148585, 148590, 150458, 151489, 152240, 152257, 152913, 152928, 152989, 153055, 153316, 153385, 153386, 153950	Durham County Council	149355	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme as it would improve safety for local traffic, transport and junctions. These respondents suggest that the plans would improve the Cross Lanes and Rokeby junctions, ensuring safer local access points, and introducing dualling throughout. Respondents also suggest that less congestion would reduce pressure on roads generally, which should make the route safer. Respondents highlight how unsafe the road currently is.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
577		Durham County Council		Economics - Local economy	A respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it will benefit the local economy by creating jobs and training opportunities and using local suppliers and amenities.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. A range of jobs will be generated during the construction programme. This will include unskilled and skilled construction jobs as well as engineering, planning and management professionals. Individuals from within the study area who gain employment on the construction of the Project may experience positive health effects including improved mental health and increased ability to access healthy lifestyle choices through increased income. There is a potential for long-term benefits to health and wellbeing through training and improved future employment prospects. Individuals who are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>currently unemployed or in low-paid or insecure employment will have the highest potential for health benefits. The total number of construction jobs, and the proportion of jobs likely to be available to the local community, are not known at this stage and therefore the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>New spend within the local economy by construction workers is likely to benefit local businesses such as accommodation, retail and hospitality. While this is likely to be relatively small when compared with overall spend in the area, it could benefit local businesses for the duration of the construction programme. Increased spend in these sectors may lead to increased employment opportunities and incomes, leading to positive health effects. The scale of indirect employment has not been quantified and therefore the health effects are assessed as neutral.</p>	
768	148637, 152922, 152923, 153316, 154342			Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing support for the Project on the grounds that it would reduce congestion.</p> <p>Respondents state that the scheme would improve HGV traffic flows, particularly on Eggleston Bridge.</p> <p>Others state that the proposals would reduce the need for right turns on the</p>	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					carriageway, thus improving traffic flows, particularly at Rokeby and St. Mary's.		
849	148550, 148578, 148588, 148615, 149365, 149413, 152911, 153072, 153335, 153377, 153826, 153828		154035	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing general support for the scheme, without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
933	153035, 153316, 153952			Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the engineering design of the scheme. These include: the removal of right-hand turns; the additional slip roads, such as the Northern slip road and at Smithy Cottage; and the Cross Lanes turn-off.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
962	150466, 151511, 152264, 153073, 153311, 153312			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the Project on the grounds that it would improve safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents state that the Cross Lanes junction would be safer for non-motorised use, and that the A66 would become safer to cross. Others suggest	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					that the widening of pavements within this scheme would improve safety.		
964	149378, 152139, 152207, 153316		149381	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for the Project on the grounds that it would improve traffic accessibility. Respondents state that the new junctions would provide easier access, particularly to businesses in Bowes. Others state that the proposals could divert HGV traffic to the north of Barnard Castle which could improve access for other road users.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
966	153035, 153312	Durham Constabulary		Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the Project because it would improve road safety, without providing specific detail. A respondent specifically states that the Cross Lanes junction could reduce the number of collisions.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. One of the core Project objectives is to improve safety for all users of the network.	No
1003	153072			Get on with it / overdue	One respondent expressing support for the scheme and encouraging the Applicant to start as soon as possible, without providing further information.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
1061	152139			Engineering design and development	Respondents expressing opposition to the engineering design of the scheme stating that the underpass option would be more suitable for the Rokeby junction.	Stakeholder engagement and feedback has factored into the review of alternatives assessed, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). The Black	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Route proposed has emerged from these studies of alternative options as the preferred arrangement to address the problems on the existing A66 relating the scheme area and to deliver the Project objectives. This assessment considered various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) provides further details in this regard	
1062	152139			Economics	Respondents expressing support for the scheme for economic reasons. In particular, respondents state that the Cross Lanes junction will be cheaper to construct than other proposals.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the route being promoted.	No
1063	152139			Land	One respondent expressing support for the scheme as it would require minimal land take, particularly around the Cross Lanes junction.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted.	No
1066	148574, 151462, 151467, 151503, 152217			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds of safety for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. In particular, respondents suggest that the scheme would improve safety for these users when crossing the road, and specifically for cyclists at Cross Lanes.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
337	148574, 148641, 148706, 149362, 149374, 149400, 149404, 149405, 149798, 150158, 150160, 150163, 150182, 150197, 150202, 150415, 150418, 150420, 150424, 150426, 150427, 150431, 150432, 150435, 150437, 151328, 151456, 151463, 151494, 151499, 151503, 151521, 151522,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglesstone Abbey Parish'	153831, 153893, 154035, 154201	Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the Black Route. Respondents state that the junction at Rokeby needs to stay where it is to stop gridlock in Barnard Castle; that the Black Route perpetuates HGV traffic on local roads; that it will increase traffic into Barnard Castle and on local roads which can't handle the traffic; that the junction at Rokeby is the wrong choice; that access to Barnard Castle should remain as it is; that it will harm residents of Teesdale; that the Black Route will impose additional miles to travel for non-motorised users; that journeys from Teesdale, Newsham, Greta Bridge and Barningham will be longer; that it is more expensive; vehicles travelling westbound will have to travel further; respondents also oppose this route for the perceived influence of Historic England in designing it over the concerns of local people.	Both the black and blue options for Rokeby shown that the Autumn 2021 Consultation would have public benefits. Stakeholder engagement and feedback has factored into the review of alternatives assessed, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). The Black Route proposed has emerged from these studies of alternative options as the preferred arrangement to address the problems on the existing A66 relating the scheme area and to deliver the Project objectives. This assessment considered various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) provides further details in this regard. The proposed Black Route does increase some journeys for non-motorised users such as walkers, cyclists and horse-riders, but in doing so, routes that are currently severed have been reconnected to provide a better standard of footpath, cycle route	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	151523, 152137, 152176, 152207, 152210, 152212, 152225, 152231, 152233, 152240, 152253, 152922, 152928, 152947, 152968, 152971, 153035, 153056, 153071, 153074, 153080, 153170, 153315, 153324, 153342, 153344, 153346, 153365, 153367, 153369, 153370, 153371, 153378, 153391,					<p>and bridleway. In addition, these routes are safer than existing, with the inclusion of grade separated crossings over or under the main A66 dual carriageway.</p> <p>Traffic flows on the A67 through Barnard Castle will drop with the Black Route option. This is because the improved (faster) A66 attracts more longer distance east-west traffic from the A67 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington.</p> <p>HGV traffic will continue to be signed to the Rokeby Junction as it will remain the route to/from Barnard Castle for HGVs; HGVs will still be able to leave the A66 at the proposed Cross Lanes Junction in order to reach all other destinations south of the River Tees.</p> <p>Traffic modelling at this location has been undertaken. However, traffic models calculate the fastest journeys and are therefore not influenced by signage. Therefore the scheme causes a <i>modelled</i> causes a modelled rerouting of HGV traffic (44 HGVs per day) from Barnard Castle Road to Moorhouse Lane / The Sills in a northbound direction, due to the additional distance needed to for traffic to double back at the proposed Cross lanes junction. The result of this is that</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153558, 153575, 153576, 153582, 153584, 153618, 153794, 153826, 153828, 153829, 153833, 153834, 153837, 153839, 153868, 153889, 153921, 153952, 153965, 154018, 154019, 154181, 154193, 154195, 154228, 154262, 154342, 154463, 154466, 154467, 154474, 154475, 154476, 154477,					<p>these HGV movements between the A66 east and destinations north of Barnard Castle, such as Alston and Stanhope will use the B6277 on the west side of the River Tees for their journey as opposed to the B6278 on the east side.</p> <p>Further investigation has been carried out which has concluded that, considering both currently observed travel times and modelled data, the modelled rerouting may not necessarily occur as the route via the B6278 may possibly remain the more appealing route for HGVs given the observed journey times and the fact that it will remain as the signed route.</p> <p>The main route into Barnard Castle will remain via the Rokeby Junction and the signage designed accordingly. Although the layout will result in a longer distance for traffic travelling from the east, our analysis shows that this route, when compared to a route via the Cross Lanes Junction, is shorter in terms of overall journey time, as traffic can flow more freely.</p> <p>Section 8 of the Transport Assessment outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme, including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154481, 154485, 154486, 154488					to without (Figure 8 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). The ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 ‘Cultural Heritage’ (Application Document 3.2) presents assessment of the alternative junction arrangements against applicable legislation and guidance, including testing against policy to understand the potential harm in terms of loss and setting to all heritage assets and particularly those with the highest significance such as Rokeby Park the Grade II* RPG. It was considered that the eastern junction alternative at Rokeby was likely to be considered as not conforming with national policy; refer to the Case for the Project and the Project Development Overview Report for further information.	
43	152222, 152233, 152989, 153904	Durham County Council	153795	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents suggesting provision of a cycle path, footpath or bridleway to serve the route. Suggestions include general requests for a dedicated active travel route that is parallel to the road, and an underpass like at Greta Bridge. Respondents believe that these are particularly necessary along Church Bank and The Sills, and that these would make walkers, cyclists and horse-riders safer.	The proposed design ensures all existing walking and cycling routes (there are no Bridleways) on this scheme are retained, these have been made safer by connecting them to the nearest junction, removing unsafe at-grade crossings. Connecting these routes to the junctions has linked more routes together creating more recreational opportunities.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The area at the existing at-grade crossing at Rokeby is constrained by the Grade II* Registered Park and Gardens of Rokeby Park, and the two properties of Tack Room Cottage and The Grove. Therefore, an underpass is not feasible in this location due to the level of land required for ramps to and from an underpass.</p> <p>Walkers and cyclists travelling to/from Greta Bridge will still be able to make their journey to the C165 Barnard Castle Road, via a dedicated connection to a shared cycleway and access road proposed between Tack Room Cottage and the Rokeby Junction.</p> <p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Design Team identified an opportunity to improve walking and cycling facilities on the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme, and so, a new cycleway is proposed from the Rokeby Junction, connecting to the proposed access road serving Streetside Farm and the proposed balancing pond creating an east/west route along the A66. This creates the opportunity for new routes to Barnard Castle or The Stang.</p> <p>Wider improvements of WCH infrastructure including Church Bank and The Sills remains outside the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						scope of the Project and as such any consideration of these improvements would be a matter for the local authority. Refer to the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19) for further information.	
211	149428, 150143, 150163, 151479, 151523, 152146, 152212, 152217, 152240, 153046, 153056, 153797, 153826, 153829, 153924, 153930, 154018, 154215, 154368	Durham County Council	153062, 154035, 154127	Alternative Route - Blue - Environment - cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the alternative Blue Route as it would be less detrimental for cultural heritage sites. Respondents state that the Rokeby Plantation has already experienced much felling, and therefore is not as in need of protection as Historic England claim. Respondents state that this site should not be used to rule out the Blue Route, when the Black Route could potentially cause damage or disruption to other historic sites, such as The Bank, County Bridge, and the Butter Market.	Both the black and blue options for Rokeby shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation were carefully reviewed with respect to their impacts on cultural heritage, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). The Black Route benefits the historic environment through reduction of severance between St Mary's Church and the Old Rectory and the likely reduction of impact risk at the Gate Piers at the southwest corner of the park. The updated traffic modelling has identified that the Black Route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66. The County Bridge will not be subject to increased traffic	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>levels and no significant impacts are identified.</p> <p>We maintain our view that the principal consideration in our preference for the Black Route is the impact on the Grade II* Rokeby Park, a Historic England Registered Park and Garden (RPG). The Blue Route would lead to fragmentation of the RPG site.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of this RPG have been considered throughout route development.</p> <p>Options which would result in land take within the plantation have not been taken forward as they would be too damaging to the historic environment.</p> <p>Following consultation with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>Such risks and resulting mitigations are assessed and managed within the ES to ensure compliance with policy, standards, and best practice. Refer to the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) for further information.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
258	150431, 150432, 152226, 152254, 152265, 152947, 153315, 153342, 153577, 153794, 153804, 153826, 154368	Durham County Council	154206	Alternative route - Blue - Community impact	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Blue Route would have a lower community impact than the Black Route. In particular, these respondents suggest that induced traffic and construction disruptions would be lower than from the Black Route. Respondents also suggesting that the local community is generally more supportive of the Blue Route, and the Rokeby Junction in particular. Respondents suggest that these benefits outweigh potential negatives of the Blue Route.</p>	<p>Both the Black and Blue options for Rokeby shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation would have public benefits.</p> <p>Careful review has determined that the Black Route offers wider benefits for the scheme, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR, Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). Community impact has been considering during optioneering, as detailed within both the PDOR and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The updated traffic modelling identifies that the Black Route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66. The County Bridge will not be subject to increased traffic levels and no significant impacts are identified. Refer to the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) for further information.</p> <p>Regarding disruption during construction, the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Application Document 2.7) outlines measures to mitigate and manage this.	
261	153901, 154368			Community impact - Listen to locals Alternatives	Respondents suggesting that National Highways listen to local communities, including their concerns over congestion and safety, and support for the Blue Route.	<p>Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. National Highways team members were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.</p> <p>Both the black and blue options for Rokeby shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation would have public benefits. Careful review has determined that the Black Route offers the better option for the scheme, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Respondents support for the Blue Route has been carefully considered. The Black Route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 relating the scheme area and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses</p> <p>Further detail relating this scheme is presented in the Application for development consent submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	
265	149373, 151503, 151522, 152207, 152212, 152229, 152240, 152928, 153342, 153577, 153633, 153826, 153841, 153952,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154035	Alternative route - Blue - Environment - cultural heritage	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Blue Route would be better than the Black Route for cultural heritage reasons. These respondents state that the Blue Route would have a reduced impact on sites like St Mary's Church and the Rokeby Estate, due to less induced traffic near these sites. Respondents suggest that the Blue Route would also have less impact on historic sites in Barnard Castle, as well as heritage views along the proposed Black Route. Respondents also state that the heritage concerns others may have of</p>	<p>National Highways has carefully considered route options relating the scheme during the optioneering, refinement of current design, and the appraisal process. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>Both the black and blue options for Rokeby shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation would have public benefits. Careful review has determined that the Black Route offers the better option for the scheme, as</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154262, 154339, 154368				the Blue Route are overblown, and that the Blue Route would be a net positive for historic sites.	<p>detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3. The preferred Black Route option brings benefits to the historic environment through reduction of severance between St Mary's Church, the school house, and the Old Rectory and the likely reduction of impact risk at the Gate Piers at the southwest corner of the park. The updated traffic modelling also identifies that the Black Route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66. In terms of wider public benefits there are no additional benefits we believe that exist for the Blue Route over and above the Black Route. National Highways maintains the view that the principal consideration preferring the black junction is the impact on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG, and the blue junction would lead to fragmentation of the RPG site.</p> <p>The impact of the scheme on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of this RPG have been considered throughout route development. Options which would result in land take within the plantation have not been</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>taken forward as they would be too damaging to the historic environment. Following consultation with Historic England, the Project proposes to undertake improvement planting in part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>Throughout the development of the scheme National Highways has engaged with Historic England and continue to work with them.</p> <p>A detailed setting assessment has been carried out for the Project (Black Route) and is detailed within the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) which sets out the effect of the Project on heritage assets.</p> <p>No significant heritage impact is identified as a result of the Project at historic assets within Barnard Castle.</p>	
314	154368, 154485			Alternative route - Blue - Environment - landscape / visual	Respondents suggesting that the Blue Route would have a lower negative impact on the landscape and visual environment. These respondents suggest that the Blue Route has more sympathetic design, and that it would facilitate improved landscaping and tree planting. Respondents also state that the Blue Route would require fewer earthworks than the Black	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project including potential landscape and visual impacts.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Route. These respondents suggest that entrances to underpasses could be more easily hidden in the Blue Route, due to the landscape of the area.</p>	<p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>The Blue Route (Cross Lanes western junction and Rokeby eastern junction) has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the RPG (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. National planning policy, paragraph 5.131 of the NNNPS states that: "Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced, and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Given that heritage assets are irreplaceable, harm or loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>convincing justification...Substantial harm to or loss of designated assets of the highest significance, including...grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens should be wholly exceptional.”</p> <p>If there is substantial harm to the Rokeby Park heritage asset the DCO application would need to set out exceptional circumstances for the Rokeby east junction alternative. These exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in terms of substantial public benefits which outweigh any harm or loss, or alternatively other strict criteria apply as set out in paragraph 5.133 of the NNNPS.</p> <p>It was considered that the Blue Route was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO application would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the Black Route (Cross Lanes western junction and Rokeby western junction) was the preferred solution.</p> <p>With regards landscape and visual impacts, the Blue Route was also identified as having more negative impacts than the Black Route. During construction the Black Route at Rokeby would require earthworks of a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>similar scale in comparison to the baseline, however, the construction works will be in closer proximity to Rokeby Grove and Tack Room Cottage. In addition, there would be permanent loss of woodland at Rokeby RPG and permanent alteration of the RPG, topography and land use in the field to the north of the underpass in the Blue Route. During operation, it is considered that the Blue Route will permanently alter landscape in the setting of the RPG and this will result in greater impact on landscape character than the Black Route. The Blue Route at Rokeby would result in a noticeable change in views, it is considered that opportunities for mitigation such as alteration of landform in the field to the north of Church Plantation and additional planting alongside Barnard Castle Road and at the</p> <p>underpass would reduce impacts to a degree by year 15. Overall, however, the Blue Route is considered to be a minor worsening in comparison with the Black Route in visual terms.</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.	
331	151522, 153056, 153073			Alternative Route - Blue - Alternative design	Respondents suggesting modifications to the alternative Blue Route. Suggestions include adding a direct road from the C165 to Barnard Castle; adding a spur road from the B6277 to cross the A67; adding a direct road from the A66 to Abbey Bridge; including more underpasses; and moving the A66 crossing further east of Rokeby.	<p>We recognise that there is some support for the Blue Route within the community, including suggested alterations to it.</p> <p>Side road strategy has been considered as part of the design development and the proposed design for the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme improves connectivity between the A66 and its surroundings, including between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane via Cross Lanes junction, and the proposed dual carriageway and the C165 Barnard Castle Road via Rokeby junction. Access for walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and others has been provided at these junctions to allow safe crossing of the proposed dual carriageway. Our proposals must consider how they fit with national policy, and this has informed the location of Rokeby junction.</p> <p>The sifting process looked at engineering, environment, transport and stakeholder aspects. Whilst the views of the local community are understood, the sifting process and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>careful review has determined that the Black Route offers the better option for the scheme, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The principal consideration in the preference for the Black Route was the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. The Blue Route would create harm to the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. Whilst impacts on some key views of the Blue Route at Rokeby could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the eastern junction would still lead to additional fragmentation of the site.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative.</p> <p>It was considered that the Blue Route at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO application for the Blue Route would not secure a grant of consent. As</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						such, the Black Route was identified as the preferred solution.	
382	154262	Forestry Commission	153131, 153611	Request for further information Alternatives Construction	Respondents requesting further information, including why alternative routes have not been considered, specifically mentioning the route through The Rectory. Respondents also request information on timescales for construction closures; details on land affected; details on environmental and drainage assessments; and traffic modelling.	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the preferred solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The design avoids the need to demolish the Old Rectory. The Old Rectory has a relationship with the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church and group value with the former School House and Schoolmaster's House. Demolishing the Old Rectory and building the improved A66 next to the existing alignment would negatively impact on this heritage asset.</p> <p>Further information is provided in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and the Route Development Report appended to it.</p> <p>Construction impacts, including those on traffic management and potential road closures, are outlined in ES Chapter 2 – The Project (Application</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Document 3.2), with further information provided in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan, Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The DCO Order Limits as shown on the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) provide further information on land affected by the Project.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (ES, Application Document 3.2) investigates a range of ways in which our scheme might impact the environment. Further information, specifically for drainage, can be found in ES Chapter 14 – Road Drainage and the Water Environment.</p> <p>In order to define the need for the Project, to refine the design, and to understand the effects of it, detailed operational traffic modelling and assessments have been completed at each stage of Project development.</p> <p>The output of this traffic modelling is reported in full in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7), which accompanies the DCO application.</p>	
396	152139	Durham County Council	153131, 153857	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents consideration should be given to the potential increased air pollution to cause indirect adverse effects on the ancient woodland and	Within the ES, the impact of nutrient nitrogen deposition on sensitive ecological receptors such as ancient woodland within 200m of the Affected	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Forestry Commission			<p>appropriate mitigation proposed. Noting it would be useful to understand the proposed species and planting shown adjacent to Rokeby junction and Jack Wood. Respondents also raise mitigation measures should be designed to reduce the effects of the Project whilst not in themselves introducing additional adverse effects. Suggestions include planting Willow which acts as both a visual barrier and a sound barrier, access tracks and security gates.</p>	<p>Road Network (ARN) have been assessed following the guidance in DMRB LA 105 and the results of this assessment are within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>An illustration of how ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting could be implemented is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Woodland planting is proposed adjacent to Jack Wood. Precise details in regards proposed species would be confirmed at detailed design.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects of the Project and will not introduce additional adverse effects.</p> <p>Suggestions in regards to woodland planting to attenuate noise have been noted however given the seasonal nature of leaf cover for trees and the density of vegetation required, tree planting is not generally adopted as a reliable noise mitigation measure and has therefore not been considered as a noise attenuation mitigation measure.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Aspects such as fencing, and security gates will be considered during detailed design.	
487	152989, 153170, 153820, 153837, 154144, 154342, 154466, 154467, 154473, 154476, 154477, 154480, 154487			Alternative Route - Blue - Local community impact - general	Respondents suggesting that the Blue Route should be chosen on the grounds that it would have a less significant impact on the local community. Respondents suggest that fewer buildings would be lost, and that fewer homes would be impacted by a road which would follow the Blue Route. Others suggest that the route could be better for the health and safety of local residents.	Both the black and blue options for Rokeby shown at the Autumn 2021 Consultation would have public benefits. Careful review has determined that the Black Route offers the better option for the scheme, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). The respondents' concern relating to impact on receptors such as homes and property factored in the assessment of these alternatives, with outcomes reported in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). These together with matters such as environmental and health and safety considerations have provided a balanced approach in assessing and selecting the preferred option.	No
491	151450, 153056			Alternative Route - Other - General	Respondents expressing support for the Red and Blue Route without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received expressing support for other junction options considered as part of the Blue and Red Route options.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project and Scheme objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses, as detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).	
528	153073, 153075, 153305, 153608, 153612, 153860, 153982		153609	Request for further information	Respondents requesting further information about the scheme. Respondents have questions regarding: the proposed land take; junction layouts; road designs; mitigation measures such as drainage; cycle path provision; and questions about the loss of ancient woodland.	Further information about the development of the scheme is provided within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and the Route Development Report appended to it. The DCO Order Limits as shown on the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) provide further information on land affected by the Project. Cycle path provision is indicated on these, and further information regarding these arrangements can be found in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.6). The Environmental Statement (ES, Application Document 3.2) outlines the existing baseline conditions and investigates a range of ways in which our scheme might impact the environment. Further information, specifically for drainage, can be found in ES Chapter 14 – Road Drainage and the Water Environment. Information regarding impacts on ancient woodland can be found in ES Chapter 6 – Biodiversity.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation measures are outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
529	151456, 152225, 152260, 153035, 153575, 153823, 154213, 154218, 154252	Durham County Council	152990, 154035, 154456	Alternative Route - Other	<p>Respondents suggesting the Red Route would be preferable stating that it is more direct and has minimal amount of alteration which they suggest should keep cost down. Respondents also suggest moving the route further north of Cross Lanes Farm Shop.</p>	<p>We recognise that there is some support for alternative route options within the community.</p> <p>The western junction option at Cross Lanes (Black Route) was favoured primarily for the significant safety improvements, traffic movements, proximity to Rokeby and WCH improvements it offers over the eastern option (Red Route) The alternative junction supports more favourably with National Highways priorities of Safety, Customer and Delivery.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The design of the Cross Lanes Junction has been amended since the autumn 2021 Consultation following feedback and the opportunity to refine the layout. The resulting layout reduces overall land take and the impact on the businesses of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café, and Dent House Farm whilst retaining all existing accesses to properties and the local road network.</p> <p>The proposed layout retains the direct connection between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane, improving journeys for all users intending to cross the A66, including cyclists. The link to Moorhouse Lane, and thus Brignall, on the south of the A66 has been moved north of the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café building, negating the need to take the route across the fields south of the shop.</p>	
568	153833	Durham County Council	152990	Economics - Facilities /alternative spend	Respondents suggesting that funding for the scheme be spent elsewhere, including on improving public transport infrastructure, and using the money designated for moving slip roads to build an underpass instead.	The dualling of the remaining sections of the A66 is expected to have a positive impact and contribute to national and regional connectivity and contribute to the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse initiative and the achievement of the Government levelling-up agenda. Investment through this Project is essential to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>continued development of the economy in the north of the country. Dualling between the M6 junction 40 and the A1(M) junction 53 at Scotch Corner and making other improvements along its length will support local and national economic growth and development.</p> <p>The Project is aligned with the principles set out in Road Investment Strategy 1 and 2 which promotes improving the road network to support the economy, create a greener network, making a safer and more reliable network, a more integrated network, and a smarter network. The Project delivery team are also working towards conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) (Department for Transport, 2014a).</p> <p>Both the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) provide further information on the early stages development of the Project. Strategic benefits highlighted for A66 dualling included journey time savings (particularly for strategic trips, including freight), safety improvements including a reduction in accidents, and improved reliability.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
708	150201			Construction - Mitigate construction	Respondents suggesting that the impacts of construction could be mitigated by using spare land to prevent traffic delays.	<p>To construct the Project, traffic management will be carefully considered as part of the works phasing to ensure congestion is limited whilst enabling the construction works to be carried out safely. On some schemes it is likely that a number of minor diversions will look to be established during the construction works, to re-route the current A66. Additional land is not expected to be required outside of the Order Limits to facilitate such diversions, with account taken for this during the design process.</p> <p>Whilst the establishment of larger diversions on further acquired land may present a small improvement to journey reliability time during the works, the additional cost of establishing large sections of new road, compliant to standards must be considered, along with the additional disruption and impacts to land owners and stakeholders during construction and operation. For this reason, it is felt that smaller diversions within the permitted Order Limits present the best value solution.</p>	No
716	151462			Walking, cycling and	One respondent suggesting that an active travel route be introduced, either	A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents between	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				horse-riders - Active travel	parallel to the new road or separately with safe crossing points.	Greta Bridge and Cross Lanes. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Further information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	
774	148574, 149385, 149404, 150175, 151470, 151484, 151486, 151522, 152207, 152222, 152906, 153076, 153311, 153823, 153839, 153963, 154215, 154221, 154893			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents suggesting that safe routes of walkers, cyclist and horse-riders be incorporated into the design of the scheme. Suggestions include: a dedicated cycle path; dedicated crossings for the users; and an underpass on the C165. The areas east of Rokeby are of particular concern for these respondents, and respondents state that usage of the old A66 for such a route would be inadequate. Respondents state that a dedicated route for these users is required due to the narrowness of local paths.	<p>Within the limits of the project, the proposed design ensures all existing walking and cycling routes are retained; these have been made safer by connecting them to the nearest junction, removing unsafe at-grade crossings. Connecting these routes to the junctions has linked more routes together creating more recreational opportunities.</p> <p>An underpass at C165 was considered during the preliminary design stage but was not deemed feasible and subsequently discounted due to engineering and drainage issues. This area constrained by the Grade II* Registered Park and Gardens of Rokeby Park, and the two properties of Tack Room Cottage and The Grove. Therefore, an underpass is not feasible in this location due to the level</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of land required for ramps to and from an underpass.</p> <p>In relation to the reference to WCH infrastructure to the east of Rokeby, the scope of the project does not include retrospective upgrade of walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities on other parts of the network (including existing dualled sections of the A66 to the east of Rokeby). The new east-west PRow do however tie into existing routes to the east of Rokeby.</p> <p>A shared cycle/footway parallel to the dual carriageway has been proposed within the scheme extents between Greta Bridge and Cross Lanes. The proposed Cross Lanes and Rokeby junctions will provide segregated crossings of the A66 dual carriageway for these users. A shared cycleway/footway will also be provided in the verge of the de-trunked A66 between Cross Lanes and Rokeby so walkers and cyclists will not be required to use the old A66 carriageway.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
788	150435, 150437, 151522, 151523, 152133, 153080, 153823, 153829, 153901, 154193, 154467			Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents suggesting that National Highways listen to the views of local people. Respondents state that their voices should be heard since they would have experience and knowledge of local congestion and the potential impacts of construction.	There has been regular engagement through a Community Liaison Group and individually with relevant stakeholders, including all the host local authorities and town and parish councils. This has included engagement with Durham County Council and Barnard Castle Town Council. Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. The National Highways Team and specialists involved in the technical work were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.</p> <p>Further detail of the consultation and engagement process and the outcome from this process is set out elsewhere in this Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). The engagement will continue with all the key stakeholders on matters such as the detailed design of the Project, following the submission of this DCO application.</p>	
800	154215			Construction - Priority of works	One respondent suggesting an alternative priority of construction works, in particular that tree planting should begin as soon as possible, instead of waiting for construction to begin.	Tree planting, as well other environmental mitigations, has been considered and proposed at various locations. Further details are published as part of the Environmental Statement and are included in the Order Limits of the scheme. The timing of planting will be prepared during detailed design which will consider proximity to construction activities.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
819	151336			Engineering design and development - Additional improvements	Respondents suggesting an underpass to Rokeby Grange.	Access to Rokeby Grange is provided via a relocated access from the de-trunked A66 in close proximity to the proposed Rokeby Junction.	No
827	151458, 151522, 152139, 152257, 153055, 153073, 153829, 154204		149381	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents suggesting safety measures relating to traffic, transport and junctions. These include: a safer crossing for the Reeth egress; and signage to prevent HGVs from using Egglestone Bridge and County Bridge.	<p>The safety of the Reeth (Rutherford Lane) egress and crossing of the A66 is improved as part of the grade separation of the Cross lanes junction. A signing strategy will be developed in the Detailed Design stage. This will identify origin and destinations within the local area and the wider region. Strategic routes for all traffic, including HGVs, and the signing design developed accordingly.</p> <p>The route into Barnard Castle for HGVs travelling to/from the east or west will remain only via the proposed Rokeby Junction and Eggleston Abbey Bridge, not via the Cross Lanes junction. Prohibited Traffic and Advised Route type signage will be considered for route guidance for HGVs.</p>	No
1010	148616, 152968			Engineering design and development - Futureproofing	Respondents suggesting that the engineering design of the scheme be futureproofed. Respondents suggest the use of grade separated junctions and wider bridges to facilitate further additional lanes. Respondents also	A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future; this information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					request that designers be generally mindful of the longevity of the route when making decisions relating to its layout.	can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
1030	152914			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting that the scheme design should include the provision of motorhome and rest facilities. In particular, respondents suggest that an Aire style motorhome facility, that is free to use, should be included in the proposals. Others state that safe HGV rest facilities should be constructed as part of the scheme.	Overnight facilities for motorhomes are not within the scope of the Project but our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative to the A66 NTP Project.	No
1046	151474, 152176			Alternative Route - Blue - Local community impact - economy	Respondents expressing support for the Blue Route on the grounds that it may have a lower negative impact on the local economy than the Black Route. Respondents suggest that the Blue Route would allow for the continued operation of local agriculture, through lower land take and less affected land than with the Black Route.	During the Autumn 2021 Consultation optioneering evaluation considered key matters such as environmental and heritage impact, and transport analysis considering local factors to determine the preferred solution. The scheme being taken forward is the Black Route option as detailed within the DCO application materials. In terms of wider local economy and public benefits there are no additional benefits considered to exist for the Blue Route over and above the Black Route. An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). Impacts on agricultural land are assessed and reported in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health and Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2).	
1122		Historic England		Engineering design and development - Safety	Respondent suggesting that the 3 scheme options could achieve the same safe junction outcome at Rokeby. The choice of option is ultimately for National Highways and the Inspector during examination to conclude	National Highways is confident the preferred route ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements.	No
1363	148579, 150199, 151479, 151522, 152217, 152971, 153035, 153865, 154243, 154368			Traffic, transport and junctions - Relief road	Respondents suggesting that a relief road for Barnard Castle is built and that it will have higher priority with the increase in traffic seen in Barnard Castle.	National Highways is aware of the feasibility study into a possible bypass east of Barnard Castle; however, as it was determined by Durham County Council that the bypass east of Barnard Castle would not be progressed further, this was not considered when developing the design. The updated traffic modelling also identifies that the Black Route will see a reduction in traffic flows northwards through Barnard Castle as a consequence of the improvements overall to the A66.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1364			153131, 153831, 154035	Engineering design and development - Jack Wood driveway	Respondents suggesting that a driveway should run alongside the current woodland, Jack Wood, and join the junction on the south to avoid taking additional productive land.	<p>All existing private means of access onto the A66 will be removed to improve safety, therefore alternative accesses are routed to the nearest junction to maintain connectivity. The proposed access to Ewebank Farm, the proposed balancing ponds in this area, The Grove and Tack Room Cottage, will therefore connect to the proposed Rokeby Junction. A new shared use access road from the proposed Rokeby junction will provide access to Rokeby Grove and the Tack Room so access for service vehicles will be maintained.</p> <p>The design presented at the autumn 2021 Consultation aimed to minimise the land take/footprint and impact from the works. However, following feedback from the consultees, a section of the access has been updated to follow alongside Jack Wood.</p> <p>As Jack Wood is categorised as Ancient Woodland, this has influenced the design, as the works involved in constructing the proposed access need to be a minimum of 15m away from the boundary.</p>	Yes
1365	152489, 153036, 153608,	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone	152990, 153609, 153831,	Engineering design and development -	Respondents suggesting that because of the access roads through two fields at Dent House Farm and concern that	The design of the Cross Lanes Junction has been amended since the autumn 2021 Consultation following	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153826, 153828, 153904	Abbey Parish'	153857, 153893, 154035, 154201	re-routing suggestions	<p>the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café would become inaccessible. Respondents suggest re-routing the B6277 Moorhouse Lane from south of Smithy and Ivy cottages instead of from north of them; creating the new Brignall link road next to the newly dualled A66, such that it runs west-east to the north of the Cross Lanes Farm Shop instead of to the south of it; maintaining the current southbound turn off to Brignall for westbound traffic on the newly dualled A66; to use the junction of the existing road resulting in no loss of land for Poundergill Farm.</p>	<p>feedback and the opportunity to refine the layout. The resulting layout reduces overall land take and the impact on the businesses of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café, and Dent House Farm whilst retaining all existing accesses to properties and the local road network.</p> <p>The proposed layout retains the direct connection between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane, improving journeys for all users intending to cross the A66, including cyclists. The link to Moorhouse Lane, and thus Brignall, on the south of the A66 has been moved north of the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café building, negating the need to take the route across the fields south of the shop.</p> <p>The design of the overall junction layout in this area is constrained; Rutherford Lane would need to be raised in order to reuse it as the westbound junction, which would require additional embankments causing avoidable knock on affects to the adjacent fields. The design standards the roads are designed to restrict the curvature of the Rutherford Lane/B6277 Moorhouse Lane link, meaning it could not tie back in east of Smithy and Ivy Cottages.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						As a result of the changes to the layout at Cross Lanes, and after more information has become available, the Environmental Mitigation has been revised and the resulting land take is reduced. The current proposal is for Cross Lanes Farmhouse to be retained due to its Grade II listed status; there are no plans to disassemble and reconstruct it elsewhere on the plot, access will be provided via a connection to the B6277 Moorhouse Lane to the north.	
1367	152139		153131, 154035	Land - Farm ponds	<p>Respondents suggesting that proposed drainage ponds on Ewebank Farm could be located to the north and drain into the River Tees and if the pond opposite the Rectory could be located between the two roads; that there needs to be access to the eastern pond on Street Side Farm's fields and suggests that the location of the westerly pond will not work as it is located upon a hill but that it should be moved further North into the corner of the field where the low point is; that the proposed large SuDS basin on Mortham Estate will require significant earthworks.</p>	<p>The location, shape and size of proposed balancing ponds have been designed with consideration of the proposed highway design, the existing topography, engineering challenges, construction, future maintenance and access, cost, land take and stakeholder impacts.</p> <p>We need balancing ponds to collect, store and clean water run-off from the road network before it enters existing watercourses. They are designed to strict standards to ensure their capacity is suitable and takes into account climate change, and the resulting water entering the local network is clean. In the event of heavy rainfall, the ponds hold back the water to avoid flooding downstream. Gates at the outfalls of the ponds can be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>closed following a spillage on the road to stop contaminated water entering local watercourses.</p> <p>Due to topography and the distance to the River Tees to the north, it is not possible to drain the A66 in this direction, this has resulted in the majority of the proposed balancing ponds being located south of the A66 due to the proximity of Tutta Beck. Relocating ponds to the north would result in lengthy, deep pipes to the River Tees which would cause large scale impacts to the agricultural fields during construction, would be costly and could present future maintenance issues. The design teams have tried to locate the proposed balancing ponds close to the A66 to limit land take to the highway corridor, which improves maintenance access and avoid long access tracks across additional land.</p> <p>Most outfalls are proposed to be ditches, however more detailed discussions with landowners will take place in detailed design which could consider changing these to pipes.</p> <p>Further refinement to the pond design, including the large SuDS basin, is needed at the detailed design stage; this may result in the relocation and/or resizing of some of the ponds.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1368			153131	Engineering design and development - Rectory	Respondents suggesting that the A66 should go through the Rectory in order to take less land and avoid a residential property being left between the two roads.	The design avoids the need to demolish the Old Rectory. The Old Rectory has a relationship with the Grade II* listed St Mary's Church and group value with the former School House and Schoolmaster's House. Demolishing the Old Rectory and building the improved A66 next to the existing alignment would negatively impact on this heritage asset.	No
1371	148640, 148700, 150189, 150197, 151456, 153036, 162161		151465	Engineering design and development - Slip road	Respondents suggesting that the on-off slip roads for southbound A66 traffic needs to be longer because of the high-speed approach; that suitable acceleration and deceleration lanes are put in place at Cross Lanes junction; that a new junction 400 metres to the west of Cross Lanes will increase the probability of collisions with vehicles emerging from the B6277 to travel east; that Cross Lanes junction should not be for cars only.	There are no proposals to change the Cross Lanes junction to cars only. Both the Cross Lanes Junction and Rokeby Junction will be open to all traffic, however the main HGV route into Barnard Castle will continue to be via the Rokeby junction and C165 Barnard Castle Road and will be signed accordingly. The proposed layout of the eastbound diverge at Cross Lanes has a deceleration lane, technically known as an auxiliary lane diverge, this will provide additional length for vehicles to decelerate before turning off the A66. The proposals have been designed to the latest highway design standards.	No
1372	149407, 153377, 153907, 154215	Durham County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - WCH provision	Respondents suggesting that the eastern junction in the Blue Route option is preferential for cyclists and	The proposed design ensures all existing walking and cycling routes (there are no Bridleways) on this scheme are retained; these have been	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					that the Black Route would require a detour for cyclists.	<p>made safer by connecting them to the nearest junction, removing unsafe at-grade crossings. Connecting these routes to the junctions has linked more routes together creating more recreational opportunities.</p> <p>A dedicated grade separated crossing has been considered as part of the design optioneering for the Scheme however it is not the preferred option in this location as a proposed footbridge would result in adverse landscape and heritage impacts and increased cost compared to the current proposal.</p> <p>Walkers and cyclists travelling to/from Greta Bridge will still be able to make their journey to the C165 Barnard Castle Road, via a dedicated connection to a shared cycleway and access road proposed between Tack Room Cottage and the Rokeby Junction.</p> <p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Design Team identified an opportunity to improve walking and cycling facilities on the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme, and so a new cycleway is proposed from the Rokeby Junction, connecting to the proposed access road serving Streetside Farm and the proposed balancing pond creating an east/west route along the A66. This creates the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						opportunity for new routes to Barnard Castle or The Stang.	
1373	153056			Engineering design and development - Thorpe Farm	Respondents suggesting that Thorpe Farm junction is included in the project and that a deceleration lane is provided to make it consistent with design standards adopted for this project.	The section of the A66 at Thorpe Farm, east of Greta Bridge, is outside the scope of the Project.	No
1375	151522, 152205, 152968, 153055, 153075, 154019, 154144, 154243		153893, 154201	Engineering design and development - Abbey Bridge link	Respondents suggesting that a single junction to the east of Cross Lanes with a new north-south link road up to Abbey Bridge is the best solution to provide connectivity at the lowest cost.	<p>A single junction option was considered for the Cross lanes and Rokeby Junctions located to the west of St. Mary's Church with a direct northerly link to the C165 Barnard Castle Road, which would result in a shorter route to Barnard Castle and would be further away from the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Rokeby Park.</p> <p>This option was discounted due to the additional costs of a new link road to the C165 Barnard Castle Road and additional parallel service roads linking the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Moorhouse Lane South. The steep topography of the land adjacent to Manyfold Beck Wood would result in significant earthworks for a road between the A66 and the C165 adjacent to the River Tees. This was</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						considered to be inferior in comparison to the current proposed junction option which makes better use of the existing road network.	
1376	149373, 149392, 151453, 151522, 152207, 153354, 153577, 153826, 153910, 153928, 154144	Durham County Council	154127	Alternative Route - Blue - Modified blue	<p>Respondents suggesting modifications to the Blue Route. Respondents suggests combining the Black Route at Cross Lanes with the Blue Route at Rokeby; taking the new road closer to Abbey Bridge or north of the A66 to join the C165; or improved connectivity between the old and new A66. Respondents also suggest constructing either a bypass or an underpass.</p>	<p>An alternative option was considered (detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) Section 5.7 'Design development of Rokeby junction alternatives') for the Rokeby Junction; locating to the west of St. Mary's Church with a direct northerly link to the C165 Barnard Castle Road, which would result in a shorter route to Barnard Castle and would be further away from the Grade II * Registered Park and Garden of Rokeby Park.</p> <p>This option was discounted due to the additional costs of a new link road to the C165 Barnard Castle Road. The steep topography of the land adjacent to Manyfold Beck Wood would result in significant earthworks for a road between the A66 and the C165 adjacent to the River Tees. This was considered to be inferior in comparison to the current proposed junction option which makes use of the existing road network.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1377	153820, 153904, 154215		153831, 154035	Alternative route - Blue - Blue Route 2	<p>Respondents suggesting an alternative 'Blue Route 2' as they believe the Blue Route requires significant extra work to make it work. The Blue Route 2 will remove the 6-lane merging point and allow St Mary's Church to remain dominant in the immediate landscape. This alternative would include a new junction and slip road to reduce the volume of traffic currently exits the A66 onto the C165 thereby reducing impact damage currently experienced with the present junction arrangement. This proposed route would retain the existing east bound carriageway as a private means of access to enable agricultural traffic to enter opposite Smithy and Ivy Cottages. Part of the proposed route is also an underpass under the present junction footprint.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the development opportunities put forward for the previously considered Blue Option, and the emergence of an option known as the 'Blue 2' Option (detailed within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), Section 5.7 'Design development of Rokeby junction alternatives'). However, the requirement to not construct within the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Rokeby Park as set out in national policy (National Policy Statement for National Networks), resulted in the Blue Option being discounted.</p> <p>Additionally, it has been determined that the Old Rectory will not be demolished to make way for an improved A66 dual carriageway; this is because of its own historical importance but mainly for its historical contribution to the setting of St. Mary's Church.</p>	No
1380		Durham County Council		Engineering design and development - SuDS	<p>Respondents suggesting that for SuDS it is a requirement to mitigate against potential pollution by ensuring that water quality and biodiversity is addressed in the SuDS designs. Respondents suggest that pollution indices and treatment levels should be in accordance with recommendations</p>	<p>The drainage strategy has been developed in accordance with the DMRB and CIRIA guidance and in consultation with the various local authorities across the Project. The road drainage design will include a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) whereby the road run-off is collected,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					in the CIRIA SuDS manual. Landscaping and planting schedules must include for biodiversity mimicking natural processes for surface water treatment and disposal whilst also protecting downstream ecosystems. Final discharge rates should be as close as reasonably practical to a greenfield run-off rate.	treated and attenuated before outfalling to the receiving watercourse. Further development of the drainage design and SuDS provisions will be carried out in the detailed design stage.	
1382	148574, 148595, 148641, 149362, 149363, 149365, 149373, 149385, 149392, 149400, 149420, 149426, 149427, 149798, 150143, 150147, 150151, 150152, 150153, 150154, 150156, 150157, 150160, 150163,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153062, 153626, 153795, 153805, 153857, 153893, 154035, 154127, 154201, 154209	Alternative Route - Blue - Blue Route	Respondents suggesting that the Blue Route is the better alternative. Respondents mention: that the Blue Route complies with the NPPF which allows for 'substantial harm' if 'it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss'; that traffic would be better with the Blue Route; that the Blue Route provides safer crossings for cyclists to and from Greta Bridge and that it is better for pedestrians; that the Blue Route results in less traffic into Barnard Castle; that the Blue Route would require less visually obtrusive signage; that the Blue Route would require less construction; that land take would be less for the Blue Route; that the Blue Route would result in less traffic, CO2 emissions and pollution in Startforth and Barnard Castle; that the junction in the Blue Route maintains access to	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the identification, optioneering, and appraisal processes. This process included consideration against potential environmental (including noise and visual aspects), cultural heritage, traffic and transport, and construction impacts of the Project. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information). Whilst we recognise the significant support for the Blue Route this route could only be taken forward if there was evidence of sufficient public benefit to outweigh harm on the heritage interests. National policy	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150164, 150181, 150193, 150195, 150197, 150198, 150199, 150200, 150415, 150417, 150418, 150419, 150420, 150424, 150425, 150426, 150427, 150430, 150431, 150432, 150433, 150435, 150437, 150440, 150473, 151328, 151329, 151342, 151450, 151451, 151453, 151455, 151456, 151459,				the Grove including for oil tanker deliveries and the postal service; it allows cars to turn at Rokeby towards Barnard Castle.	<p>requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, including evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. If this was the case then the route would more likely be supported by Historic England.</p> <p>The Blue Route has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the Registered Park and Gardens (RPG) (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route (the black option) ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	151463, 151466, 151467, 151474, 151478, 151479, 151480, 151485, 151489, 151494, 151495, 151497, 151499, 151503, 151509, 151512, 151514, 151515, 151521, 151522, 151523, 152129, 152132, 152136, 152140, 152141, 152142, 152143, 152144, 152145, 152146, 152148, 152205, 152207,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152209, 152210, 152212, 152217, 152221, 152222, 152225, 152226, 152229, 152231, 152233, 152234, 152240, 152253, 152255, 152268, 152269, 152483, 152484, 152486, 152488, 152908, 152912, 152922, 152924, 152928, 152935, 152947, 152968, 152971, 152989, 153049, 153058, 153063,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153068, 153069, 153071, 153072, 153074, 153075, 153080, 153082, 153083, 153170, 153323, 153324, 153342, 153344, 153346, 153367, 153368, 153370, 153371, 153378, 153558, 153575, 153576, 153577, 153583, 153584, 153618, 153633, 153794, 153804, 153808, 153820, 153823, 153826,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153828, 153829, 153834, 153837, 153841, 153865, 153868, 153889, 153896, 153898, 153904, 153910, 153918, 153921, 153924, 153930, 153932, 153937, 153939, 153952, 153979, 154018, 154019, 154144, 154148, 154181, 154193, 154195, 154204, 154218, 154224, 154228, 154235, 154247,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154252, 154256, 154262, 154333, 154339, 154342, 154368, 154463, 154464, 154465, 154466, 154467, 154473, 154474, 154475, 154477, 154478, 154481, 154482, 154486, 154487, 154488, 154489, 154893						
1386	152489			Land - Access ownership	Respondent suggesting that the ownership of a new access road to the point where it meets a public highway is either transferred to the landowner or adopted as a public highway to the point where it meets the landowners property.	Ownership and future maintenance of access roads will be subject to discussion and agreement with affected landowners and National Highways as part of the accommodation works developed during the detailed design stage of the Project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1387	153073			Traffic, transport and junctions - Rokeby junction 1	Respondent suggesting that the Rokeby junction needs to remain an equally attractive option for traffic accessing Barnard Castle from the east to ensure that traffic continues to use that junction rather than a more attractive junction at Cross Lanes.	<p>The main route into Barnard Castle will remain via the Rokeby Junction and the signage designed accordingly. Although the route is slightly longer for traffic travelling from the east, our analysis shows that this route, when compared to a route via the Cross Lanes Junction, is shorter in terms of overall journey time, as traffic is more free flowing.</p> <p>Rokeby Junction will remain the route to/from Barnard Castle for HGVs. HGVs will still be able to leave the A66 at the proposed Cross Lanes Junction in order to reach all other destinations south of the River Tees.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme, including Cross Lanes to Rokeby.</p>	No
28	151456, 151499, 152225, 152242, 152922, 153035, 153323, 153814, 153826, 153865, 153921,	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154127, 154206, 154209	Engineering design and development - General	Respondents expressing general concern over the engineering design of the scheme, in particular that too many additional roads would cause unnecessary complexity, and concern over the level of research into the local area before development of the preferred route.	The Project design proposals have been prepared by a multi-disciplinary design team appointed by National Highways, working in close partnership as an integrated Project team. It is comprised of appropriately qualified and experienced professionals that include landscape architects; town planners; highways engineers; drainage engineers; heritage specialists; and a variety of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154213, 154243					<p>environmental specialists that include acousticians, ecologists and air quality specialists. The contributions from each of these technical specialists has resulted in a balanced, well integrated design approach to the Project.</p> <p>During Project design development the integrated Project team have worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with enhanced knowledge and experience of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project.</p>	
42	151503, 154236			Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	A respondent expressing concern that the scheme would encourage antisocial behaviour on the grounds that increased HGV use and agricultural vehicles may encourage illegal camping in Barnard Castle, in	The traffic model has forecast an increase in HGV flow on Moorhouse Lane / The Sills. The model forecasts that the increase in HGVs on the B6277 north of Barnard Castle will be 31 vehicles per day. This is due to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					particular leading up to the Appleby Horse Fair.	<p>HGVs travelling from the A66 to areas such as Barnard Castle, and Middleton in Teesdale reassigning (rerouting) from the adjacent route they currently use, namely via the signed route from Rokeby junction i.e., via Barnard Castle Road, Westwick Road and Newgate. This has come about due to the location of the new junctions provided as part of the Project at Cross Lanes and Rokeby.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the very small increase in daily HGV traffic will lead to an increase in antisocial behaviour in Barnard Castle for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modelled HGV traffic is not new to Barnard Castle. • The proposed signed route (for all traffic) from the A66 will remain as Barnard Castle Road/Westwick Road and Newgate. • In order for the rerouting to occur in reality as modelled, the HGV drivers would need to know of the existence of the alternative route via Moorhouse Lane / The Sills. This is because one of the assumptions underlying the modelled behaviour is that each driver chooses their route based on informed decisions about the travel time and 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						cost of their journeys via all available routes.	
68	150164, 151456, 151522, 152225, 153056, 153928	Historic England	154035	Alternative route - Blue	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the Blue Route would threaten cultural heritage sites, in particular in Barnard Castle, and also cause connectivity and safety issues for pedestrians and motorists, specifically at the Cross Lanes junction. Respondents also expressing concern that the Blue Route would negatively impact agricultural businesses by taking productive land and be disruptive for local residents.</p>	<p>The Project has balanced the engineering and environmental benefits and constraints of each option to ensure that a balanced approach was taken to the selection of the preferred junction arrangement. This resulted in the Black option being selected over the Blue option.</p> <p>The design of the Cross Lanes Junction has been improved since the Autumn 2021 Consultation following feedback and the opportunity to refine the layout. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information. The resulting layout reduces overall land take and the impact on the businesses of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café, and Dent House Farm whilst retaining all existing accesses to properties and the local road network.</p> <p>The proposed layout retains the direct connection between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane, improving journeys for all users intending to cross the A66, including cyclists. The link to Moorhouse Lane, and thus Brignall, on the south of the</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A66 has been moved north of the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café building, negating the need to take the route across the fields south of the shop.	
212	148619, 149369, 149404, 150158, 150415, 151328, 151341, 151484, 151522, 152217, 152222, 152235, 152251, 152253, 152969, 153035, 153055, 153170, 153311, 153315, 153346, 153377, 153860, 153898, 154018,		154035	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents expressing concern for the potential lack of access for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents' concern about connectivity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the lack of continuous, segregated active travel routes; the increased length of the Black Route; and narrow footpaths along The Sills and in Barnard Castle. <p>Respondents express concern that Public Rights of Way would be disconnected or restricted by the route, particularly at Rokeby.</p> <p>Respondents also express concern about the lack of dedicated pedestrian crossings along the route, particularly at Church Lane, Gill Lane and Church Steps.</p>	<p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, additional east-west WCH provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes. This includes improvements within the Cross Lanes to Rokeby section to include additional segregated active travel routes. It is acknowledged that the active travel route promoted between Greta Bridge and Barnard Castle Road includes a slightly longer route to cross the A66 at the Rokeby junction, however this is offset by the improvement in safety associated with avoidance of at grade crossing of the A66 at Greta Bridge.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154236, 154474					<p>accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Schedule (Application Document 5.19) and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Plans</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>The specific comments raised regarding the narrow footpaths, Sills, Barnard Castle and dedicated pedestrian crossings along the route, particularly at Church Lane, Gill Lane and Church Steps are a matter for the overseeing organisation for the local road network, in this case Durham County Council.</p>	
248	152489, 153071, 153170		152990	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern over access to their property and that proposed changes to their current access will make their journeys longer.	The Project has aimed to maintain existing property access points where practicable. Where the proposed works will impact existing accesses, it is proposed to provide alternative access as close as practicable to the existing access from the nearest point on the side road / junction network. Our public liaison officers have worked	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						closely with all impacted landowners to ensure access to their land and property. This has included discussions on the location and design of accommodation structures such as bridges and underpasses.	
250	150430, 151463, 153075, 153866, 153904, 153918, 153924, 154262, 154368	Durham County Council	154035, 154127	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impacts of congestion on traffic, transport and junctions. Respondents mention that the NPPF states that developments should consider opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts, and that this project will negatively affect air quality. Respondents are concerned that increased usage of the road, combined with longer journey lengths from the Rokeby junction, would encourage more traffic to enter Barnard Castle through the Cross Lanes junction, resulting in increased congestion and delays through narrow local roads and across County Bridge, which would also make traffic less safe. Respondents also mention Startforth, The Sills, Bridgegate and The Bank as areas of concern. Respondents state that additional congestion would particularly impact on bus services, and that congestion may be further impacted by horse-</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). In relation to Bridgegate, Startforth, the Bank and the A67 more generally through Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that:</p> <p>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, (of 520 vehicles per day i.e., less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day) the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					drawn vehicles during the Appleby Horse Fair.	<p>A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle, improving conditions for car traffic and Bus Services. The overall lower traffic within Barnard Castle would also lessen any impact of horse-drawn vehicles during the Appleby Horse Fair.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project. The existing air quality along the A66 is generally good and we have considered how the improved road could change the local air quality. While there may be an increase in the volume of traffic using the A66 following our planned improvements, the local road network can expect to see lower levels of air pollution.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Routes into and out of Barnard Castle will not be altered. The new Rokeby junction will be maintained as the signed HGV route into Barnard Castle. The specific comments raised regarding the narrow footpaths, Sills, Barnard Castle are a matter for the overseeing organisation for the local road network, in this case Durham County Council.	
256	152139, 153339, 153612, 154216, 154262, 154485		153131, 153609	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern about the areas designated for species rich grassland and state that they would prefer these areas to be placed away from their land or on less productive agricultural land.	National Highways recognises the concern in regards the proposed areas for planting. We have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. The Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land and agricultural land holding viability. National Highways has sought to	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						reduce required land take. Where land is required for temporary uses during construction the Project will reinstate the land.	
259	151503, 152207, 152240, 152950, 153576, 153826, 154368	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153795, 153831	Community impact - Health	Respondents expressing concern over a potential negative impact on local residents' health and wellbeing, in particular from noise and air pollution, and risks to safety from increased traffic, both during construction and operation of the scheme. Concerns include vulnerable populations and to the area of Startforth.	National Highways notes the concerns over the potential impact of the scheme on physical and mental health. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) has identified the effects of the scheme on human health outcomes, including both negative and positive health effects associated with traffic noise emissions and no health effects (neutral) associated with air quality. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) has identified changes in road traffic accident rates, which have been reported in the health assessment. The majority of changes are positive, reflecting a reduction in accident rates. Some areas of existing dual carriageway will see negative effects due to slightly higher accident rates resulting from increased traffic flows. Overall, the number of deaths and injuries will reduce significantly.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
260	149401, 150200, 151349, 151488, 151495, 151503, 152928, 153035, 153344, 153348, 153371, 153382, 153794, 153826, 154193, 154368	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153831, 154035	Economics - Local economy	Respondents expressing concern over negative impacts of the scheme on the local economy, on the grounds that increased congestion in Barnard Castle and reduced connectivity to Cross Lanes Farm shop may deter tourists and customers from visiting local businesses. Respondents also expressing concern that the scheme may undermine access to mineral deposits, in particular carboniferous limestone.	<p>The design of the Cross Lanes Junction has been amended since the autumn 2021 Consultation following feedback and the opportunity to refine the layout. The resulting layout reduces overall land take and the impact on the businesses of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café, and Dent House Farm whilst retaining all existing accesses to properties and the local road network.</p> <p>The proposed layout retains the direct connection between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane, improving journeys for all users intending to cross the A66, including cyclists. The link to Moorhouse Lane, and thus Brignall, on the south of the A66 has been moved north of the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café building, negating the need to take the route across the fields south of the shop.</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, including those in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby vicinity e.g. Cross Lanes Farm Shop, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>is set out in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the scheme will support Cumbria's Local Industrial Strategy and provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the scheme at a route wide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p> <p>The ES, Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2.) identifies that the scheme will encroach into a Carboniferous Limestone Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) due to the new adjacent eastbound carriageway to the south between the B6277 junction at Cross Lanes and the existing Tutta Beck Cottage access. This will include significant engineering interventions, namely new junctions at Cross Lanes and Rokeby.</p> <p>The new junction at Cross Lanes will also lie within the boundary of the Boldron Cross Lanes, a proposed unallocated mineral site and may have an impact on future development.</p> <p>The scheme has been refined to reduce the overall footprint of the Cross Lanes and Rokeby junctions, thus minimising encroachment into the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>MSA and will also consider the potential for the extraction of aggregates before construction as far as practicable. However, a moderate adverse likely significant effect has been identified for the sterilisation of a mineral safeguarding site for both the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme and Routewide as per DMRB LA110 which states significance as sterilisation of ≥ 1 mineral safeguarding site.</p> <p>Further details in regards the potential impacts of the scheme on Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA) and on Mineral Safeguarding Sites (MSS), including the potential for sterilisation, is detailed within Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2.)</p>	
262	149362, 149375, 149392, 149400, 149409, 150157, 150163, 150195, 150198, 150200, 150405, 150426, 150433,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154127	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concern for the safety of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders due to impacts of the scheme. These respondents state that the scheme would increase the speed of vehicles in the area. Respondents expressing further concern about local footpaths being either narrow or non-existent, leading walkers, cyclists and horse-riders to use the roads, meaning that increased traffic on these roads could lead to safety issues and potential increases in collisions with</p>	<p>Footpaths in Barnard Castle town are out of the Project scope, and this concern should be passed on to the relevant Local Authority.</p> <p>Where provision for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders is made design solutions will be assessed against the Road Safety Audit process to ensure they are safe to use and maintain.</p> <p>In terms of Greta Bridge, currently, the existing Greta Bridge cycleway terminates at Greta Bridge Bank (to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150437, 150467, 151336, 151450, 151453, 151460, 151466, 151474, 151480, 151485, 151488, 151489, 151495, 151498, 151499, 151503, 152207, 152222, 152226, 152233, 152234, 152235, 152240, 152241, 152246, 152251, 152252, 152918, 152922, 152928, 152968, 153046, 153049, 153324,				these users. Respondents expressing particular concern for The Sills, Moorhouse Lane, Gill Lane, and Greta Bridge, as well as much of Barnard Castle, which all have high foot traffic, narrower paths, and may be particularly affected by increased road traffic. Some respondents also expressing concerns for pushchairs and mobility scooters on these paths, and that overgrown trees and hedges along the route may exacerbate safety issues.	the east of Tack Room Cottage), where users are directed to steps down the embankment to the existing A66 verge. Users then cross the existing A66 via an uncontrolled crossing at the existing Rokeby junction. Under the scheme proposals, cyclists from Greta Bridge will be linked to a new shared cycleway from Greta Bank Bridge, running parallel to the dual carriageway where they will be routed to the proposed Rokeby grade separated junction, allowing a safer crossing of the A66 dual carriageway. They can then choose to head west to Cross Lanes via a new shared cycle way or head east along the de-trunked A66/ Barnard Castle Road. n terms of vehicle speeds and flows with the scheme, the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). In relation to Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that:	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153342, 153344, 153354, 153367, 153368, 153371, 153378, 153382, 153391, 153558, 153575, 153633, 153826, 153828, 153837, 153860, 153866, 153868, 153884, 153889, 153952, 154193, 154221, 154368					<p>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills (of 520 vehicles per day i.e. less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre, and Startforth to the west. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>Moreover, Traffic Modelling shows an increase in traffic (2046) on Moorhouse Lane in the Northbound and southbound directions - primarily due to the proximity of the proposed Rokeby junction. The improvements will upgrade the junctions where these routes meet the A66. Making these</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>junctions safer and easier to use could attract more traffic onto these routes. But we know that around 80% of traffic on the A66 is long-distance traffic and only 20% of traffic uses the local access routes. We're not anticipating any significant changes in the future regarding how local traffic accesses the network, with journeys expected to continue as existing. Further information can be found within the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Speed limits on the roads mentioned by the responder are not changing.</p> <p>The specific comments raised regarding the narrow footpaths, Sills, Barnard Castle are a matter for the overseeing organisation for the local road network, in this case Durham County Council</p>	
266	152139, 152489, 153170, 153898, 154144, 154236, 154368, 154472, 154480, 154481,			Community impact – Property/Land	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact their properties. In particular, respondents express concern that the Project would undermine access to properties, including for agricultural vehicles, and that landowners should either own new access roads, or National Highways should be responsible for their maintenance.	The Project has aimed to maintain existing property access points, including for agricultural vehicle movements. Where the proposed works will impact existing accesses, it is proposed to provide alternative access close to the existing from the nearest point on the side road / junction network. During construction, the existing access will remain until the alternative access is provided.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154485, 154487					<p>Landowners have been regularly consulted on how the proposed dualling can accommodate access requirements, throughout the current design phase.</p> <p>Where new accommodation access tracks are proposed, we will discuss ongoing ownership with the relevant landowners who may choose to assume ownership under agreement. These discussions will take place in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>	
286	148641, 152225, 152257, 152928, 153323, 153342, 153344, 153371, 153576, 153633, 153826, 153841, 153904, 154193, 154368	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154127	Community impact - General	<p>Respondents expressing general concerns over potential negative impacts on local communities, in particular in Startforth, Barnard Castle, and Teesdale. Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would be disruptive, undermine residents' quality of life, and pose a threat to their safety.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the concerns over the potential impact of the scheme on physical and mental health. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) has identified the effects of the scheme on human health outcomes, including both negative and positive health effects associated with traffic noise emissions and no health effects (neutral) associated with air quality. The Transport Assessment has identified changes in road traffic accident rates, which have been reported in the health assessment. The majority of changes are positive, reflecting a reduction in accident rates. Some areas of existing dual carriageway will see negative effects due to slightly higher accident rates</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						resulting from increased traffic flows. Overall, the number of deaths and injuries will reduce significantly.	
287	150426, 151494, 151503, 152207, 152240, 152928, 153826, 153904, 154215, 154216	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154035, 154127	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would negatively impact agricultural land and businesses. This includes loss of high quality agricultural land on the Rokeby Estate, at Dent House Farm, near to Cross Lanes junction, and loss of productive and organically farmed land in other unspecified locations.	Since our autumn 2021 consultation, we have developed the design of the proposed replacement junction, which now has a smaller footprint due to the more compact design. Following feedback, in relation to concerns for Dent House Farm, the Scargill Road link from Moorhouse Lane to the bridge has been rerouted and now runs to the north of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land and agricultural land holding viability.	Yes
294	149373, 150198, 151327, 151461, 152207, 152209, 152233, 152252, 153035, 153362, 153371, 153575, 153904,	Durham County Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	154035	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing concern over access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. These respondents state that the Black Route extends walking routes, including between Greta Bridge and the new overbridge. Respondents also state that current pavements along the Sills and County Bridge are too narrow for adequate pedestrian access, and that there is lack of connectivity between proposed footpaths. Respondents also expressing concern over a lack of	The specific comments raised regarding the narrow footpaths, Sills, Barnard Castle are a matter for the overseeing organisation for the local road network, in this case Durham County Council All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
153907, 154368					<p>crossing access at Rokeby, and over the removal of cycle provision at Greta Bridge without sufficient replacement. Respondents expressing specific concern for pushchair, walker and mobility scooter users.</p>	<p>accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Currently, the existing Greta Bridge cycleway terminates at Greta Bridge Bank (to the east of Tack Room Cottage), where users are directed to steps down the embankment to the existing A66 verge. Users then cross the existing A66 via an uncontrolled crossing at the existing Rokeby junction. Under the scheme proposals, cyclists from Greta Bridge will be linked to a new shared cycleway from Greta Bank Bridge, running parallel to the dual carriageway where they will be routed to the proposed Rokeby grade separated junction, allowing a safer crossing of the A66 dual carriageway. They can then choose to head west to Cross Lanes via a new shared cycle way or head east along the de-trunked A66/ Barnard Castle Road.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the active travel route promoted between Greta Bridge and Barnard Castle Road includes a slightly longer route to cross the A66 at the Rokeby junction, however this is offset by the improvement in safety associated with avoidance of at grade crossing of the A66 at Greta Bridge</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
295	150181, 151499, 153324, 153826, 154368		153795, 154035	Community impact – Property	Respondents expressing concern that a potential increase in traffic may negatively impact their properties, in particular through noise and air pollution, reduced safety through public access, and a reduction in house prices. Respondents also expressing concern that the Black Route prioritises the protection of land at Rokeby over local livelihoods.	National Highways have considered any adverse impacts on noise and air pollution caused by the scheme. Design solutions aim to mitigate increases in pollution where it is deemed necessary and has a negative effect on a sensitive receptor. The environmental assessment assesses both the construction and operational phases of the development for potential significant adverse effects. Where the potential for adverse effects is identified, mitigation proposals are incorporated into the design to reduce such effects where required and practicable. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, and air quality during construction and operation are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Throughout design development, assessment of alternatives has been considered through the identification, optioneering, and appraisal processes. This process included consideration against potential environmental (including noise and visual aspects), cultural heritage, traffic and transport, impacts on the local community and economy, and construction impacts of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise the significant support for the Blue Route this route could only be taken forward if there was evidence of sufficient public benefit to outweigh harm on the heritage interests. National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, including evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative. If this was the case, then the route would more likely be supported by Historic England.</p> <p>The Blue Route has not been taken forward as it is not compliant with the NPSNN due to direct impacts upon the Registered Park and Gardens (RPG) (NPSNN 5.130, 5.131, 5.132). With appropriate mitigation it is considered that setting impacts related to this option could be reduced however the direct loss and fragmentation of the RPG cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>National Highways is confident the selected preferred route (the black option) ensures the least amount of impact on the identified heritage</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						assets and meets policy requirements. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) summarises the Project's alignment with the strategic objectives of the NPSNN.	
330	148574, 148619, 149409, 149798, 150143, 150167, 150175, 150415, 150417, 150422, 150462, 151453, 151463, 151478, 151511, 151519, 151521, 151522, 151523, 152133, 152137, 152141, 152209, 152222, 152226, 152253, 152260, 152947,		154035	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would cause safety issues for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents express specific concern about blind corners and increased journey lengths as design elements which could reduce safety.</p> <p>Respondents express concern that the scheme would require these users to cross at dangerous junctions, and that the narrowness of roads and paths in The Sills and Barnard Castle could cause collisions between cars and WCH users, particularly as drivers can occasionally mount the pavement in this area. Respondents also express concern for schoolchildren crossing the B6227.</p>	<p>Improvements to footpaths in Barnard Castle, and the specific comments raised regarding the narrow footpaths, Sills, including safety of schoolchildren are a matter for the overseeing organisation for the local road network, in this case Durham County Council</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network including the specific roads mentioned in this feedback.</p> <p>The Project is subject to a Road Safety Audit at each stage of the design process. Audits consider in great detail the interactions between motorised and non-motorised users of the network and ensure the design solutions are safe to use and maintain. This includes pedestrian crossings where provided.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153049, 153063, 153068, 153069, 153071, 153073, 153170, 153312, 153346, 153367, 153369, 153618, 153826, 153896, 153898, 153937, 153979, 154018, 154181, 154193, 154195, 154215, 154221, 154235, 154236, 154262, 154342, 154463, 154467, 154474, 154476, 154485						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
332	153073, 154181, 154256			Traffic, transport and junctions - Impact on infrastructure	Respondents expressing concern over the potential impact of increased traffic on the condition of transport infrastructure. These respondents state that increased traffic, particularly from HGVs, could potentially damage smaller and older roads and paths, as well as the Barnard Castle Bridge (also known locally as County Bridge/Sills Bridge/Gill Bridge). Respondents are also generally concerned about infrastructure in Barnard Castle, and do not believe it would be able to handle the induced traffic from Cross Lanes junction.	The impacts of the Project on Barnard Castle are discussed in Chapter 8.1 Forecast Local Network Performance – Local Impacts, of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.07). It explains that: While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills (of 520 vehicles per day i.e. less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge (County Bridge/Sills Bridge/Gill Bridge), and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67. The scheme causes a modelled reassignment of HGV traffic from Barnard Castle Road to Moorhouse Lane / The Sills in a northbound direction, due to the additional distance needed to travel to the compact grade separated junction to exit the A66. This impacts HGV movements between the A66 east and destinations on the B6277 and B6278 north of Barnard Castle, such as Alston and Stanhope. The model forecasts that the increase in HGVS on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the B6277 north of Barnard Castle will be 31 vehicles per day.</p> <p>It should be noted that the route into Barnard Castle for HGVs travelling to/from the east or west will remain only via the proposed Rokeby Junction and Eggleston Abbey Bridge, not via the Cross Lanes junction; signage along the improved A66 will inform this.</p>	
334	149401, 149409, 149421, 150167, 150415, 150417, 151328, 151342, 151463, 151485, 151509, 151522, 152148, 152253, 152260, 153071, 153073, 153080, 153082, 153316, 153369,			Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase congestion. These respondents state that the design of the route would encourage use of Cross Lanes junction, leading to induced congestion at the County Bridge, The Sills, The Bank, the B6277, and around Barnard Castle generally. Respondents state that many of these roads are particularly narrow, adding to the risk of congestion, and that current levels of congestion are already high. These respondents also state that the route would increase the likelihood of accidents, adding to potential delays. Respondents express concern that this congestion would hinder emergency services and make it harder for local residents to access amenities. Respondents also express concern</p>	<p>The impact of the Project on Barnard Castle are discussed in Chapter 8.1 Forecast Local Network Performance – Local Impacts, of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.07). It explains that:</p> <p>337While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the B6277 at The Sills (of 520 vehicles per day i.e., less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge (County Bridge), and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153618, 153826, 153829, 153898, 153979, 154019, 154181, 154235, 154262, 154463, 154466, 154477, 154485, 154487, 154488, 154489				that the scheme would encourage housebuilding in the area, further increasing congestion. Some respondents state that the increased length of the route would further encourage use of Cross Lanes junction, adding to congestion.	Chapter 9 Road Safety, of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.07) describes the overall reduction in accidents due to the scheme, caused by vehicles being attracted to the improved A66, which has a lower accident rate, and away from the rural links or the surrounding road network, which have a higher accident rate due to their lower design standard. The reduction in traffic within Barnard Castle on the A67 will lead to a reduction in accidents on this road. National Highways and their designers have been engaging regularly with the Emergency Services throughout the current design phase, to ensure our proposals are acceptable.	
421	150198, 152139, 152922, 152947, 153316, 153612, 153804, 154215, 154243, 154247		152990, 153831	Land - Other	Respondents expressing concern about the non-agricultural land take of the scheme. Respondents state that the proposed slip roads, carriageways, and junctions require an excessive land take.	The scheme design seeks to minimise the area of land required both temporarily and permanently. The impact on landowners is always considered during the design phases of a project, particularly when it comes to land take.. Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Cross Lanes junction has been developed significantly, based on feedback the subsequent junction layout has reduced land take significantly and makes better use of the land that is taken, such that	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>remains is of best use to the existing owners and users.</p> <p>The A66 will be realigned to the south of the Old Rectory to avoid demolition due to its important historical contribution to the setting of St. Mary's Church. The road realignment has been designed within the limits of the geometric standards of the Design Manual of Roads and Bridges, whilst also considering other impacts such as landowners, the environment, cost, and also, the resulting impact on the Old Rectory itself. The land take at the Old Rectory has been minimised.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) details the agricultural land holding impact assessment undertaken for the Project. The assessment considers agricultural land within the Order Limits of the Project where land is required either permanently or temporarily in order to deliver the Project and identifies potential significant effects on agricultural land holdings.</p>	
463	152240, 153049, 153073, 154195, 154464, 154465,			Community impact - Health	Respondents expressing concern about potential negative health impacts from the Project in the local communities. Respondents expressed specific concern that the Project would increase cases of heart disease,	An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154466, 154473, 154477, 154485, 154487				<p>cancer and asthma. These respondents also expressed concern that these would particularly affect very young and older residents.</p>	<p>methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors.</p> <p>No negative health effects were identified during construction or operation in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby area.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
472	151341, 151523, 152139, 152176, 152257, 152260, 153898, 154144, 154466, 154480, 154485, 154487, 154489	Durham County Council		Economics - Local economy	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on the local economy. These respondents mention reduced access to Cross Lanes farm shop, congestion deterring visitors to the area, and land take from local farms and campsites as having particularly negative impacts on local business.	<p>The design of the Cross Lanes Junction has been amended since the autumn 2021 Consultation following feedback and the opportunity to refine the layout. The resulting layout reduces overall land take and the impact on the businesses of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café, and Dent House Farm whilst retaining all existing accesses to properties and the local road network.</p> <p>The proposed layout retains the direct connection between the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and Rutherford Lane, improving journeys for all users intending to cross the A66, including cyclists. The link to Moorhouse Lane, and thus Brignall, on the south of the A66 has been moved north of the Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Café building, negating the need to take the route across the fields south of the shop.</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, including Cross Lanes Farm shop and nearby campsites, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is set out in ES Chapter 13</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the scheme will support local authority growth agendas and provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the scheme at a routewide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p> <p>The ES also considers the average and peak worker numbers during construction and potential associated impacts. It is identified that any impact that temporary workers may have on the local area is unlikely to be significant and may result in a minor beneficial effect due to increased local spending.</p>	
475	150415, 151339, 151523, 152139, 152260, 153826, 153828, 153833, 153898, 154228,		152990	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the potential cost of the project. These respondents state that a longer route and new slip road requires more construction and land purchased. Respondents also express concern over the maintenance costs of the existing road.</p>	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154262, 154485					. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and justification for the Black option can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). In terms of new slip road costs, regardless of the new junction location, new slip roads would require constructing.	
493	149401, 149427, 150417, 152246, 152252, 152254, 153049, 153073, 153618, 153797, 153837, 154236, 154247, 154342, 154466, 154467, 154473			Community impact - People - general / not specified	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have broad negative impact on the people in local communities. These include negatively impacting on the Startforth and Barnard Castle areas and their communities, through increased traffic, construction and disruption.	During Project design development the Project team has worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with knowledge and understanding of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project. The Environmental Statement, Chapter 13 'Population and Human Health' sets out the impact of the Project in relation to the population and human health assessment. This assessment covers private property and housing, community land and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assets, development land and businesses, agricultural land holdings and walking, cycling and horse riding provision.</p> <p>During operation, through improved connectivity, it is considered the Project will improve access to community facilities and other services for rural communities, leading to a range of benefits on wellbeing.</p> <p>Two of the core objectives of the scheme are to re-connect currently severed communities and provide better links between settlements along the route, and to improve access to services such as healthcare, employment areas and education, and to improve access to key tourist destinations such as the North Pennines, Lake District and Yorkshire Dales.</p> <p>Throughout construction, there is likely to be a short-term effect on the way people access and enjoy the area. Consideration during detailed design will be given to construction access and crossing points to ensure safety for our workers and other road users. Where practicable, dedicated haul roads will be built alongside the new A66 to keep construction vehicles off local roads and to ensure that our</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						construction teams can continue to safely access and exit the Project site.	
501	151522, 153367, 154195, 154472			Community impact - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about the potential impacts of this route on the safety of local people. These respondents state that the scheme would make them generally more unsafe.	National Highways have continually sought feedback and insight from customers, stakeholders, and road users on the emerging design solutions to better inform and adapt its plan to fully dual the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner. Engagement and consultation comments relating to safety, from local and community interest groups, have been factored into development of the design and are subject to the Road Safety Audit process in ensuring the safety of road users. Refer to the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) for further information. Potentially hazardous turnings, such as right-turns across the dual carriageway. will be removed as part of the Project, with new links provided via the local road network to safe junctions to provide safer journeys on the newly-dualled sections of the A66. Junctions have been included which are connected to the local road network, and which enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, slip	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>roads will be provided that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and horse-riding provision for the scheme includes grade-separated crossing points of the A66.</p> <p>National Highways regularly monitors the safety of the network and works throughout the year to ensure motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards.</p>	
532	152139, 153608		153609	Economics - Local economy - agriculture	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impact of the scheme on agricultural businesses on the grounds that species rich grassland would replace productive land used for farming and grazing.	ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land and agricultural land holding viability. National Highways has sought to reduce required land take where practicable. Where land is required for temporary uses during construction the Project will reinstate the land.	No
581	151498	Durham County Council		Community impact - Local amenities	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on local amenities, on the grounds that congestion would make Barnard Castle less appealing for visitors, and the scheme proposes building on community green spaces including allotments.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This assessment indicates that whilst there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67.</p> <p>As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>Any impact on Special Category Land (such as green space or allotments) will need to comply with the requisite legal obligations to ensure that impacts are mitigated or compensated for accordingly</p>	
748	152233	Environment Agency	154127	Alternative route - Red	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the Red Route and mention the decision to culvert Tutta Beck under, rather than around a proposed embankment. Respondents also mention that the junctions in the Blue and Black Route are preferable to the Red Route.</p>	<p>The preferred junction layout at Cross Lanes will see the Black option taken forward with the junction located west of Cross Lanes Farm Shop. Due to the proximity of the Tutta Beck and the requirement to connect Rutherford Lane into the proposed junction, it will result in a minor diversion of the beck with culverts to allow the beck to pass under the re-aligned B6277 Moorhouse Lane and the westbound junction connector road.</p> <p>Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), section 5.7 'Cross Lanes to Rokeby' for further information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
753	149420, 150198, 150432, 151494, 153322, 153342, 153921, 154252, 154339		154127	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern over the cost of the scheme due to longer routes and more land take, which would be expensive. Respondents also expressing concern over the cost of the upgrade to Rutherford Lane, on the grounds that the road is hardly used.</p>	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the preferred solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>Land take and therefore the costs associated with this has also been reviewed throughout design development and where practicable has been reduced.</p> <p>The proposed upgrade to Rutherford Lane supports improved vehicular and no-motorised user connectivity for the area, including a more direct link to the B6277 Moorhouse Lane via the proposed Cross Lanes junction.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), section 5.7 'Cross Lanes to Rokeby'. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) contains further information on traffic levels and use of roads throughout each scheme of the Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
805	150181, 150199, 150405, 150435, 150466, 152207, 152918, 153035, 153323, 153324, 153348, 154228	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153857, 153959, 154035	Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern over the potential negative impacts on access. Respondents state that businesses in Cross Lanes, properties in The Lendings, Thorngate and Bridgegate, and emergency vehicle access generally, are all at risk of being cut off or restricted due to increased traffic. Respondents also expressing concern over access to Barnard Castle, due to increased journey times, and because the narrow roads in the area are prone to flooding and HGV congestions, which could lead to frequent closures.	Where there is access to private, commercial or community land and assets that are impacted by the Project, the existing access will be maintained through construction until alternative access is provided. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). In relation to the A67 through Barnard Castle, the Transport Assessment states that: The impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67. The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge and Bridgegate is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle. The result of this is that access to business and properties for all traffic (including emergency vehicles) will be improved throughout Barnard Castle for any link that takes access from the A67, for example Thorngate.</p> <p>Traffic flows on the Lendings, and on Thorngate would not be affected.</p> <p>Within Barnard Castle one street, The Sills, is expected to have an increase in traffic, due to the layout of the new A66 junctions at Cross Lanes and Rokeby. While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, this is expected to be modest, namely 520 vehicles per day which equates to less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day. This level of traffic increase is not anticipated to cause issues with residents or emergency vehicles accessing side roads, such as Thorngate.</p> <p>The provision of a grade separated junction (as opposed to the existing at grade junction) at Cross Lanes will provide a step change in capacity at this location, such that businesses located here will not be in any way</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						restricted due to the marginally increased traffic volumes.	
893	152139, 152240, 153315, 153342	Durham County Council		Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing concern over potential disruption during the construction phase, in particular that the Black Route would cause more disruption than the Blue Route without added benefit, and that diversions may encourage more HGV traffic through Barnard Castle.	As part of the traffic management planning process, when considering diversion routes, impacts on road users and stakeholders will be considered with routes being selected that offer a safe viable alternative. In many instances due to the limited number of roads in the area, traffic is likely to be diverted by weight or size, with larger, heavier or oversize vehicles being navigated onto larger diversion routes. Where practicable, smaller vehicles will be permitted to use smaller, more local diversion routes subject to suitability and assessment. Further information on the proposed traffic management measures during construction can be found in ES Chapter 2 – The Project (Application Document 3.2) and also the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)).	No
960	152922, 153833		152983, 152990	Engineering design and development -	Respondents expressing concern that engineering and design improvements on the existing road are not necessary.	National Highways acknowledges this view about congestion levels. Please refer to the Case for the Project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				Improvements unnecessary	These respondents state that congestion in the area is not constant and existing slip roads function well.	(Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the Project. National Highways plan is to provide a fully dualled carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner to the national standard that provides a consistent road user experience. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), section 5.7 'Cross Lanes to Rokeby' and The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 for further information on the background and justification of the scheme.	
967	153315			Construction - Timescale	One respondent expressing concern over the timescale of the construction phase on the grounds that the consultation documents do not indicate how long construction may take.	We expect the main construction developments to begin in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful and continue for five years until 2029. This may be subject to change.	No
1120		Historic England		Alternative route - Blue	Respondents expressing concern that the Blue Route proposes an underpass junction east of St Mary's Church. This places the proposed junction closer to existing one. They acknowledge that the design of the proposed underpass for these options has sought to provide mitigation for their impact on the RPG which does reduce the impact. Nevertheless, the	National Highways acknowledges the concern over the impact of the Blue Route in this location. National Highways has therefore worked closely with Historic England to develop a route which provides the least impact on historic environment providing an offline route which minimises the impact on the RPG and does not impact on the setting of St	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>impact is still greater than that of the Black option.</p>	<p>Mary's Church or require the demolition of the Old Rectory.</p> <p>During the Autumn 2021 Consultation optioneering evaluation considered key matters such as environmental and heritage impact, and transport analysis considering local factors to determine the best solution. The scheme being taken forward is the Black Route option as detailed within the consultation material.</p> <p>The principal consideration in the preference for the Black Route was the impact on the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Rokeby Park. The Blue Route would create harm to the Grade II* RPG at Rokeby Park. Whilst impacts on some key views of the Blue Route at Rokeby could be mitigated through careful landform design and reinstatement, the impacts cannot be completely avoided as the junction at Rokeby would still lead to additional fragmentation of the RPG.</p> <p>National policy requires a very strong justification for any harm to a nationally designated asset, and evidence to show that there is not a viable alternative.</p> <p>It was considered that the Blue Route at Rokeby was likely to be regarded as not conforming with national policy and therefore there was a risk that a DCO</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						application for the Blue Route would not secure a grant of consent. As such, the Black Route was identified as the preferred solution.	
1362	154236			Traffic, transport and junctions - Emergency access	Respondents expressing concern that emergency vehicles would not be able to enter the village from each end of Low Road based on the proposals.	Under the proposals, emergency vehicles will access Bowes Village and Low Road from the A66 via the grade separated junction at Bowes.	No
1366	148570, 148574, 148579, 148595, 148616, 148641, 148695, 148700, 148706, 149362, 149363, 149365, 149372, 149373, 149375, 149392, 149398, 149400, 149401, 149405, 149409, 149421, 149798,	Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish'	153609, 153857, 153893, 154035, 154127, 154209	Traffic, transport and junctions - B6277	Respondents expressing concern about the proposed Black Route causing increased traffic on the B6277 Moorhouse Lane, the Sills and the Bank into Barnard Castle town centre via Market Place. Respondents also express concern about the increased traffic through Startforth as a result of the proposed Black Route. Respondents mention visibility issues when turning right onto Gill Lane from the Sills; that the proposed route will lead to increased unsuitable heavy traffic down B-roads; that it is dangerous having HGVs and heavy farm vehicles travelling on these roads as they are too narrow; that it will be more dangerous for schoolchildren and other pedestrians walking to and from Barnard Castle from Startforth because of increased traffic and that the pavements are already too narrow and in a poor condition; that traffic	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). Any proposed highway/junction upgrades (that could impact on visibility) have been designed accordance with the appropriate design standards While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on B6277 Moorhouse Lane and the Sills (of 520 vehicles per day i.e. less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
150143, 150157, 150158, 150160, 150163, 150164, 150181, 150193, 150197, 150198, 150199, 150200, 150201, 150405, 150419, 150420, 150422, 150426, 150431, 150432, 150433, 150435, 150462, 150466, 151327, 151328, 151335, 151341, 151342, 151343, 151351, 151450, 151453, 151455,					<p>accidents will be increasingly likely with the proposed route because of increased traffic; that the proposed junctions will result in an increase in traffic using Cross Lanes for journeys to Teesdale; that Sat Navs will send traffic through Westwick; that the roads are too narrow to carry the traffic; concern about safety when using the exit from residential area, The Lendings, only allowing one vehicle to enter/exit at one time causing congestion on the B6277; Rutherford Lane turning into a rat run.</p>	<p>Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre, and Startforth to the west. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'</p> <p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>Traffic flows on the Lendings, would not be affected. Rat running on Rutherford Lane is not observed in our traffic model.</p> <p>The signed HGV route from the A66 to Barnard Castle and Teesdale will continue to be signed via the Rokeby Junction.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Figure 8-20 shows that forecast AADT on the B6277 Lartington Lane reduces by 189 vehicles with the Project in place, which indicates that there is no overall increase in traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	151456, 151457, 151459, 151460, 151463, 151466, 151471, 151474, 151479, 151485, 151495, 151498, 151503, 151509, 151511, 151519, 151521, 151522, 151523, 152137, 152144, 152179, 152205, 152207, 152209, 152221, 152222, 152226, 152229, 152234, 152235, 152240, 152241, 152246,					<p>using the Cross Lanes route to access Teesdale.</p> <p>The Project will undertake Road Safety Audit per scheme against the design solutions under development. These aim to identify and address potential hazards to road users, including pedestrians walkers, during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the A66. National Highways have consulted with local authorities on its plans to upgrade the A66 and how this might impact local roads which are the responsibility of those local authorities.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152252, 152253, 152260, 152263, 152269, 152270, 152488, 152908, 152912, 152918, 152922, 152928, 152947, 152950, 152968, 152971, 152989, 153035, 153046, 153047, 153049, 153056, 153058, 153063, 153071, 153073, 153074, 153075, 153083, 153170, 153305, 153311, 153312, 153322,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153323, 153324, 153330, 153342, 153344, 153346, 153348, 153354, 153365, 153367, 153368, 153369, 153371, 153378, 153382, 153558, 153575, 153576, 153582, 153618, 153633, 153794, 153804, 153820, 153823, 153826, 153828, 153829, 153834, 153837, 153841, 153865, 153889, 153896,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153898, 153904, 153918, 153924, 153930, 153932, 153951, 153952, 153979, 154019, 154144, 154181, 154193, 154195, 154198, 154215, 154216, 154217, 154235, 154236, 154237, 154247, 154252, 154256, 154262, 154339, 154342, 154368, 154463, 154464, 154465, 154466, 154467, 154472,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154473, 154474, 154475, 154476, 154477, 154478, 154481, 154482, 154485, 154487, 154489, 162161						
1369		Durham County Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - HGV traffic	Respondents expressing concern that the Black Route option will result in a switch of 118 HGVs from Barnard Castle Road to B6277 Moorgate.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme, including Cross Lanes to Rokeby.</p> <p>The scheme causes a modelled reassignment of HGV traffic from Barnard Castle Road to Moorhouse Lane / The Sills in a northbound direction, due to the additional distance needed to travel to the compact grade separated junction to exit the A66. This impacts HGV movements between the A66 east and destinations on the B6277 and B6278 north of Barnard Castle, such as Alston and Stanhope. The model forecasts that the increase in HGVs on the B6277 north of Barnard Castle will be 44 vehicles per day. It should be noted that further traffic modelling has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>been undertaken since Statutory Consultation, as such the updated forecast on this route is for an increase of 44 HGVs per day as opposed to 118 HGVs per day.</p> <p>It should be noted that the route into Barnard Castle for HGVs travelling to/from the east or west will remain only via the proposed Rokeby Junction and Eggleston Abbey Bridge, not via the Cross Lanes junction; signage along the improved A66 will inform this.</p>	
1370	149798, 150158, 150181, 150415, 150432, 151522, 151523, 152133, 152137, 152233, 152488, 153055, 153080, 153315, 153316, 153558, 153618, 153829,	Durham County Council	154206	Traffic, transport and junctions - HGV traffic	<p>Respondents expressing concern about increased HGV traffic. Respondents are concerned about HGVs crossing the County Bridge and ignoring the weight limit; HGVs entering the centre of Barnard Castle causing congestion; HGVs being involved in accidents leading to oil spills causing environmental damage to Tees Riverside.</p>	<p>The proposed junctions of Bowes, Cross Lanes and Rokeby will be open to all vehicles. The route into Barnard Castle for HGVs travelling to/from the east or west will remain only via the proposed Rokeby Junction and Eggleston Abbey Bridge, not via the Cross Lanes junction; signage along the improved A66 will inform this.</p> <p>Concerns of traffic violations by HGVs or damage resulting from HGVs to the County Bridge and within Barnard Castle or to Tees Riverside would be directed to Durham County Council, who is the relevant highway authority.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154169, 154193, 154204, 154215, 154236, 154256, 154463						
1374	151351, 151453, 151509, 151522, 151523, 152264			Traffic, transport and junctions - Increased traffic	Respondents concerned that increased traffic along the C165 from the A66 to Barnard Castle will make the road more dangerous and cause more congestion. Respondents also concerned that Eggleston Bridge on the C165 is a bottleneck when HGVs are trying to turn towards Barnard Castle and that there is too much HGV traffic in Barnard Castle town centre.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Cross Lanes to Rokeby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without (Figure 7 18: Cross Lanes to Rokeby – Forecast Year with-Project Flow (Changes from without-Project)). While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on B6277 Moorhouse Lane and the Sills (of 520 vehicles per day i.e., less than 1 vehicle per minute across the day), the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles AADT, including on Barnard Castle Bridge, and on Galgate within the town centre, and Startforth to the west. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67.'	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The result of lower traffic flows is that the operation of the A67 on Barnard Castle Bridge is improved with the scheme as shown in The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7, Section 8.3, Table 8-22). As such there would be less congestion on this link within Barnard Castle, which would result in slightly improved journey times through the centre of Barnard Castle.</p> <p>The signed HGV route from the A66 to Barnard Castle and Teesdale will continue to be signed via the Rokeby Junction.</p> <p>Concerns relating to existing problems on the local road network as a result of new developments, specific causes of congestion and disruption, as well as local authority highways projects would be in the remit of Durham County Council, who is the relevant highway authority.</p>	
1379	152207, 152240			Construction - Health	Respondents expressing concern about the health and wellbeing of the residents of Startforth during construction.	<p>The main construction works in this area will be focused around the A66 route, with limited impacts on Startforth during the construction process. Health effects associated with increased traffic flows on the A67 during construction are assessed in</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors.</p> <p>No negative health effects were identified during construction or operation in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby area.</p>	
1381	150143, 151327, 151450, 151456,		153831, 154127	Traffic, transport and junctions -	Respondents expressing concern about the Black Route and the additional miles to travel for westbound traffic heading for the C165 at Rokeby.	The layout and positioning of the Rokeby Junction is due to the constraint of Rokeby Park, a Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, from	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	151479, 151522, 152137, 152209, 152217, 152971, 153073, 153342, 153378, 153829, 153930, 154018			Rokeby junction	Respondents are concerned that the additional distance to the new Rokeby junction will lead vehicles to use the Cross Lanes junction causing additional traffic and congestion at the County Bridge and in Barnard Castle.	<p>which land cannot be taken due to national policy (National Policy Statement for National Networks). This will result in a longer journey for some drivers, and is why some drivers may choose to use the Cross Lanes junction to minimise the distance they travel.</p> <p>The main route into Barnard Castle will remain via the Rokeby Junction and the signage designed accordingly. Although a longer distance, our analysis shows that this route, when compared to a route via the Cross Lanes Junction, is shorter in terms of overall journey time, as traffic is freer flowing.</p> <p>However as some people will choose to use the Cross Lanes junction, this will lead to an increase of traffic on the Sills of around 520 vehicles per day, which equates to less than 1 vehicle per minute throughout the day.</p> <p>While there is forecast to be an increase in traffic on the Sills, the impact on Barnard Castle is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the lower flows on the A67, of around 400 vehicles per day including on Barnard Castle Bridge (County Bridge), and on Galgate within the town centre. This reduction on the A67 occurs due to the improved A66</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67</p> <p>Rokeby Junction will remain the route to/from Barnard Castle for HGVs; HGVs will still be able to leave the A66 at the proposed Cross Lanes Junction to reach all other destinations south of the River Tees.</p> <p>Chapter 8.1 of The Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7) provides further details of the traffic flows on the local roads around Barnard Castle.</p>	
1383	153794			Traffic, transport and junctions - Health effects	<p>Respondents expressing concerns that the proposed Black Route will cause negative physical and mental health effects including acute ones from the increased risk of accidents between vehicles and pedestrians in Startforth and lower Barnard Castle and more chronic health effects from reductions in air quality, noise and disturbance, and respondents state that these risks are not assessed in the PEI Report.</p>	<p>Routes into and out of Barnard Castle will not be altered. The new Rokeby junction will be maintained as the signed HGV route into Barnard Castle.</p> <p>Traffic Modelling shows an increase in traffic (2046) on Moorhouse Lane in the Northbound and southbound directions - primarily due to the proximity of the proposed Rokeby junction. The improvements will upgrade the junctions where these routes meet the A66. Making these junctions safer and easier to use could attract more traffic onto these routes. But we know that around 80% of traffic on the A66 is long-distance traffic and only 20% of traffic uses the local access routes. We are not anticipating any significant changes in the future</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>regarding how local traffic accesses the network, with journeys expected to continue as existing.</p> <p>Further information relating to traffic, safety and accidents, can be found within the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Further information on management and mitigation of the effects of changes to air quality, noise and disturbance, can be found within the ES Volume 1, Chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5: Air Quality 12: Noise and Vibration 13: Population and Human Health. <p>The main construction works in this area will be focused around the A66 route, with limited impacts on Startforth during the construction process. Health effects associated with increased traffic flows on the A67 during construction are assessed in</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors.</p> <p>No negative health effects were identified during construction or operation in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby area.</p>	
1385	154368			Land - Air pollution	<p>Respondents expressing concern that increased congestion will increase air pollution affecting health, local heritage assets and the local environment and farmland.</p>	<p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) includes assessments of the points raised by the respondent. Specific chapters are highlighted below for reference.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 Air Quality includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme with regards to congestion and changes in air quality, such as potential increases in pollution.</p> <p>Impacts on human health receptors</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>are also outlined in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage includes an assessment of the impacts on local heritage assets.</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land, including an agricultural soils assessment.</p> <p>Impacts on agricultural land are also assessed and reported in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health. This chapter identifies that where land is required for temporary uses during construction the Project will reinstate the acquired land to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. The Project will also accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where practicable to account for potential crop loss and maintain farm access points where practicable and reinstate these as soon as practicable. The Project will also outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as practicable.</p> <p>Information regarding the development of the preferred route, and how this</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						has considered the points raised by the consultee, is provided within the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	
1388	151522			Engineering design and development - Access to tree trimming	Respondents expressing concern that there is no easy access for Startforth Parish Council to arrange trimming of trees at the riverside which now blocks a viewing point.	Concerns relating to existing problems on the local road network outside of the scope of the A66 Project should be directed to Durham County Council.	No
1134	154368			Need case	Respondent expressing concern and would prefer an alternative route at Rokeby / Cross Lanes believing that the public benefits will outweigh the harm that the alternative route would cause	Our assessment of the route alternatives at Rokeby, as presented at the Autumn 21 consultation, demonstrated that the Black Route (the route that is now taken forward into the DCO application) was preferred in relation to a wide range of criteria. Further details of the assessment process and findings are presented within the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1) and ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2). It was concluded that the public benefits of the alternative (blue) route do not outweigh the harm of that route, particularly given the harm to heritage assets, which would conflict with policies of the National Networks National Policy Statement.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor – Environment’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
901	153316			Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Needs Case	One respondent expressing support for the scheme on the basis that environmental considerations have received a high level of attention.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme.	No
1126		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) – Cultural Heritage	Historic England expressing support that consultation has been carried out with the organisation on initial proposals in relation to the area of the Roman fort and prehistoric enclosed settlement. Historic England note the road would be raised as it passes through the existing cutting through the Roman Fort in order to accommodate retaining walls and reduce the construction impact which would be required within the cutting.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme and the approach to engagement and design development. National Highways has continued to carry out assessment work and engage with Historic England throughout the pre- application period to share latest data and positions. Associated matters are captured within the Statement of Commonality and Statements of Common Ground (Application Document 4.5).	No
681	154135		149368	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce road noise, specifically mentioning support for the road running through a cutting.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme.	No
1097	149413			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	One respondent suggesting design changes to mitigate against noise pollution, including low-noise surfaces and avoiding the use of rumble strips.	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Road markings will be confirmed as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>part of the detailed design that will be carried out post consent. The assessment considers a typical low noise road surface and provides a robust worst case assessment of potential noise levels.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. Potential mitigation has been discussed and agreed with relevant local authorities.</p> <p>National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	
1072	149367			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	One respondent suggesting that the focus of the scheme should be to reduce demand rather than to increase capacity in order to reduce climate impact and meet climate change commitments.	<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)).</p> <p>National Highways is required under law (the EIA Regulations) and policy</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions associated with the Project. These mitigation measures can be found in section 7.10 of the ES Chapter.</p> <p>The climate assessment is underpinned by transport modelling set out in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) which outlines traffic impacts for each Project scheme.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project will not have any likely significant effects with respect to GHG emissions.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to be net zero in construction.</p>	
823	148611, 149425, 151464, 152942, 153819, 154370		153846, 154371, 154372	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment relating to noise pollution. Respondents expressing concerns that as a result of the topography and height of the scheme noise levels would increase and have a detrimental impact on the environment and local residents.</p>	<p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out and how the assessment uses noise modelling which takes into account the road elevation and topography of the area.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation on sensitive receptors including</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						residential properties. National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	
876	148611, 153339, 153365, 153797, 153839, 153871, 153965		152983	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would increase the volume of traffic, and therefore CO2 emissions, which is contrary to climate change commitments.	<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)).</p> <p>National Highways is required under law (the EIA Regulations) and policy (the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions associated with the Project. These mitigation measures can be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>found in section 7.10 of the ES chapter:</p> <p>The climate assessment is underpinned by transport modelling set out in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) which outlines traffic impacts for each project scheme.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have any likely significant effects with respect to GHG emissions.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to be net zero</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						in construction.	
879			153846	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	One respondent expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with particular reference to air quality.	<p>The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Since the PEI Report submission, baseline air quality monitoring has been carried out at 16 locations across the Affected Road Network (ARN). No exceedances of the relevant Air Quality Standards for nitrogen dioxide or particulate matter are predicted during the operation of the Project and no likely significant effects are concluded.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts on air quality from dust arising during construction has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes a dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, on site and off site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events. No likely significant effects are concluded with the implementation of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						these mitigation measures.	
1129		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Historic England expressing support for the alignment of the route to be online through the existing cutting as it enables a continuity of the historic route. Historic England state that an 'on-line' option with an appropriately considered engineering solution has the potential to limit further impact on cultural heritage on this section of the route than an off-line option. Historic England continue to advise and comment on the development of the design.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme. The potential impact of the scheme on the historic environment is fully considered in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). Design development retains an online solution minimising landtake through the adoption of a retaining wall.	No
455	151518	Durham County Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Durham County Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for the scheme as the route is taken away from the front elevation of Ravensworth Lodge which will benefit from the reduction in traffic whilst the local access road remains. Respondents also note the Project is acceptable in cultural heritage terms and impacts can be managed through detailed design and mitigation.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the Project.	No
1127		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Historic England suggesting that the route to Warrener Lane and the attenuation ponds may impact on unknown cultural heritage resources. Historic England note that engagement is ongoing with National	We thank the respondent for their comments and confirm that we will continue to engage with their teams to identify areas of design and mitigation that can minimise impacts upon the Historic Environment.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Highways over the designs for this scheme.	<p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets including consideration of areas required for attenuation ponds and the route to Warrener Lane.</p> <p>As part of the assessment, lidar surveys supported by trenching, have suggested Roman remains are present concentrated to the west and prehistoric remains are present to the east. In light of these survey results the two ponds proposed to the west have been moved to an area outside of the immediate vicinity of Roman remains. The remaining attenuation ponds to the east cannot be relocated and therefore the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) proposes to mitigate by preservation by record.</p>	
1128		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	<p>Historic England suggesting the PEI Report identified a number of cultural heritage impacts to Roman Fort and prehistoric enclosed settlement 400m west of Carkin Moor Farm which would result, without mitigation, in a moderate adverse impact on the resource.</p> <p>Historic England acknowledge that National Highways are developing the design to seek to minimise the impact and the results will be reported in the</p>	<p>We thank the respondent for their comments and confirm that we will continue to engage with their teams to identify areas of design and mitigation that can minimise impacts upon the Historic Environment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Further surveys have been carried out of the Carkin Moor Roman</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					ES.	fort and surrounding area. Surveys identified that remains are within areas required for Project construction. The combination of physical impacts from the construction of the Project and the changes to the asset's setting would, without mitigation, result in a moderate adverse impact, resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect. A programme of archaeological mitigation will be put in place to ensure preservation by record of any archaeological remains within the footprint of the works. This preservation by record of any archaeological features will reduce the physical impacts on the resource from a moderate adverse impact to a minor adverse impact. However, the combination of impacts including changes to the resource's setting, outlined above, will result in a moderate adverse impact on this high value resource, resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect.	
196	148615, 153797, 153965, 154370		154371, 154372	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern about the impact on the area's cultural heritage, specifically mentioning that the proposed route crosses Carkin Moor Roman fort scheduled monument which they would like to be preserved.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is now reported in the ES and includes details of proposed mitigation measures. Design development subsequent to the Autumn 2021 Consultation within the Carkin Moor Scheduled Monument	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>location has sought to minimise the impact of the Project on this asset. Through ongoing engagement with Historic England the scheme design has developed an online solution in this area minimising setting impacts. To achieve this online design a retaining wall is required which will require some land to be taken from the south side of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Further surveys have been carried out of the Carkin Moor Roman fort and surrounding area. Surveys identified that remains are within areas required for Project construction. The combination of physical impacts from the construction of the Project and the changes to the asset's setting would, without mitigation, result in a moderate adverse impact, resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect. A programme of archaeological mitigation will be put in place to ensure preservation by record of any archaeological remains within the footprint of the works. This preservation by record of any archaeological features will reduce the physical impacts on the resource alone from a moderate adverse impact to a minor adverse impact. However,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the combination of impacts including changes to the resource's setting, outlined above, will result in a moderate adverse impact on this high value resource, resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect.	
682	154135		151490	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondent expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that the visual impact of the scheme on the area's landscape has been minimised.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the scheme. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4).	No
467	152977		151490, 154145	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents suggesting mitigation measures be introduced in relation to the environmental landscape and visual aesthetic of the area.</p> <p>Respondents suggest the screening of roads to protect the landscape, specifically mentioning the Stephen Bank area and suggesting that a retaining wall be built in the section near the Roman fortlet. Respondents also suggesting general maintenance of the route.</p>	<p>In designing the Project, National Highways has recognised and reflected on the key characteristics of the landscape. The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>The mitigation strategy devised by the landscape and heritage teams include the removal of scrub planting and keeping screen planting clear of the scheduled monument to allow a clear picture of its setting.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>5.11) incorporate the overall Project design principles.</p> <p>The Project Team have engaged with Historic England and the North Yorkshire County Council archaeologists in regards the proposed design at Carkin Moor fort, which is a scheduled monument. The current A66 runs through the middle of the fort site and engagement has identified that the preference is for the scheme to maintain this relationship. Therefore, in order to accommodate this whilst minimising land take, a retaining wall is proposed within the scheme design on the south side of the new A66 carriageway.</p> <p>Matters of ongoing maintenance will be discussed and agreed between National Highways, its appointed Principal Contractor and relevant local authorities at the detailed design stage.</p>	
366	152977, 152986, 153339, 153797, 153965, 154000, 154137, 154175, 154243, 154370	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153959, 154001, 154371, 154372	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the environment, with particular reference to the landscape and the visual aesthetic of the area including the proposed bridleway underpass referencing East Layton village, Mainsgill, Browson Bank Farmhouse and holiday cottages.</p>	<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape and providing replacement planting. Proposed structures such as underpasses have been designed to be simple and unobtrusive within the local landscape. The local topography between</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Browson Bank farmhouse and the A66 provides effective screening of the Project. Mitigation measures and the retention of mature trees around the balancing ponds will reduce potential impacts of the Project in this area.</p> <p>Of the 17 landscape character designations assessed, none have significant residual landscape impacts. Of the 13 visual receptors assessed there are two with moderate and therefore significant residual visual effects, both of these are in relation to views from Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>For further information, an assessment of the potential impact of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
1096	149413			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Light pollution – Landscape and Visual	One respondent suggesting that road lighting is not required for this scheme due to low volumes of night- time traffic and the goal to reduce light pollution.	Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the Project is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the Project and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	No
680	150169, 153901,			Environment - general (non PEI Report) -	Respondents suggesting that some of the money invested in the Project should be spent on measures to	An assessment of the impact of the Project on local wildlife is set out in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154135			Wildlife / habitats	protect wildlife and habitats, such as the creation of wildlife corridors across the new road.	Document 3.2), which sets out the mitigation and enhancement proposed to reduce effects on wildlife, including wildlife crossings. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable. Mitigation and enhancement measures are set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
356	148611, 150460, 153339, 153365, 153797, 153965, 154135, 154137, 154169, 154243	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on existing ponds and wildlife. Respondents express concern that the scheme would negatively impact many SACs and SSSIs as well as valuable trees and habitats, all of which could negatively impact the area's wildlife.</p> <p>Respondents express concern about native birds, mammals and river life, and make particular reference to habitats such as the area's rivers, wetland and woodland.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5). provides a full impact assessment of the effects of the Project on designated sites (including all European (including SACs) and Nationally designated sites (including SSSIs) and other biodiversity receptors. This includes but is not limited to all notable/protected habitats (including woodlands, wetlands, ponds, rivers and known notable and veteran trees), birds, mammals, invertebrates, reptiles, amphibians and aquatic species within the defined study area/Zone of Influence for each receptor.</p> <p>The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on all designated sites and sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where practicable.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Ecological mitigation is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
783	154000			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondent expressing support for the proposals to increase the size of the drainage pond in Mainsgill and to create a wetland.	<p>National Highways notes the comments in regards support for a larger drainage pond at Mainsgill and the creation of a wetland.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report landscape planting has been developed/refined and includes a combination of proposed new broadleaved woodland, species-rich grassland, trees, native species-rich hedgerows and wetland habitats as appropriate, to help preserve and create additional habitats</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						in the local area. This is presented in Chapter 6 (Biodiversity) of the ES (Application Document 3.2). The drainage pond noted has also been increased in size.	
38	149782, 151352, 151464, 152986, 153036, 153134, 153365, 153616, 154137, 154243	Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	151490, 151502, 153586, 154017	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern that the scheme could increase flood risk, specifically mentioning Ravensworth Lodge and Carkin Moor. Respondents also querying the placement of wetland habitat on areas which are not prone to flooding and querying what drainage measures will be in place for the scheme.	National Highways note the consultees' concerns about flooding and the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the outline Project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document Number 3.4). Ravensworth Lodge and Carkin Moor are considered within this assessment and no increased flood risk as a result of the Project is identified in these areas. The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Since the publication of the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures have been developed in more detail to incorporate feedback from stakeholders in relation to the placement of wetland habitat. The required mitigation is set out in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity, the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and the Design Principles document (Application Document 5.11).</p> <p>An indication of how the ecological mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Wetland habitats have been retained and enhanced where practicable.</p>	
1088	150165			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	One respondent expressing support for the proposed planting adjacent to the road for the visual and environmental mitigation.	National Highways acknowledges the support of the proposed mitigation measures for the scheme.	No
374	150165, 150169, 151354, 152942, 152977, 152986, 153028	Forestry Commission	149368, 153580, 154145	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	Respondents suggesting roadside tree planting and rewilding for environmental and visual amenity mitigation, as well as to prevent unused parts of the old A66 road being used for illegal sites.	Planting, which has been considered in the design of the Project (Application Document 2.3, Project Design Report) and in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity, (Application Document 3.2) is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>having a distinct primary mitigation functions such as screening and, in most cases, secondary functions such as habitat creation/enhancement.</p> <p>Since the publication of the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed/refined and include a combination of proposed new broadleaved woodland, species-rich grassland, trees, native species-rich hedgerows and wetland habitats as appropriate, to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. This is presented in ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Mitigation measures are described in the ES and are secured in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Opportunities to maximise environmental enhancements as part of this have been sought where practicable with additional areas of woodland, species-rich grassland, hedgerows wetlands and ponds creating habitats linkages to existing areas of habitats where practicable. The planting proposals submitted with the DCO are illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application document 2.8).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Following completion of the scheme, the re-purposed A66 would be managed and maintained by the relevant local authorities, and this includes responding to occupation of the site by travellers.	
1183			153134	Environment - general (non PEI Report) Ravensworth Lodge structural issues	One respondent suggesting the adoption of various measures in relation to the maintenance of Ravensworth Lodge, including a detailed repairs strategy for drainage works and regular maintenance programme; CCTV surveys to ensure drainage suitability; drainage improvements; proposals to alleviate the flooding in the basement; crack monitoring and structural review; necessary repair works; the installation of a drainage pipe.	National Highways' Operations team have recently undertaken surveys and are currently assessing the results with a view to making the structure sound. This work is being undertaken separately to the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project.	No
1173	154137			Environment - general (non PEI Report) Browson Bank farm pond	Respondents expressing concern regarding the drainage pond location near Browson Bank farm. Concerns include the loss of arable farmland, access to Browson Bank farm, and flood risk. Some respondents suggested a preference for drainage ponds to be located within the black plantation woodland or relocated to the northern side of the road.	The proposed drainage pond positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation, whilst minimising the risk of flooding. The design has been amended to locate the pond in the current location of black plantation, which is currently felled. A flood risk assessment and outline	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>drainage design is included within Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). No likely significant adverse effects are predicted to the receiving water environment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>The proposed access track to Browson Bank Farm has been designed in accordance with current standards. A retained right of access will be provided to the land owner to allow access to adjacent fields.</p>	
1178	152986, 153134, 153616, 154243	Richmond shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	154017, 154145		<p>Respondents suggesting the adoption of various environmental measures in relation to flooding and drainage, in relation to the balance ponds near Foxwell Cottages. Suggestions include moving the pond to the north of the road to increase usable space in the south; combining the ponds into one; and relocating the ponds towards the main line of the A66 to reduce maintenance. Other suggestions regarding drainage include moving the pipe run towards the west; place the pipe through the embankment; providing drainage plans that minimise the impact to nearby farmland; the installation of a</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment and outline drainage design is included within Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>The proposed drainage pond positions have been determined by capacity requirements, local topography and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation, whilst minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>The balancing ponds near Foxwell Cottage have been positioned such</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					cover to prevent blockages; and ensuring the drains are properly connected and can withstand heavy rainfall.	that they allow for positive falls to be achieved within pipework from the proposed highway network and as such, any re location may result in the need for alternative pumped drainage solutions to be implemented. This is outlined in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
10	148574, 150467, 151339, 152217, 152263, 153907	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would provide safer routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, specifically mentioning road crossing points at Collier Lane and Moor Lane and routes near to Ravensworth, Warreners Lane, Mainsgill Farm shop and East and West Layton.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Further information on our proposals for Walking, cycling and horse-riders can be found in the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
11	149403, 150467, 151518, 153907	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that there are suitable provisions made for access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents make particular reference to the Moor Lane junction; the overbridge linking Collier Lane with the A66; the Ravensworth public footpath and bridleway; the bridleway	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Further information on our proposals for Walking, cycling and horse-riders can be found in the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			at Mainsgill farm; and the bridleway at Hutton Fields.		
19	148585, 148601, 149378, 150165, 150189, 150458, 151354, 152942, 152977, 152986, 153028, 153067, 153070, 153366, 153571, 153859, 153907, 153910, 154135, 154469	East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	151502, 153580, 157273	Engineering design and development - Moor Lane junction	<p>Respondents including East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressed support relating to the proposed design of Moor Lane and Moor Lane junction and commenting that previous concerns have been addressed and that the scheme would improve connectivity for local residents and businesses.</p> <p>Some respondents made suggestions such as that Moor Lane junction only allows local access.</p> <p>Carkin Moor to Stephen Bank section to be carefully designed to prevent vehicles cutting through West Layton and East Layton or remove direct access from these villages to the A66.</p> <p>In relation to Moor Lane junction to model wider traffic loading through Melsonby, East Layton and West Layton.</p> <p>Sinking down the Moor Lane junction into the landscape.</p> <p>The junction from Mains Gill westbound needing a longer slip road.</p> <p>Joining the A66 to Moor Lane at New Lane Ravensworth junction.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the proposed design of Moor Lane and Moor Lane junction arrangement.</p> <p>For the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor route alignment, our design includes the creation of a new compact, grade-separated junction to the west of Moor Lane to provide safe and easy access to the de-trunked A66, the villages of East Layton, West Layton, Ravensworth, and Mainsgill Farm Shop. The junction provides connectivity between the local road and Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>The Moor Lane junction is proposed to be sunken into the landscape to reduce any visual impact as much as is practicable, and the southern portion of Moor Lane will be realigned to connect into the new junction link road, meaning the default movement for traffic will be to enter the A66 via Mains Gill Junction, therefore reducing likelihood of vehicles cutting through East and West Layton</p> <p>Junctions and associated merge and diverge slip roads have been designed to current national design standards and the scheme has been subject to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Other respondents expressed concern relating to certain proposed road closures and changes in road layouts that might hinder access to and from some properties, specifically mentioning the closure of Moor Lane. Respondents also expressing concern about the increase in mileage and journey time for the residents who have to follow diversions as well as increase in fuel expenditures.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concern about a potential increase in traffic as a result of the scheme, which they feel would worsen existing congestion in the area.</p>	<p>traffic modelling (refer to Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) which considers loading on local roads, including congestion.</p> <p>A link at Browson Bank Farm has been provided between the de-trunked A66 and the westbound carriageway of the new A66.</p> <p>Any roads that are closed/stopped-up by the project have been reconnected to ensure all existing access to properties is maintained. Specifically regarding the closure of Moor Lane: the road has been re-routed and connected to the new grade separated junction which provides a far safer crossing of the A66. Any existing property accesses from Moor Lane are to be replaced with suitable accesses off the new road alignment.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) considers local impacts of the scheme and no impacts on journey times are expected as a result of the scheme. There is an increase in traffic flow on the B6274 to the south of the A66 however as the route is not heavily trafficked, the increase in flow is not likely to impact journey times. There is a decrease on the parallel Stoneygate Bank Road through Ravensworth. This redistribution of traffic on the roads to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the south of the A66 is due to the increase in design speed and capacity on the A66 encouraging traffic to get to the A66 for more of their journey. To the north of the A66 there are small reductions in traffic on Collier Lane and the B6274, as traffic is again redistributed onto the faster A66 for more of their journey.	
192	149412, 150165, 152986, 153043, 153316, 153377, 153829, 153907, 154135, 154243	East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council	151490, 151502	Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents including East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council expressing support for the scheme's engineering design. Respondents support the proposals, commenting that previous concerns have been addressed, and making particular reference to the Moor Lane junction.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted, including support of the proposed Moor Lane Junction arrangement.	No
368	153070, 154213, 154243		153959	Community impact – General support	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would have a positive impact on the local community and residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme. We are committed to working closely with local people and businesses to understand how the improved road will affect them and consider the health effects associated with noise, air, and light emissions and how a safer, better aligned and less congested de-trunked A66 could lead to health improvements for the local community.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
377	148574, 148601, 149396, 149412, 149415, 150177, 150423, 150456, 150458, 150462, 151339, 152217, 152263, 152266, 152922, 152986, 153070, 153316, 153335, 153829, 154135, 154243	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service	149368, 153321	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service expressing support for the scheme on the grounds it would improve road safety, specifically that the scheme would reduce traffic through local villages and expressing support for the proposed Moor Lane junction and Collier Lane overbridge.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No
381	148550, 148568, 148569, 148572, 148578, 148583, 148588, 148591, 148600, 148603, 148604,	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire	151502, 154017, 154145	General / no reason given	Respondents including North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	148613, 148615, 148621, 148626, 148637, 149352, 149370, 149413, 149782, 150165, 150189, 150458, 150460, 152217, 152243, 152902, 152911, 152986, 153028, 153070, 153134, 153316, 153335, 153386, 153939, 154218, 154220, 154230, 154243, 162144	County Council					
449		Richmondshire District		Walking, cycling and	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council and North Yorkshire County Council		horse-riders - General	the scheme on the grounds that it includes adequate provisions for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, and makes some improvements to cycle paths, footpaths, and bridleways.	We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Further information on our proposals for Walking, cycling and horse-riders can be found in the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
458	148585, 148601, 148615, 150177, 150456, 150458, 150466, 152923, 152986, 153070, 153338, 154135, 154261		149368, 151490, 153948	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it would reduce traffic congestion, specifically mentioning local villages and near to Mainsgill Farm.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
459	152909, 153793, 154261			Get on with it / overdue	Respondents expressing support for the scheme and encouraging the Applicant to start as soon as possible.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
883	149374, 150182, 152134, 153365, 153797, 153833,			Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the scheme going ahead in principle. Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153839, 153965						
1240			153586	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Private track in RLB	Respondents oppose that a private track, which diverts from Collier Lane to West Lane and is currently used for lorries and farm machinery, is included with the red line boundary.	Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, National Highways has refined the scheme design and the track indicated (which diverts from Collier Lane to West Lane) has been removed from the Order Limits.	Yes
291	150165, 151354, 152977, 152986, 153028, 153829, 153859, 153876, 154137, 154173, 154175, 154178, 154243, 154261	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	150455, 151490, 151502, 153580, 154201	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council stating that the current design means travelling west from Browson Bank Bungalow will be a dead end, expressing concern about antisocial behaviour, potential increases in fly tipping, general littering and unauthorised camping or parking. They suggest that access should be provided past Browson Bank and connect to the new A66. They suggest that a slip road is created after the entrance to Browson Bank to allow traffic to travel west. Respondents suggest that the Browson Bank service road should go west and join the A66 at Smallways which will mean agricultural machinery does not need to drive on the A66. Respondents suggest that the old A66 should have access from the A66 at Stephen Bank, while others oppose westbound access to the A66 from Stephen Bank.	A new connection between the de-trunked A66 and the proposed mainline has been provided at the western extend of the scheme. This connection will allow vehicles travelling from villages at the western extent of the scheme who wish to join the A66 in a westbound direction to travel west along the de-trunked A66 and connect directly to the proposed A66 mainline by means of a safe slip road connection. As part of this reconfiguration, an altered private means of access provision has been proposed between the de trunked A66 and Browson Bank Farm. While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. There is no reason to believe	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Respondents suggest that a slip road is constructed from Dick Scot Lane to join the A66 in the westbound direction. Respondents suggest that a suitable area for HGVs to be able to turn is created in case they take a wrong turn.	that the increase in traffic will lead to an increase in antisocial behaviour. The turning requirement for HGVs is no longer required as the final design allows for direct connection for all vehicles to the westbound carriageway and entrances to the proposed highway network have been designed to accommodate HGV and large farm machinery movements.	
354	153134, 153616, 154243	Forestry Commission North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153586, 154017	Request for further information	Respondents including the Forestry Commission, North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council requesting further information on aspects of the scheme such as its impact on land; whose responsibility it is to manage and maintain certain areas of land; how drainage issues will be managed; proposed dates for construction and working hours; proposed locations of temporary infrastructure; and the plans for the woodland affected by the scheme.	During Project design development the Project team has worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with enhanced knowledge and experience of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project. The draft Development Consent Order (Application Document 5.1) makes provision for the maintenance	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>responsibilities in relation to the highways affected by the Project</p> <p>The effects of the scheme in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water, have been assessed and consider potential impacts to flows and impacts on water quality. This is reported in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (Road Drainage and the Water Environment) (Application Document 3.2). It considers the potential effects on the quality and quantity of surface and ground waters, geomorphology and flood risk that may result from construction activities, operational road drainage and accidental spillages. The detailed drainage design and maintenance strategies will be developed at the next Project design stage and Lead Local Flood Authorities will be consulted throughout the Project to ensure the solution is agreeable to all.</p> <p>For further information about construction compounds, please refer to A66 Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) Annex B15 Site Establishment Plan. Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>provides more clarity on construction durations.</p> <p>Subject to securing a DCO, works are planned to commence in 2024, with all schemes to be completed by 2029 or earlier. The high level programme of key milestones are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SoS DCO Decision in September 2023 - DCO Judicial Review period ends in October/November 2023 - Site establishment Late 2023 - Start of main works January 2024 - Full Scheme open to traffic 2029 <p>Most construction works will be carried out during standard day working hours of 07:30 until 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 07:30 until 13:00 on Saturdays. In some instances, it may be essential to undertake works at night or on Sundays and Bank Holidays due to traffic management restrictions, with additional traffic management or closures required for works such as road connections or interface points, bridge beam lifts and deck pours.</p> <p>The landscape planting design includes a range of measures designed to complement the local landscape character using species of local provenance with appropriate consideration of climate change</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						resilient species. The measures will include Woodland planting, Woodland edge, Linear belts of trees and shrubs, Blocks of single and mixed species native woodland, Scattered trees, Scrub, Hedgerows, Hedgerows with trees, Individual trees, and Species rich grassland.	
357	149425, 154469, 162144		152983	Engineering design and development - Collier Lane slip road	Respondent suggesting that a slip road into Collier Lane / West Layton on the new A66 towards the A1 for people arriving from Penrith.	The inclusion of a link at Collier Lane has been investigated as part of the optioneering work carried out to finalise the location of Mains Gill Junction. This optioneering work found that slip roads at Collier Lane would create a negative environmental impact on surrounding properties. The negative impacts were in relation to impacts upon woodland, hedgerows and agricultural land, the east facing slip road would join the road in proximity to Carkin Moor Roman Fort which could result in setting impacts upon the fort. Further information can be found in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).	No
370	150175	Richmondshire District Council and North		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath /	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting the provision of cycle paths, footpaths and	We have proposed a shared bridle/footway in the verge along the de-trunked A66 on the Project along the length of the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme to better connect	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Yorkshire County Council		footpath / bridleway	<p>bridleways for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that these could be provided alongside and linked to the existing road network, for ease and safety of active travel.</p>	<p>bridleways and footpaths together. It is proposed that cycle traffic will use the de-trunked A66 itself which will be subject to significantly less traffic in the proposed situation.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals for PRow can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
404	153819		153846, 154017	Engineering design and development - Mitigation	<p>Respondents suggesting measures to mitigate aspects of the scheme's engineering design and development. Respondents' suggestions include sound dampening, screening, additional planting, and a turning area for HGVs. Respondents specifically mention the area between Foxwell Farm and the new A66 and the area between Mainsgill and the new A66.</p>	<p>We have refined our plans for environmental mitigation since our Autumn 2021 consultation.</p> <p>Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats and species at the locations referred to by the consultee. In addition, we have been talking to landowners about some of the environmental measures they have already introduced such as planting and wetland areas. We have amended our plans to ensure our</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>proposals compliment these valuable, local initiatives. The ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) show one way in which the environmental mitigation for the Project could be delivered. For details on the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the ES (including information on measures to mitigate noise and visual impacts, such as low noise surfacing, noise barriers and planting as referenced in the response) please see the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The turning requirement for HGVs is no longer required as the final design allows for direct connection for all vehicles to the westbound carriageway.</p>	
445	148615	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Engineering design and development - Alternative route	Respondent including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that the carriageway is not placed directly over a scheduled monument and that Carkin Moor Farm be moved further north.	The option past the Carkin Moor Scheduled Monument to the north was investigated in PCF Stage 2. Following Public Consultation and extensive engagement with Historic England, the option was discounted and the current preferred option of online widening through the monument was selected as this is deemed to have less impact on the scheduled monument due to the fact there has always been a road	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>through this section of the monument. A route further north risk unintentionally resulting in more impact on the monument.</p> <p>Following the comprehensive optioneering process, the preferred route has been taken forward for reasons outlined in more detail in the ES chapter 3 (DCO Document 3.2) and PDOR (DCO Document 4.1). There is no intention to move Carkin Moor Farm further north.</p>	
447	148611, 148693, 149369, 149403, 149407, 151336, 151462, 151470, 151484, 151486, 151491, 151518, 152902, 152906, 152969, 153362, 153616, 153860, 153939, 153963,	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153586	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Modified design	<p>Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting the provision of cycle paths, footpaths and bridleways for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents suggest that these could be provided alongside and linked to the existing road network, for ease and safety of active travel.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>We have proposed a shared horse-pedestrian path in the verge along the de-trunked A66 running the entire length of the Scheme from Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together.</p> <p>Please refer to Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) for more information on the individual connections at along the proposed route.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154230, 154243						
461	152202, 153068, 154469		154017, 154145	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	<p>Respondents suggesting that the money set aside for this scheme should be spent on other road projects instead, specifically mentioning improvements to the A66-B6274 junction and new facilities such as service stations and rest areas.</p>	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. In addition to the immediate issues of congestion and journey time savings as identified in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), the scheme also delivers localised benefits for communities such as improved accessibility, safety and better local connectivity.</p> <p>Provision of roadside services, Heavy Goods Vehicles rest areas and litter facilities is outside the scope of the Project. New laybys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards. Existing laybys will be retained where possible.</p> <p>The A66/B6274 junction is not within the scope of the Project. National Highways Operations are responsible for the maintenance and operation of the A66 and undertake regular assessments of the network, including</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						existing junctions such as the B6274, to understand where interventions are required.	
466	151336, 153134, 153616, 154137	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153586, 154017, 154145	Land - Land take	<p>Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that the land take in this scheme could be reduced. Respondents state that: too much productive agricultural land is impacted by the construction; that environmental mitigation designs could be altered so they do not impact private property; that alternative land could be used including land owned by National Highways; that land is acquired under a temporary licence; and that the land take overall for this scheme is minimised.</p>	<p>We have refined our plans for environmental mitigation since our autumn consultation. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. We have refined the Order Limits as far as we are able to do so with the current level of design and further refinement will happen at the detailed design stage should development consent be granted.</p> <p>Refer to the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) for further information about how mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) for details on the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation as identified in the ES.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
633	152268, 152939			Construction - Priority of works	Respondents suggesting that this scheme should be given a higher priority than other schemes within the Project due to the perception that this section of the A66 is the most dangerous.	<p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with the overall Project targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p> <p>As part of the A66 dualling process, National Highways identifies all the schemes to be of high importance and safety concerns exist within each of the key schemes along the route that will look to be addressed as part of the new upgrades.</p> <p>Construction of the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme is expected to take around 2 years, with a current proposed start date of 2026 (subject to change) to align with the complexities of developing the detailed design and traffic management interface with other schemes.</p> <p>Further information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Project, (Application Document 3.2)</p>	No
721	153616		153586	Land Compensation	Respondents suggesting that compensation should be provided for	. The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) considers	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					individuals whose land has decreased in value or who have been impacted financially through the Project, including through increased household expenditure.	the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identifies that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, the team have proposed mitigation measures to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The environmental effects as reported in the ES, following the incorporation are acceptable, although if there if a The Project and its mitigation is designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable. Where land is acquired, the landowner is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code. Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on National Highways' web site.	
723	148611, 149367, 149374, 153365, 153797, 153833			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents suggesting that sustainable transport, such as transporting goods via rail and investing in public transport should be prioritised over the proposed scheme, thereby reducing the demand for road journeys rather than upgrading road infrastructure.	National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of pollution free vehicles. We will also continue our work integrating the Strategic Road Network with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. For further information please see the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4). and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document: 5.19)</p> <p>The Trans-Pennine Strategic Route Study carried out at PCF Stage 0 considered a number of different interventions for transport solutions across the Pennines, including non-highway modes, as set out in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. The east and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						east-west rail link in the north of England (north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line) is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle.	
724	148549, 148611, 154000		154001	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting changes to traffic signals, signage, and speed limits to reduce congestion and improve safety: additional signage from the new route to local businesses and amenities, specifically mentioning Mainsgill Farm shop; clearly signposted cycle routes and speed limits.	<p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs (including signs for local services and places of interest) within the scheme extents will be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Signage for the scheme will be provided in accordance with the Traffic Signs Manual to ensure the safety of all road users. Signage arrangements for Public Rights of Way including cycle routes will be discussed with key stakeholders throughout the detailed design phase. Signing arrangements for places of interest will also be developed during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Reducing the speed limit would make journeys times longer and would therefore encourage rat running on other roads which are less appropriate for strategic traffic. Reducing speed limits on roads without appropriate safety reasons leads to enforcement issues.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further information on the traffic data and traffic impacts of the Project is provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7)	
886	153901			Community impact - Listen to locals	One respondent suggesting that the opinions of local residents be listened to and taken into account.	<p>Engagement has been ongoing through the relevant Community Liaison Group and with relevant stakeholders such as Durham County Council, North Yorkshire County Council, Richmondshire District Council and East / West Layton Parish Meeting.</p> <p>Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with Local Planning Authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. The Project team were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the Development</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Consent Order application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its non-technical summary, as well as plans of the proposals. Further detail is presented in the application for development consent. All feedback from the consultation has been thoroughly reviewed and we have used it to help us improve the final design. A comprehensive list of all issues raised is provided in this Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>We have continued engaging with landowners, land interests and key stakeholders following the Autumn 2021 Consultation to update on the progress of the Project and discuss any technical matters relevant to the preparation of the Project design, environmental assessment and SoCGs prior to submission of the draft DCO. We do not view engagement and consultation as a single point in time and this has been reflected in our ongoing approach to engaging at a local, regional and national level.</p> <p>We have continued our regular meetings with the SSG, focus groups, CLGs, host local authorities, PINS,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Councillors and MPs, where relevant, and landowners and agents.	
1071	149782, 151496			Engineering design and development - Priority of works	Respondents suggesting that this section of the scheme should be given priority in terms of when it is constructed, specifically mentioning the sections where the current A66 goes from two to one lane as well as around the New Lane and Moor Lane junctions.	<p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with the overall Project targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p> <p>As part of the A66 dualling process, National Highways identifies all the schemes to be of high importance and safety concerns exist within each of the key schemes along the route that will look to be addressed as part of the new upgrades.</p> <p>Construction of the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme is expected to take around 2 years, with a current proposed start date of 2026 (subject to change) to align with the complexities of developing the detailed design and traffic management interface with other schemes.</p>	No
1174		Richmondshire District Council and North		Engineering design and development -	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern regarding maintenance responsibilities for the proposed bridgeway/access track in	Following review of the environmental impacts caused by the inclusion of footbridges within the scheme landscape, a Project wide decision was taken to provide underpasses	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Yorkshire County Council		Maintenance responsibilities	the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme.	where possible, minimising any environmental effects. The draft Development Consent Order (Application Document 5.1) makes provision for the maintenance responsibilities in relation to the highways affected by the Project. .	
1175			153586, 154017	Engineering design and development - Warrener Lane Access	<p>Respondents suggesting design changes to the scheme, in particular relating to Warrener Lane.</p> <p>Suggestions include connecting the Brownson Bank to Warrener Lane service road to the Gilling junction, which would decrease the need for agricultural vehicles to enter the A66; private road diversions, slip roads, under or over passes to be added in the existing Pond Dale junction;</p> <p>The construction of a private road from Pond Dale to the Gilling west junction.</p>	<p>The proposed extension of the service road to the Gilling junction is outside of the scheme extents. Any proposed improvement would affect local highway authority roads and would therefore be a matter for them to consider.</p> <p>An underpass to carry the proposed grade separated bridleway has been added in the vicinity of the existing Warrener Lane/A66 junction, which is in the vicinity of Pond Dale farm.</p> <p>Provision of a new link from Warrener Lane (on which Pond Dale Farm sits) to connect to the B6274 (Gilling West Junction) to the east is outside of the scheme extents. Any proposed improvement or implementation is a matter for the private landowner to consider with the local highway authority. Access to both east and westbound carriageways of the A66 from Pond Dale Farm is achieved via the new Warrener Lane link and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						proposed Mains Gill compact grade separated junction.	
1176	149419, 150170, 151485, 153036, 153859			Engineering design and development - Out of scheme scope	<p>Respondents suggesting improvements for roads and junctions close to the scheme:</p> <p>The junction between the B6274 and A66;</p> <p>Undulations on Hargill, Hutton Magna, Newsham and surrounding villages junctions, and Hargill/Moor Road junction.</p> <p>Respondents wants to know if the road from Gilling West to Melsonby will remain a cross junction on the A66.</p> <p>Some respondents raised concerns regarding accidents at the Moor Road and Hargill crossover and the junctions between Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner and how those would be addressed by the proposed design.</p>	<p>The objectives of the A66 NTP scheme are to dual those sections of the A66 which are currently single lane carriageway. In addition, junctions in the sections to which dualling is occurring are also improved.</p> <p>Improvements to junctions which are currently on existing dualled sections of the A66, such as the junction with the B6274, are outside of the scope of the current scheme. National Highways Operations are responsible for the maintenance and operation of the A66 and undertake regular assessments of the network, including existing junctions such as the B6274, to understand where interventions are required.</p> <p>Undulations on Hargill, Hutton Magna, Newsham and surrounding villages junctions, and Hargill/Moor Road junction are existing issues on the local road network. These issues have been raised with the relevant overseeing organisation.</p> <p>Gilling West to Melsonby will remain a cross junction on the A66.</p> <p>Moor Road and Hargill crossover and the junctions between Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner are not within the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>extents of the Project and will not be amended as part of the design. The junctions are however part of a separate National Highways Operations study and amendments to the junctions may be considered in the future.</p>	
1177	152250, 153362		154372	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Bridleway connectivity	<p>Respondents suggesting design changes, relating to the new bridleway underpass north of Warrener Lane being diverted to link with other bridleways in the area. Other suggestions regarding traffic signals, signage and speed limits included ensuring appropriate signage and traffic management in West Layton and East Layton; speed limit in the A66 close to the overbridge at Mainsgill Farm Shop to ensure safe passage for cyclists; signage for cyclists in the track between Warrener Lane through to the underbridge.</p>	<p>The provision of walking, cycling and horse-riding infrastructure has been considered across the whole Project. On Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor, circular routes have been created to promote use and improve the existing provision. Safe crossing points and appropriate signage of the new routes, including the new bridleway underpass north of Warrener Lane, will be implemented as part of the proposed works.</p> <p>For further information see the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs (including signs for local services, warning signs and places of interest) will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detailed design.</p> <p>The A66 Dualling will be sign-posted 70mph. The existing alignment of the A66 will be retain the current 50mph limit throughout its length.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Warning signs alerting drivers to the presence of cyclist and pedestrian crossing points will be provided.	
1180	152996, 154178			Engineering design and development - Browson Bank	Respondents suggesting that the road past Browson Bank should be extended and linked to Smallways which would mitigate the risk of vehicles being forced to drive on narrow roads around Dalton should a major incident occurred in the A66 (Ravensworth intersection).	The respondents' proposed connection of a local highway to Smallways Junction is outside of the extents of the scheme. Any proposed improvement would be a matter for the local highway authority to consider. Following comments raised during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, a new connection between the de-trunked A66 and the proposed mainline has been provided at the western extent of the scheme. This connection will allow vehicles travelling from villages at the western extent of the scheme who wish to join the A66 in a westbound direction to travel in a west along the de-trunked A66 and connect directly to the proposed A66 mainline by means of a safe slip road connection. As part of this reconfiguration, an altered private means of access provision has been proposed between the de-trunked A66 and Browson Bank Farm.	No
1181			154017	Engineering design and development - Gilling West	Respondents suggesting that the service road proposed from Browson Bank to Warrener Lane is extended to the Gilling junction / Gilling West.	The proposed extension of the service road to the Gilling junction / Gilling West is outside of the scheme extents. Any proposed improvement	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						would be a matter for the local highway authority to consider.	
1184	148549, 148580, 148589, 152914, 152923, 152977, 154243			Engineering design and development - Rest areas / laybys	<p>Respondents suggesting the need to incorporate additional rest sites and facilities into the scheme's engineering design and development to improve safety and convenience for motorists, specifically mentioning HGV drivers and motorhome users. For HGVs suggestions include the provision of a rest area and facilities in the southwest of Moor Lane junction and generally throughout the scheme, provision for HGV parking area rather than just laybys.</p> <p>Regarding motorhomes respondents suggested that there is a need for motorhomes' parking area, accessibility to fresh water and sewers.</p> <p>Other respondents expressed concerns regarding the proposed laybys as they would increase litter dump.</p>	<p>A new service area for HGVs is not within the scope of the Project, however- National Highways Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and this will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p> <p>All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be replaced within the Project boundaries in line with current national design standards.</p> <p>Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p>	No
1239	154137			Land - drainage pond access	Respondents suggest that the drainage pond proposed on the Browson Bank land is placed in a specific location specified on attached	Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					plans and that access routes are provided to the relocated location.	including access arrangements to ponds, <i>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</i>	
1255	153963	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing support for the proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provision specifically mentioning the footpath diverted onto Collier Lane north of the proposed dual carriageway and the proposed new bridleway looping past land which will hold ponds.	National Highways welcomes the support shown for the scheme.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1256		Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing their approval of the walking, cycling and horse riding proposals.	National Highways welcomes the support for the proposals.	No
1258		Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	154017	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council providing facts or information about existing provision: usage of current public rights of way; that a large number of gates on the route will tend to inhibit use as bridleway/footpath and use as access tracks; whether the proposed Public Rights of Way diverted into Harrison's Farms is an error.	National Highways thanks the respondents for their observations regarding existing usage. Proposals for Public Rights of Way have been informed by ongoing engagement throughout the Project with various user groups. A WCH Focus Group was established in 2019, formed by lead members of several active user groups, including The Ramblers Association, local cycling clubs, British Horse Society, Cycling UK, Local Access Forum, Parish Councils, and the Public Rights of Way officers from Cumbria, Durham and North Yorkshire County Councils. The number of gates included within any proposed public right of way will be kept to a minimum following approval by CAS, however will need to ensure that both livestock and ownership boundary security is maintained and that misuse of land is not facilitated.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Detailed information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p> <p>The proposed Public Rights of Way diverted into Harrison's Farms was an error in the map books presented at consultation which has since been resolved.</p>	
1259		North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Guidelines	<p>North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service suggesting the public rights of way should be: - barrier free. Consent must be given by CAS prior to any structure being installed on existing or proposed public rights of way and will only be given either for the purpose of the control of livestock or in limited circumstances for public safety. New structures on public rights of way must comply with BS 5709-2018. -Use of verges alongside busy roads to link public rights of way and minor roads should be avoided. - Where practicable all public rights of way should be accessible to wheelchair users with a firm, stable non-slip surface and maximum gradient of 10%. - The minimum width for new</p>	<p>National Highways thank the respondents for the proposed design details. The surfaces of diverted Public Rights of Way will be suitable for their use. Bridleways will not be surfaced with bitumen or asphalt. They will be compacted stone or granite dust topped, and in keeping with the rural environment. The suggestions and advice set out by the respondents will be considered fully during detailed design of the Scheme, should development consent be granted.</p> <p>The number of gates included within any proposed public right of way will be kept to a minimum following approval by CAS, however will need to ensure that both livestock and ownership boundary security is</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					public footpaths is 2.0 metres and public bridleways 4.0 metres. Where public rights of way are enclosed by hedges, fences, or walls this will need to be extended to 3.0 metres and 5.0 metres respectively to maintain the minimum usable width without users coming into contact with boundary features or overgrowth from adjacent hedges or other vegetation. - Widths of new or diverted public rights of way should be stated in the Side Roads Order. - The minimum headroom required for public footpaths is 3 metres and public bridleways 4 metres. - Maximum 10% gradient on all footpaths on cuttings and embankments - Vehicle restraint systems to be set back at least 2 metres where footpaths run alongside carriageway. 4. Minimum gap of 1 metre to be provided in vehicle restraint system where footpaths cross it.	maintained and that misuse of land is not facilitated. In relation to highway assets that would be adopted by the local highway authority, they will be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of that local highway authority prior to handover in accordance with the terms of the Development Consent Order.	
1260	149403			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Modified design	Respondent suggesting design changes to the walking, cycling and horse-rider proposals, stating a possible link from south of the Moor Lane Underpass in a south easterly direction across the land acquired by National Highways to come out near or east of the balancing pond, i.e. a bridleway away from the old A66 LAR	We have proposed a shared bridle/footway in the verge along the de-trunked A66 on the section of the Project between Hutton Magna bridleway No12 to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together. This includes the diagonal south easterly bridleway link	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					that will cut out a considerable amount of riding on the old A66 and avoid the road junction at the south of Moor Lane, this would be an out of scope proposal from designated funds and should be provided if the link to the east from East Layton Moor Bridleway to Carkin Moor Bridleway is not going to be provided.	from Mainsgill junction mentioned by the respondent.	
1261	153616	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service	153846	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Modified design	<p>Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service suggesting design changes to the walking, cycling and horse-rider proposals in the scheme.</p> <p>i) The footpath to be moved to follow the hedge line instead of going through the middle of arable fields.</p> <p>ii) Incorporate a bridle path or public byway at the side of the old A66 so that Foxwell farm could be connected to bridle path and Moor Lane junction.</p> <p>iii) Reduce severity of bend on Warrener Lane for cyclists.</p> <p>iv) Path to be of unbound construction surfaced with hard stone dust.</p> <p>v) Shared use path for walkers, cyclists and horse riders along old A66 to be minimum 3 metres wide set back a minimum of 2 metres from the carriageway.</p>	<p>National Highways thanks the respondents for their feedback on design changes to the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals. We have proposed a shared bridle/footway in the verge along the de-trunked A66 on the section of the Project from Hutton Magna bridleway No12 to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together.</p> <p>i) This is an existing footpath through the middle of the field which is not affected by the proposed scheme therefore there is no intention for the project to make amendments to this footpath</p> <p>ii) We have proposed a shared bridleway/footway in the verge of the de-trunked A66 – this route goes past Foxwell Farm and connects to the bridleway and Moor Lane junction.</p> <p>iii) This is outside of the scope of the Project as these are existing bends</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and are within North Yorkshire County Council control.</p> <p>iv) The surfaces of diverted Public Rights of Way will be suitable for their use and bridleways will not be surfaced with bitumen or asphalt. They will be compacted stone or granite dust topped, and in keeping with the rural environment.</p> <p>v) The Scheme provides sufficient land to accommodate the requested dimensions and the precise dimension will be determined during detailed design, should development consent be granted.</p> <p>Further information can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
197	149425, 150165, 152942, 153028, 153339, 153616, 153900, 154137, 154243, 154261	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153586, 154017	Engineering design and development - General	<p>Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing general concern about the engineering design and development of the scheme.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concern that certain elements outlined in the scheme may not be necessary and are an inefficient use of resources, specifically mentioning the proposed underpass at the top of Dick Scot Lane.</p> <p>Respondents expressing concerns that the potential to upgrade existing</p>	<p>During Project design development the Project team has worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with enhanced knowledge</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>junctions as an alternative to the scheme haven't been examined in enough detail.</p>	<p>and experience of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project.</p> <p>In summary the feedback from consultation and engagement has informed and shaped the design including elements such as the provision on an underpass at Dick Scott Lane which is required to facilitate access to farm land to the north of the proposed A66 and also provide a safe crossing point for non motorised users utilising the Hutton Magna 12 bridleway.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>During the feasibility stage (as part of the Trans Pennine Strategic Route Study) a number of options were considered as alternatives to the full dualling of the A66. This included an assessment of individual highway interventions aimed at improving one localised part of the route, either a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						junction or a specific route sub-section. The outcome from the evaluation of these options is that they did not provide the wide ranging strategic benefits that the full dualling of the A66 would deliver in terms of Journey time savings, safety (reduction in accidents) and reliability. Further information on the many alternative options appraisal can found in the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR).	
352	153134, 153339, 153616, 154137, 154243		153586, 154017	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on agricultural land. Respondents expressing concern about the loss of land currently used for grazing and crops, and the subsequent impact that this would have on the farming business.	Our environment team has carried out, detailed surveys and studies to better understand the unique landscape, species, and habitats around the A66. However, it is inevitable that a project of this size will have some effect on the local environment. Our aim therefore is to minimise the overall impact we might make in the area by introducing measures that replace anything lost or damaged. We are introducing woodland, grassland, wetland habitats, heathland, and hedgerows. Introducing these features provides an opportunity to enhance the local landscape and protect important wildlife, including bats, barn owls, reptiles, red squirrels, and white-clawed crayfish. We have refined our plans for environmental mitigation since our autumn consultation. Several factors have	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need to acquire as much land as we previously indicated. We have refined the Order Limits as far as we are able to do so with the current level of design and further refinement will happen at the detailed design stage should development consent be granted.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land.</p>	
369	148619, 149403, 149412, 151336, 151518, 152942, 152986, 153053, 153362, 153616, 153963, 154243	North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	151490, 151502	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Mainsgill	<p>Respondents including North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern about walking, cycling and horse-riding impacts around Mainsgill and Mainsgill Farm Shop, specifically:</p> <p>i) there is confusion as to why a right of way through the premises of Mainsgill is being closed as part of the project and moved to the side of the premises.</p>	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. We address each of the points raised in turn:</p> <p>i) following engagement with key stakeholders at WCH focus groups, concerns were raised regarding safety of the existing route which crosses a busy junction. As part of the works at Mains Gill junction the opportunity has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>ii) that there should be footpaths from Mainsgill to Fox Hall inn and up to the bridge at West Layton.</p> <p>iii) that the bridleway and A66 junction is still unsafe.</p>	<p>been taken to improve the alignment and safety of this route .</p> <p>ii) We have proposed a shared walking/horse-riding path in the verge along the de-trunked A66 from Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together and provide a link from Mainsgill Far shop to the Fox Hall Inn and the new Collier lane bridge to West Layton.</p> <p>iii)The rerouted bridlepath is the result of user requests to remove the route from the farm access where riders would often have to negotiate high traffic levels at the farm access junction. Any crossing provided on the de-trunked A66 will be designed in accordance with current standards/best practice and the overall design of crossings will be subject to the Road Safety Audit process.</p> <p>Further information on the provisions made by the Project can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
378	154243	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire	154017	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern about the potential impact of the scheme on cycle paths, footpaths and bridleways currently used by walkers,	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents expressing concern about a perceived lack of provisions in the proposals to ensure a continuous active travel network.	accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. We have proposed a shared walking/horse-riding path in the verge along the de-trunked A66 on from Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together. Further information on the extensive provision made by the Project can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (Application Document 2.4).	
403	151459, 151496, 152134, 152902, 152909, 152939, 152996, 153067, 153070, 153793, 153907, 153910, 154220	East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on traffic, transport, and junctions, in particular relation to congestion. Respondents expressing concern about a potential increase in traffic as a result of the scheme, which they feel would worsen existing congestion in the area and may cause an increase in fuel expenditure and journey times. Concerns are raised about increased traffic to West Layton, West and East Layton becoming a rat run, traffic around Scotch Corner, traffic past Fox Hotel where the two lanes go from two to one and traffic in direction of Barnard Castle. Respondents also suggest that Moor	The proposed dualling of the A66 will remove the existing bottleneck which is experienced by westbound traffic at the point at which the current carriageway reduces from two lanes into one. By allowing traffic to be free flowing through this section, and by improving the vertical geometry of the highway to prevent lorries and other heavy good vehicles causing other vehicles to slow, the proposed scheme will remove the existing experienced delays. The Transport Assessment report (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner, including within the Affected Road Network (ARN)	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Lane should not be connected to Mainsgill access or the A66.	<p>which incorporates East and West Layton, Barnard Castle, Moor Lane and Mainsgill Farm. The A66 dualling does not exacerbate current congestion. The Project provides additional capacity on the A66 to relieve congestion and remove rat running.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
406	154000		153846, 154001	Community impact - Antisocial behaviour	<p>Respondents raise concern about anti-social behaviour. fly tipping, general littering and unauthorised camping/parking and its impact on the community and Mainsgill Farm Shop. Respondents suggest that access to the field east of Foxwell Farm is restricted by a locked gate so that the land cannot be misused.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge concerns about safety and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Pond access tracks will be treated as private means of access (PMA) and will be securely gated to ensure access is by authorised people only. We will not be gating Foxwell</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Farm but will be gating the PMA that leads to the drainage pond.</p> <p>While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. The new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker more reliable journey times, enabling people to spend less time on the road, which may lead to reduced litter/fly tipping.</p> <p>Regarding overnight camping, the management and control of how byways are used is a matter for the local authority.</p>	
432	148570, 149782, 152939, 152986, 153070, 153335, 153365, 153793, 153859, 153910, 153939, 154198, 154370, 154469	East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council	154371, 154372	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents including East & West Layton Carkin Parish Council expressing concern about the safety of existing junctions, specifically mentioning the junctions at New Lane and Moor Lane. Respondents expressing concern about a perceived increase in the potential for road traffic accidents due to increased traffic on the road, increased speed of motorists and increased complexity of junctions.	Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys. The Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch (COBALT) analysis carried out to assess the Project's impact on accidents showed that over the 60-year appraisal period the Project saves 281 personal injury accidents, of which 3% are fatal, 21% are serious, and 76% are slight. Overall, the Project saves 6,975 accidents, of which 4% involve personal injury and 96% are damage-only. Further information can	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>be found in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The proposals for the scheme remove the need for any at grade minor junctions on the A66 mainline and provide a safe grade separated access at Mains Gill Junction meaning that traffic from the surrounding villages will be able to safely access the A66 in the future. Detailed traffic modelling and Road Safety Audits have been carried out to demonstrate that the proposals do not impact on the safety of the surrounding road network. Further information can be found in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	
435	153833, 154137, 154173, 154261		153586, 154372	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the cost of the scheme, with some comments questioning whether the works are necessary and suggesting that certain aspects of the scheme are not an efficient use of resources.</p>	<p>The A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project is part of the Government's Road Investment Strategy (RIS), which identifies parts of the strategic road network which need upgrading to improve safety, connectivity, and reliability for its users. The government has set a cost allocation for this scheme of around £1bn.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2) where an overview of the need for the Project including economic, social, environmental and legacy benefits can also be found.	
495	152134, 153374, 153571, 153797, 153965, 154137		154372	Community impact - People	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on people in the community and their quality of life causing danger, health, noise, and visual impacts.	An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions (such as noise and air quality), green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors. The scheme is assessed to lead to positive health effects during operation including from traffic congestion along the A66 being reduced as a result of the Project, leading to shorter, more reliable journey times. This will lead to improved connectivity for residents of West Layton and the surrounding rural community to shops, services and facilities. Better connectivity can benefit mental and physical health through increased access to a wide range of resources including employment, educational facilities, health and social care, sport, leisure and cultural facilities, basic needs such as food shopping, and opportunities for social interaction. Positive health benefits are also expected to result from a reduction in driver stress due to improved road infrastructure and layout of this, improved road safety and better facilities for walking, cycling and horse riding. Further information can be found in Chapter 13 of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of noise and vibration has been carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for construction and operation of the scheme and is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Landscape and visual impact of the proposals has been a key consideration in the design process. Measures such as grading out of steep slopes in sensitive areas, planting to screen the new road, dry stone walling and consideration to the aesthetics of all bridges and structures have been incorporated as part of the proposals. An environmental assessment has been carried out to consider the effects of both the construction and operational phase. Where the assessment identified that the construction or operation of the scheme has the potential for significant adverse effects, mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the effects where required and practicable. The ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) show one way in which the landscape and environmental mitigation for the Project could be delivered. The Environmental Management Plan</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 2.7) sets out the detail of the environmental mitigation, including measures to reduce noise and disturbance to local residents and communities, and compliance with the measures in the EMP is secured by the provisions of the draft DCO.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public. An aim of the scheme is to reduce delays, create a free-flowing road network and improve safety. Appropriate safety standards have been incorporated into the design of the scheme.</p> <p>During operation, there is also the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity may also be a significant effect for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and usability of community land and assets.</p>	
638	153819		154372	Engineering design and	Respondents expressing concern about the lack of sound and visual screening around Mainsgill Farm and	The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				development - Mitigation	that the environmental works planned will not mitigate the visual and noise impact due to the topography of the land which falls steeply south to the A66.	<p>reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The noise assessment is underpinned by modelling which considers factors such as traffic speed, wind, and topography.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The scheme design includes a modern road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation.</p> <p>The landscape and visual assessment of the scheme can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The assessment identifies potential significant visual impacts on Mainsgill Farm during construction and operation. Landscape mitigation for the Project has sought to ameliorate or offset impacts where possible.</p>	
766	148611, 152996, 153616, 154000		154001, 154372	Economics - Local economy	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on the local economy, particularly for tourism and business. Respondents expressing concern that the scheme could negatively impact tourism in the area and coupled with the impact of the scheme on agricultural land and farming businesses, respondents are	The work we will deliver through this Project will bring far-reaching benefits to those that use and live near the route. It will provide improved connections between Cumbria, Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear, but also routes between Scotland and the major towns and cities across the north. By providing better links, we will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>concerned that this could harm the local economy.</p>	<p>unlock access to tourism, jobs, essential services, and new opportunities. The existing A66 is a key national and regional strategic link; it carries high levels of freight traffic, slow moving agricultural and non-motorised traffic as well as being an important route for tourism and providing vital connectivity for nearby communities. There are no direct rail alternatives for passenger or freight movements along the corridor.</p> <p>During operation of the new A66, there is the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity may also be a significant effect for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and usability of community land and assets.</p> <p>If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity and threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse agenda.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the scheme on local businesses, in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance, is</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						set out in the Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).	
892	152986		154372	Community impact - Property	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the scheme on residential and business properties in the community and on those who own them stating that properties could be subject to increased fly tipping or antisocial behaviour and that they could decrease in value.	While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour and fly tipping, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority. The new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker more reliable journey times, enabling people to spend less time on the road, which may lead to reduced litter/fly tipping.	No
902	153315			Construction - Timescale	One respondent expressing concern that no clear timescale for the construction period has been provided.	Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases. Construction of the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme is expected to take around 2 years. At this stage, National Highways has programmed to start this scheme in 2026, this may be subject to change. Construction methods and phasing have been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Project, (Application Document 3.2)	
903	149425			Construction - Disruption	Respondent concerned that current traffic congestion arising from the current A66 carriageway reducing from two lanes into one, as noted by the respondent due to the A1(M) J53 to Collier Lane Junction and Mainsgill Farm, on this scheme will get worse during construction. They also state that this results in vehicles using single country lanes.	<p>The proposed dualling of the A66 will remove the existing bottleneck which is experienced by westbound traffic at the point at which the current carriageway reduces from two lanes into one. Doing so will remove the existing traffic issues and reduce the need for vehicles to access the local road network and surrounding villages to avoid congestion.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important, and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>detailed Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the Environmental Management Plan, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. The Traffic Management Plan will ensure that any disruption is minimised and will explain how the Project will minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local road through appropriate communication and signage. Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can look to be implemented if deemed necessary.</p> <p>It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p> <p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1098			149368	Land - Use of old A66 road	<p>One respondent expressing concern that unused parts of the old A66 could be used for unlawful traveller sites, specifically mentioning an area of land near Foxwell Farm.</p>	<p>Responding to this feedback, the scheme includes a new westbound slip road to provide access to the new westbound A66 dual carriageway for local farms and properties to the south of the A66 in this location. The access track to Browson Bank farm, which was impacted by the new road, has been redesigned to fit in with this change. This proposal should reduce journey times for those accessing the A66 in the area by avoiding detours to Moor Lane Junction for access to the A66 in addition to reducing the likelihood of misuse by increasing the volume of traffic travelling along the de-trunked A66 when compared to the design presented at statutory Consultation.</p> <p>In addition, highway boundary fencing and gates are proposed at access points to prevent unauthorised entry to adjacent land, for example in the area of land near Foxwell Farm.</p> <p>Although it will not be the responsibility of National Highways to police the use of the de-trunked section of the route the proposal described above will help to prevent the de-trunked A66 from becoming a dead-end with the potential for misuse.</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1171	153616, 154243	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	154017	Land - Dick Scot Lane Access	<p>Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concerns regarding the access around Dick Scot Lane; the accommodation road north of Dick Scot Lane being private; uncertainty on whether the access road would connect to New Road, and land take due to proposed design. Suggestions amongst respondents; access roads to be extended east of Dick Scot Lane to Collier Lane, and thus the underpass would not be needed; ensuring that the underpass is at least 5 meters high and 5 meters wide; access road to Layton to be moved to the east for direct access to the old A66; moving the underpass further west; a larger concrete area to build so that the slurry shop and tipping area are accommodated; access track to be constructed by tarmac; tipping area to be extended in the west to ensure safety.</p>	<p>The new 6m wide, 5.7m high underpass provision to the north of Dick Scot Lane will provide a private means of access for farm machinery from the de-trunked A66 to the existing fields to the north of the new alignment in addition to allowing a safer connection to the Hutton Magna 12 bridleway. The land take for the proposed private access has been derived as a result of the required width of the access road in addition to an allowance for a drainage ditch, maintenance strip for the A66 mainline and also an adjacent fence line. The materials for the construction of the proposed access track will be developed during detail design in conjunction with the land owner and other user groups.</p> <p>Connection to New Road is not provided by the proposed private access track, however it does connect to an existing private field track which would allow the farmer access to New Road.</p> <p>Connection of the private means of access to Collier Lane would result in additional land take by the scheme. Direct connection is provided by the scheme between West Layton and the de-trunked A66 via the proposed Collier Lane overbridge.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						At the western extents of the track, provision has been made to accommodate a new slurry tank to replace one lost by the scheme, and an appropriate turning head has been provided.	
1172	154137			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Browson Bank Farm access	One respondent expressed concern regarding access to Browson Bank Farm, specifically referring to the road being at least 4 metres wide to accommodate large farm machinery and HGV's.	A private means of access of minimum width of 4m has been proposed as part of the works at Browson Bank Farm and entrances to the proposed highway network have been designed to accommodate HGV and large farm machinery movements.	No
1179	148591, 149425, 150165, 151352, 153315		153586, 153846, 154145	Construction - Disruption from construction	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of the construction of the scheme. Concerns raised are noise and pollution; access to properties and businesses during construction; re-routing signage to avoid unnecessary traffic.	It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important, and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption. The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will have to produce a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the Environmental Management Plan, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will ensure that any disruption is minimised and will explain how the Project will minimise the risk of rat-running on existing local road through appropriate communication and signage and the use of diversion routes will be monitored.</p> <p>The purpose of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) is to set out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation, as identified in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This will be further developed by the Principal Contractor. The EMP sets out measures that must be implemented to control lighting, dust, noise, spillage, and the movement of construction traffic on local roads. It also sets out the requirements for the Principal Contractor(s) to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Where local access is required to be maintained, traffic management plans will look to be adapted, with the construction teams working closely with the stakeholders, local councils, and blue light services.</p> <p>Where there are key concerns, the traffic management team will look to liaise with stakeholders and local authorities through regular sessions, where additional measures can be identified and implemented if deemed necessary.</p>	
1182	152942			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic modelling	Respondent expressing concern about the traffic modelling and traffic loading through Melsonby and by not modelling that across the wider area and including Moor Lane and Collier Lane, the attraction of the new Moor Lane Junction could result in traffic flows which far exceed that junction's design and safety margins.	The strategic traffic model represents all of the movements raised by the consultee and does not forecast traffic of this nature as journeys on the improved A66 and existing A1(M) will be faster than on the local road network. Traffic on the local road network will be reduced as the current congestion on the A66 that occurs due to traffic slowing to access the Mainsgill Farm Shop will be removed through the provision of the grade separated Mains Gill junction, which will be designed to accept the traffic flows from the strategic traffic model report and the dualling of this section.	No
1238		Richmondshire District		Traffic, transport, and junctions -	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that access to Mainsgill	There are no changes proposed regarding access to Mainsgill Farm	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Access to Mainsgill Farm	Farm is important as it is a popular destination.	and access will be maintained both during construction and operation.	
1241	153616			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Slurry store replacement	Respondents expressing concern that the proposed provision of a replacement slurry store is not big enough and does not allow for a tipping area or for tractors and trailers to turn around.	The Order Limits make sufficient provision for a proposed slurry store of the existing size to be accommodated and associated turning head for tractors to turn around.	No
1242	152996			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Narrow local roads	Respondents expressing concern that Dick Scot Lane and the two roads connecting Dalton and Newsham are too narrow and make passing impossible.	Dick Scot Lane and the two roads connecting Dalton and Newsham are outside of the scope of this Project and National Highways are not amending or changing any provision on Dick Scot Lane. The lanes are managed by North Yorkshire County Council in its role as local highway authority.	No
1243	151459			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Mainsgill Farm shop safety	Respondent expressing concern about near misses when vehicles attempt to turn east near Mainsgill Farm shop.	The proposed scheme removes traffic associated with the key east and west bound movements away from the existing Mainsgill access. Traffic egressing from Mainsgill wishing to travel on the A66 will be required to turn west thus reducing the potential for conflict with east turning vehicles.	No
1257	148693	Richmondshire District Council and		Walking, cycling and	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		North Yorkshire County Council North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service		horse-riders - Crossings	Service expressing concern that some of the changes proposed in the scheme could lead to increased risk for road users, for example where traffic levels might be high, in instances where individuals have to cross busy roads, or share the road with fast-moving traffic.	<p>separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders (WCH) is of paramount importance. WCH provision will be of adequate width and design for users. Any at-grade crossing points will be designed in accordance with current national standards and subject to the road safety audit process. All facilities for WCH users will be a betterment in terms of connectivity and safety, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement Project.</p> <p>We have proposed a shared horse-pedestrian path in the verge along the de-trunked A66 on from Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor to better connect bridleways and footpaths together.</p> <p>The current proposals are subject to the road safety audit process both during the current preliminary design stage and during subsequent detailed design and construction stages. The stage 1 RSA undertaken during the current design stage did not flag safety concerns associated with this element of the design.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
347			153611	Land - Other	Respondents expressing concerns about the project's impact on West Layton Nurseries and whether it will lose land, how access will change and noting a particular concern about access from Collier Lane being compromised.	We acknowledge the concern regarding loss of land and we have worked to keep the land required from West Layton Nurseries to an absolute minimum. No alterations are anticipated to the main access of the nursery which is via a lane to the north of West Layton Manor which is outwith the scheme boundary. The current field access from Collier Lane to the southern side of West Layton Nursery will be maintained.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner – Environment' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
1028			152983	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	One respondent expressing support for the improvements at Scotch Corner on the grounds that it will reduce delays, leading to less congestion and reduced localised emissions. Respondents state that this will then have a positive impact on air quality.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
1130		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Historic England expressing support that the minimal works proposed on the scheme at Scotch Corner will not have any impact to heritage assets.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
871	150169, 153901			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents suggesting consideration be made for the wildlife at Scotch Corner, specifically mentioning that there needs to be a way for wildlife such as deer to be able to safely cross the road.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The EMP (Application Document 2.7), and the measures contained within it, has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction and operation impacts on habitats and species and would seek to employ best-practice methods for dealing with habitat loss, habitat severance, disturbance and species mortality. Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. In relation to deer, a review of the roadkill data and biological records combined with field surveys carried out at Scotch Corner did not identify the requirement for a deer specific crossing point at this location.	
473	153339, 153797, 153965	Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents expressing concerns regarding the negative impacts on wildlife and habitats as a result of the Project. These concerns include: incursion into SACs and SSSIs; the loss of habitat important for red list birds and mammals; ecological isolation; environmental degradation; and farmland destruction.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites (including SACs and SSSIs) and receptors (such as protected bird species and mammals) potentially impacted by the Project. The Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (Application Document 3.6) assesses in detail the potential for likely significant effects on European sites (SAC, SPA, RAMSAR). The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the design. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) show how	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>the mitigation could be implemented.</p> <p>Mitigation measures include ecological design features such as species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts, creating new areas of habitat and restoring/enhancing linkages to adjacent locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable/sensitive and protected species.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7), and the measures contained within it, has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction and operation impacts on habitats and species and would seek to employ best-practice methods for dealing with habitat loss, habitat severance, disturbance and species mortality.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Document Reference 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land holdings. ES, Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) also considers impacts to both soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC).</p>	
1095	150169			Environment - general (non	One respondent suggesting roadside tree planting for environmental and	The Project landscape and ecological planting, as outlined on the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
				PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	visual amenity mitigation, providing a suggested depth of at least 10m.	Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8), has been developed to mitigate environmental effects. As a consequence, the planting presented varies in depth and species composition across each scheme. The planting has been designed to include a mix of appropriate native species. Safety concerns in terms of proximity of trees to the roadway has also been considered during the design process and where space allows the design provides for a transition between species rich grassland, woodland edge and woodland planting. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) show how landscape and ecological mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits.	
499		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the noise impact from diverted vehicles during the construction period, particularly HGVs. They state that an investigation into noise sensitive receptors within a radius of 300m from any construction activity will be necessary, as defined in DMRB LA 111 guidance. They request further detail on proposed diversion routes. The respondent states that the noise impact on residents will be substantial due to rurality and higher HGV	National Highways recognises concerns over the disruption to the local road network and communities during construction of the Project and will seek to reduce disruption while maintaining highway safety. The noise and vibration assessment (ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, Application Document 3.2) for the Project has been carried out in accordance with DMRB guidance and considers sensitive receptors within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					<p>volumes on small roads, stating that this issue requires extensive consideration.</p>	<p>construction and vibration study area. The construction noise and vibration assessment gives consideration to the effects associated with on-site construction traffic i.e. noise emissions of construction traffic within Order Limits, as well as off-site construction traffic i.e. noise increase due to construction traffic using the existing nearby road network. The assessment also covers noise effects of possible diversion routes in line with the guidance presented in DMRB LA 111.</p> <p>The potential impacts of the compounds and the activities associated with them will be controlled by measures to limit or avoid dust, noise, spillage, and disruption by construction traffic as set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented. As outlined within the Annex B5 - Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NMVP) which accompanies the EMP, the Principal Contractor will determine whether applications under 'Section 61' are appropriate in relation to noise and vibration management. If applications are deemed to be required, the Principal Contractor will submit applications for approval to the appropriate Local Authority prior to construction.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
850	153839, 153965, 153339, 153797,		152983	Climate impact	<p>Respondents expressing general concern with the climate impacts of upgrading the road, specifically mentioning increased traffic and construction emissions and destruction of green space. One respondent notes as evidence the National Highways appraisal which states that the upgrade will add 3 million tonnes of carbon from increased journeys.</p>	<p>The DCO application sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and within the ES, Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)).</p> <p>National Highways is required under law (the EIA Regulations) and policy (the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>The quoted 3 million tonnes of carbon relates to the values presented in the PEI Report. The GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the upgrade will add 2,068,844 tCO₂e tonnes of carbon from increased journeys. The change from the PEI Report results from the confirmation of the alignment of the Project, and the adoption of a future dataset on typical vehicle emissions which considers more fully the effects of decarbonisation of road vehicles. The assessment concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on the ability for Government to comply with meeting its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to be net zero in construction. The Climate assessment, presented in ES Chapter 7, however, assesses the potential carbon benefits of proposed Biodiversity mitigation, which may result in the sequestration of carbon.</p>	
1073	149367			Climate Impact	One respondent suggesting that climate impact could be reduced by not	The DCO application sets out, in various documents such as the Case	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
					<p>upgrading the junction. They state that the upgrade is unnecessary since climate impact is best reduced by reducing demand for car journeys, and they suggest that Highways England (now National Highways) should invest in reducing demand instead.</p>	<p>for the Project which identifies the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy NPSNN (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>National Highways is required under law (environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)) and policy (the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per NPSNN and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on the ability for Government to comply with meeting its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040 and road user emissions by 2050. The National Highways Net Zero Highways Plan supports the DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan which provides a system level strategy for decarbonisation.</p>	
874	152270, 153339, 153797			Landscape visual	<p>Respondents expressing general concerns with the visual impact of the development in the AONB, an environment valued for its heritage and aesthetics, suggesting that it goes against aims of landscape preservation. One respondent expressing a specific concern about a strip of woodland next to St Mary's Church at Rokeby which was felled for timber and replanted and is currently subject to slow regrowth impacting visual screening.</p>	<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area and AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform and restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						<p>grassland planting. Mitigation measures are secured through the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual and Cultural Heritage teams have worked together on Project design and mitigation. Church Plantation at Rokeby forms part of the Grade II* Registered Park & Garden of Rokeby Park. Through engagement with Historic England, the Project proposes to carry out improvement planting in the part of the plantation which has been subject to extensive felling in recent times.</p> <p>An assessment of the effects of the Project on the historic environment is provided in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on the landscape is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). Reference to important heritage assets have been made throughout the baseline and assessment sections of the ES Chapter. Heritage assets are not assessed separately but instead their contribution to landscape character is considered and an assessment of effects on landscape character made on that basis. Four of the 13 assessed</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change? (Y/N)
	s47	s42(1)(a) / s42(1)(b)	s42(1)(d)				
						visual receptors for the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme retain a significant adverse impact after mitigation. None of the 24 landscape character designations, including Rokeby Park have a residual significant impact.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
389	148568, 148569, 148583, 148588, 148591, 148600, 148603, 148604, 148609, 148612, 148616, 148626, 149351, 149370, 153037, 154213, 154243	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	149381, 153321, 154190	General / no reason given	Respondents including North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service expressing support for the scheme, without providing further details. One respondent expressing support for the A66 slip road leading north to A6055, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the route being promoted including from North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue. The Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7) clarifies that existing flows on the A6055 are low in relation to the capacity of the road and therefore the additional flows expected as a result of the Project will not impact the operation of the road. It is not expected to see any deterioration in journey times as a result of the Project.	No
834	153316, 153829, 153907			Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents expressing support for traffic controls at Scotch Corner. Respondents state that the traffic lights already in place have an important role in maintaining effective traffic control at the junction and are therefore pleased that there are no plans to remove traffic controls.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
835	152948, 153316, 153936			Engineering design and development - Design	Respondents expressing support for the design of the improvements proposed in the scheme for Scotch Corner. In particular, respondents support improved lane markings and	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					the incorporation of additional lanes on the grounds that they should provide better access to the roundabout from all directions. Respondents state that these changes will help to tidy up the junction and make it less complex, meaning that it becomes more accessible for road users.		
836	148637, 153316, 153386		149355, 152983	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the scheme on the grounds that it will reduce traffic congestion at Scotch Corner. In particular, respondents highlight the importance of Scotch Corner as a major junction and that any improvements made to it that improve the traffic flow are most welcome. Respondents state that the modelling of traffic provided shows that the junction should be able to handle the increased capacity arising from the Project.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future; this information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7).	No
854	153907, 153939			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support for safety improvements for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders around the junction at Scotch Corner. In particular, respondents state that the crossing at the junction is one of the few grade separated routes over the A1 and that lights at the roundabouts make the crossing much safer. Places where people use crossings in the area for access include Richmond and Catterick.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
911	149415, 153954			Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support on the grounds that the scheme will improve traffic safety at Scotch Corner, specifically mentioning that the improvements aim to make it less complex for people navigating the junction for the first time.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme being promoted.	No
754	148593, 149374, 152219, 153833, 153839			Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the scheme, without providing further details.	National Highways acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the scheme. Please refer to the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2), which sets out the need for the scheme.	No
29	149369, 149407, 150175, 151461, 151470, 151484, 151486, 152906, 153860, 153939, 154210			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cycleway / footpath / bridleway	<p>Respondents suggesting that the scheme requires greater provision for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders and that there is a need for separate cycle provision along the route as well as for crossing the junction.</p> <p>Routes that are highlighted are the Westbound cycle route for A66 to Richmond; better integration with the rights of way at Kneeton Hall; and cycle provision from Kirkby Stephen to Penrith.</p>	<p>Works to Scotch Corner are minor, centred around Middleton Tyas Lane approach. No changes will be made to the existing WCH provision which currently hosts shared cycle/footways and associated toucan crossings. The junction has recently undergone more extensive remodelling and improvement works as part of the Dishforth to Barton A1(M) upgrade which included WCH upgrades which were subject to road safety audit at the time. These will not be affected and will be retained.</p> <p>National Highways and the Department of Transport (DfT) has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Study (TPRSS) (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the dualling of the remaining section of single carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and formed the scope of the project. A cycle track from Kirkby Stephen to Penrith, from the A66 to Richmond and from the A66 to Kneeton Hall are therefore outside of the DfT's project remit.	
53	148564, 148570, 148578, 148585, 148612, 148615, 148640, 149416, 150178, 150185, 150189, 150462, 151336, 151496, 151518, 152250, 152944, 153034, 153035,	Middleton Tyas Parish Council	151465, 152983, 153948	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council suggesting design changes to the A66/A1(M) roundabout. Changes suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating the entrance for the new services away from the roundabout to ease traffic and number of exits; • Creating slip roads in both directions to allow traffic to avoid the roundabout; • Easing the angle of attack for HGVs joining the A66 westbound from its current sharp angle; • Better lighting; • Reducing HGV traffic; • Improving the free-flow of traffic heading south on the A1(M) to Junction 53 (Scotch Corner); 	<p>National Highways acknowledges the range of views expressed. The Project has been designed to accommodate both existing and future traffic including that attributed to committed developments. Detailed traffic modelling has been carried out to demonstrate that the proposals do not impact on the operation of the surrounding road network. The Performance of the junction is shown in Chapter 8.2 of 3.07 Transport Assessment.</p> <p>During the design process, the following suggestions have been considered:</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153038, 153333, 153335, 153814, 153910, 154213, 162144				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating direct connections between the A66 and A1; • and that suitable surfaces are used for Public Rights of Way. 	<p>Locating the entrance for the new services away from the roundabout to ease traffic and number of exits; Creating slip roads in both directions to allow traffic to avoid the roundabout; Easing the angle of attack for HGVs joining the A66 westbound from its current sharp angle; Better lighting; Improving the free-flow of traffic heading south on the A1(M) to Junction 53 (Scotch Corner), and; Creating direct connections between the A66 and A1.</p> <p>The level of performance achieved within the design year with the proposed design shows that spending significantly more public money on introducing any of the above works to the junction would not be economically viable. The project is subject to the Road Safety Audit process which will ensure the improvements and final operation of the junction do not introduce any road safety issues.</p> <p>One of the objectives of the Project is to Ensure the improvement and long-term development of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) through providing better national connectivity including freight. Reducing the volume</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of HGVs would therefore not align with the aim of the investment.</p> <p>The surfaces of diverted Public rights of Way will be suitable for their use and bridleways will not be surfaced with asphalt. They will be compacted stone or granite dust topped, and in keeping with the surrounding environment at Scotch Corner.</p>	
384	148585, 148640, 150185, 151352, 151453, 152201, 152250, 152902, 152911, 152948, 154204, 154230	Middleton Tyas Parish Council	149368	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	<p>Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council suggesting changes to signage and traffic signals to improve traffic safety and reduce congestion. Suggestions are: improved and visible road lane markings and signs on slip road from A1(M) northbound, on A66 eastbound and on Middleton Tyas lane to A1(M) southbound; restricting HGV access to the bridge at Barnard Castle and Egglestone Bridge; restricting tractors and horse-drawn vehicles from the main East-West artery road; improved lighting at junctions, diversion signs for times when junction between A1(M) and A66 is closed; and, improved timing on traffic lights on the A1(M) and A66 junction.</p>	<p>The comments raised are duly noted. Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have reviewed feedback, worked further on developing the design and completing surveys. We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design has been revised to improve aspects such as lane markings, signage, lighting and signal phasing. This will be further developed during the detailed design stage of the Project. The weight restriction signage which restricts HGV access to Barnard Castle along the B6277 will remain. The proposed A66 upgrade will not include signage to restrict tractors and horse-drawn vehicles from the public highway. They are allowed on the public highway. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This information is used to ensure that the design has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7).	
443	153362, 153907	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	<p>Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that safety considerations are required for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders at Scotch Corner.</p> <p>In particular, respondents state that with the addition of an extra lane, consideration is needed for how non-motorists cross the road. Respondents suggesting that crossing signals continue to be used with the lights but that they cross into the centre of the roundabout on the grounds that this will offer a safer and shorter alternative than having signal crossings around the outside of the roundabout.</p>	Works to Scotch Corner junction are minor, centred around Middleton Tyas Lane approach. No changes will be made to the existing WCH provision which currently hosts shared cycle/footways and associated toucan crossings. The junction has recently undergone more extensive remodelling and improvement works as part of the Dishforth to Barton A1(M) upgrade which included WCH upgrades which were subject to road safety audit at the time. These will not be affected and will be retained (including the crossing of the Middleton Tyas arm). The proposals are subject to the road safety audit process both during the current preliminary design stage and during subsequent detailed design and construction stages.	No
485	153814	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	154456	Request for further information / Traffic, transport and junctions/ Consultation / Noise	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council requesting further information on how traffic will change on local roads and how the A1(M) Junction 53 Scotch Corner junction improvements have been assessed in regards noise impacts.	As part of the work carried out by National Highways, an assessment of the impact of the scheme on traffic on the local road network has been carried out. The assessment shows an increase on the A1(M) north and south of Scotch Corner. These increases are due to the improved A66 attracting	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>more traffic to the strategic road network from the local road network. There is an increase on the A6055 north of Scotch Corner. The existing flows on the A6055 are low in relation to the capacity of the road and therefore the additional flows expected as a result of the scheme will not impact the operation of the road. It is not expected to see any deterioration in journey times as a result of the Project. Further information is provided in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7).</p> <p>An assessment of the noise impact of the scheme is provided within Environmental Statement Chapter 10, Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 3.2). This assessment includes consideration of A1 (M) Junction 53 improvements. The assessment has followed the methodology set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and Vibration (DMRB LA 111) and any other relevant guidance.</p>	
503	149367, 149374, 152219, 153797, 153833	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire		Traffic, transport and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that demand for road transport should be reduced and that greater provision should be made for public transport	National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			<p>both as part of, and instead of the scheme at Scotch Corner and some respondents suggest that this needs to be done to reduce carbon emissions. Respondents state that provision should be made for public transport routes across the A66. Respondents also suggesting that instead of expanding roads the money should be used to invest into public transport instead, specifically mentioning rail as a potential beneficiary of this alternative investment.</p>	<p>practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>Chapter 3.3. of 4.1 Project Development Overview Report describes the work carried out to develop a Project with the aim of improving connectivity and delivering transformational economic growth across the Northern Region.</p> <p>It notes that there is no rail line to provide an alternative main mode and public transport route to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith and that there is low bus service provision.</p> <p>For the other trans-Pennine corridor that was considered (the A69), the Carlisle to Newcastle railway was</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>evaluated as a public transport alternative. As there were improvements already planned for this line, it was possible therefore to evaluate non-highway intervention options for the Carlisle to Newcastle Corridor.</p> <p>Therefore, it was determined that there were no viable non-highway intervention options for either the A69 or A66 corridors (that would solve the issues identified) and as such, focus was on highway intervention options only.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Document Reference 2.4).</p>	
713	151462, 151484, 153839			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	Respondents suggesting there is a need for provision for safe active travel methods around Scotch Corner on the grounds that active travel is a stated goal of Government. In particular, respondents suggest that a safe active travel route that connects to existing routes is required. Suggestions for how this can be achieved include either using parallel old alignments, or	Works to Scotch Corner are minor, centred around Middleton Tyas Lane approach. No changes will be made to the existing WCH provision which currently hosts shared cycle/footways and associated toucan crossings. The junction has recently undergone more extensive remodelling and improvement works as part of the Dishforth to Barton A1(M) upgrade	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					a segregated facility alongside the new road with safe crossing points.	which included WCH upgrades which were subject to road safety audit at the time. These will not be affected and will be retained and are deemed to offer a safe active travel route across the junction. .	
838	153901	Middleton Tyas Parish Council		Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council suggesting in general that the Project listen to local people and requesting return contact in case any clarification is required.	<p>National Highways welcomes the offer of further dialogue with Middleton Tyas Parish Council (MTPC). Contact details for the National Highways Team delivering the A66 dualling have been exchanged with MTPC.</p> <p>Consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Authorities and in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. Our Project team were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>up to the time of submitting the Development Consent Order application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals. Further detail is presented in the application for development consent. We can therefore demonstrate that we are engaging and listening to local people.</p> <p>All feedback received during the public consultation was recorded and considered and is reported within this Annex. Findings from the consultation are also summarised in the Consultation Report (Document reference 4.4).</p> <p>During construction, a Community Engagement Plan will be in place and it will be the responsibility of the Community Relations Manager (CRM) to manage these activities. The CRM will be responsible for engagement with the public, landowners, stakeholders and other interested parties, outreach and education, where appropriate. The CRM will keep local residents informed throughout construction of activities planned and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>progress being made. Community Liaison Groups will continue to also share information with local representatives.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor will further develop the Environmental Management Plan (Document Reference 2.7) and the Principal Contractor is required to have an open dialogue with the local community including a method for logging enquiries from the community.</p>	
840	148613, 153335	Middleton Tyas Parish Council		Engineering design and development - Priority of works	<p>Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council suggesting that this scheme should be given lower priority than the other schemes, specifically mentioning that:</p> <p>Upgrading the A66 is more urgent for safety reasons;</p> <p>Respondents suggest that the upgrade at Mainsgill Farm Shop junction should take priority;</p> <p>However, some respondents suggest that parts of the works on the Junction 53 scheme should be given priority, specifically the dedicated lane on the northern bridge taking traffic to the services and Middleton Tyas and the dedicated exit of Middleton Tyas Lane for traffic going south on the A1(M);</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge respondents' views on construction sequencing which will be considered further in the detailed design and construction preparation phase.</p> <p>National Highways is currently reviewing the order in which the construction of all proposed schemes across the Project will be built. This decision will be based on a number of factors including efficiency, cost effectiveness and minimising impact on stakeholders.</p> <p>Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Some respondents encourage the Applicant to start work on the whole Junction 53 upgrade as soon as possible.	<p>take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p> <p>Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the phasing of construction work is explained within the Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Project, (Application Document 3.2) (compliance with which is secured in the DCO).</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Traffic Management Plan as required by the Environmental Management Plan (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout the majority of the works. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes.</p>	
842			149776	Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondent suggesting that a more visible police presence could lead to an increase in the standard of driving along this stretch of road.	Policing matters are beyond the scope of the Project and remit of National Highways.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
847	148619, 153839			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting that motorised transport should not be prioritised over other forms of transport at Scotch Corner. Respondents suggest that new infrastructure projects for motorists should not come at a cost to walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents also suggesting that road building should be halted in favour of cycle lanes.	National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. It has continued the evaluation of route alignments for some schemes more recently in 2021 (the findings of which were presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation). The outcome from these assessments and the further development of the design for the DCO application demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the A66 dualling delivers the greatest level of strategic benefits (compared with alternative highway interventions), with particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, see the Project Development Overview Report (Document Reference 4.1) ii) There is no viable alternative mode solution (such as rail) as demonstrated in the feasibility work carried out between 2014-16 (as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study). For more information, please refer to the Project Development Overview	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Report (Document Reference 4.1) and the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2).</p> <p>The Project as a whole includes extensive improvements to WCH provision and the existing WCH facilities will be retained. Further information can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Document Reference 2.4). For Scheme 11 A1(M) Scotch Corner - works in this location are minor, centred around Middleton Tyas Lane approach, and no changes will be made to the existing WCH provision. The junction currently hosts shared cycle/footways and associated toucan crossings. These will not be affected and will be retained. Other works to Scotch Corner junction are out of scope of the Project. Prioritising Walking, Cycling and Horse riding (WCH) provision over motorised transport at a major motorway junction such as Scotch Corner would not achieve the Project's objectives. The proposed upgrades at the A1(M) Junction 53 at Scotch Corner will ensure that the junction will operate within capacity after the increased traffic flows as a result of the proposed upgrades to the A66. In addition, the scheme will also deliver localised</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						benefits for communities such as improved accessibility and better local connectivity. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2).	
852	148589, 148592, 152914, 152917, 154240, 154243			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting incorporating motorhome stopover facilities into the plan on the grounds of local economic benefits and the inconvenience of traditional campsites due to rural location. Respondents suggest a capacity of 5 to 10 motorhomes, with water and waste facilities similar to continental Aire system. Other facilities suggested are a new service station and an HGV rest area.	Overnight facilities for motorhomes are not within the scope of the Project but our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route but this will be a separate initiative from the Project.	No
1074	148640			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Restrict access	One respondent suggesting that access to the A66 should be prohibited for tractors and horse-drawn vehicles.	Tractors are permitted to use the highway though must comply with the Department for Transport's guide for tractors. Horse-drawn vehicles are permitted to use the highway though should be operated and maintained in accordance with standards set out in the Department for Transport's Code of Practice for Horse-Drawn Vehicles. Taking into account the work undertaken to date during the preliminary design, there is at present no reason (through accident statistics or otherwise) that prohibition of tractors and horse-drawn vehicles is justified.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1189	153362			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Scotch Corner	Respondents suggesting that there should be traffic light-controlled crossings for pedestrians and cyclists to cross all access roads on the Scotch Corner roundabout.	<p>All of the signalised arms of the junction have pedestrian and cycling controlled crossings. However, the arms of the junction that are not currently signalised do not have controlled pedestrian facilities. It is not within the scope of the Project to add new signalised pedestrian crossings to Middleton Tyas Lane.</p> <p>The Middleton Tyas proposals are subject to the road safety audit (“RSA”) process both during the current preliminary design stage and during subsequent detailed design and construction stages. The stage 1 RSA undertaken during the current design stage did not flag safety concerns associated with the uncontrolled crossing point.</p>	No
1192		Musgrave Parish Council		Engineering design and development - Tebay to Scotch Corner	Musgrave Parish Council suggesting that instead of dualling from Scotch Corner to Penrith, Tebay to Scotch Corner should have been dualled instead on the grounds that there are complications at the Brough, Kirkby Thore, Penrith areas.	National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. This earlier work concluded that the upgrade of the A66 between Penrith and Scotch Corner was the preferred option and culminated with the Preferred Route Announcement at the end of PCF Stage 2 in 2019. Ahead of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Autumn 2021 Consultation, a review of the development of the traffic model during PCF Stage 2 was carried out to confirm the conclusions reached at the end of PCF Stage 2. This review concluded that there would be a significant increase in traffic flows on the A66 approach to A1(M) Junction 53 as a result of the proposed upgrades to the A66. To accommodate this, it was proposed to widen the existing Middleton Tyas Lane approach to the A1(M) Junction 53 at Scotch Corner roundabout from one lane to two lanes; to alter road markings and kerbs on the circulatory carriageway to provide three lanes on the existing northern bridge structure; to relocate a section of footway, a bus stop, some signage, and lighting columns to the back of the widened carriageway to accommodate these works. 5.9.16 Design development between the Autumn 2021 Consultation and DCO application did not result in significant changes to the proposals for this scheme. Further information can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Document Reference 4.1).</p>	
30	148619, 151518, 153907, 154210	Richmondshire District Council and		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing general concern over whether the pedestrian,	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. A road safety audit has been carried out with recommendations incorporated or	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		North Yorkshire County Council			bicycle and horse-rider access will be safe, emphasising the importance of ensuring safety. Respondents express concern that the crossing points on the existing dualled sections are not up to the standard proposed on this Project.	<p>highlighted for inclusion at detailed design. Further information about road safety can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7).</p> <p>Existing dualled sections of the A66 are out of scope of this Project, however there is an opportunity to apply for designated funding to improve the bridleway crossing at Moor Road / Hargill junction. This is being carried out with the current dualling Project. The decision for successfully securing Designated Funding would be made during the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) period, where RIS2 runs from 2020 to 2025. Applying for funding does not guarantee that it will be granted. 5.1.6 Should funding be granted, the potential improvement opportunities would undergo feasibility design work outwith the scope of this Project and would be progressed in collaboration with the Local Authorities. Further information can be found in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Document Reference 2.4).</p>	
498	148591, 152201, 153384	Richmondshire District Council and		Construction - Disruption	Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern about the construction phase of the	Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		North Yorkshire County Council			<p>scheme and potential disruption caused by it and suggesting that sufficient information is communicated nationally regarding the works and alternative routes to use while construction takes place. Respondents ask for further information about working hours and location of compounds and depots.</p>	<p>schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Start dates for each scheme will be staggered to reduce the impacts with the A1(M) Junction 53 Scotch Corner scheme being the smallest on the Project. Construction of this scheme is expected to take less than 1 year with limited works taking place around the roundabout to improve connectivity. At this stage, National Highways plan to start work on this scheme in 2028, but this may be subject to change.</p> <p>Taking note of the scheme's size and limited complexity, there are no compounds proposed to be located on this scheme, with a larger compound established on the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme to help service these works.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the works required and the interface with the A1(M), works are expected to take place at night when reduced traffic movements are observed. For more details on working hours, please refer to the Environmental Management Plan, (Document Reference 2.7) (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO), A number of communication</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>measures will be implemented to ensure that all stakeholders are aware well in advance of any works taking place, any potential disruption and of diversion routes. For the works being carried out, there will be limited impacts on the A66 and A1(M). It is likely that only a small number of diversions will be required during the works, with reduced lanes likely to be implemented to keep traffic flowing.</p> <p>National Highways will provide relevant, accurate and timely information about network traffic and conditions to road users, including disruptions and changing road situations both regionally and nationally through a range of communication channels including websites, social media, e-mail alerts and mobile services (apps). It is likely that monthly meetings will be held with local council leads, stakeholders and interested parties on the upcoming traffic management plans, with a view to consulting and discussing the impacts and mitigation measures to be adopted.</p> <p>More information on traffic management can be found in the Traffic Management Plan and Environmental Management Plan Annex B14 Construction Traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Management Plan.	
504	148619, 152270, 152969, 154198, 154210	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents including Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern about lack of access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders.</p> <p>One respondent expressing agreement with Cumbria County Council that the overall A66 designs lack a continuous active travel network.</p> <p>Another respondent states that the plans require reasonable adjustment for Disabled Access and Leisure according to the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>Another respondent expressing concern about the suitability of the junction for horse-riders.</p> <p>Respondents expressing disappointment in the removal of the planned Scurragh Lane crossing on the grounds that cyclists did not use the current junction crossing, which they state is an assumption which has then been used to justify the removal.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that a grade separated crossing be added to the plan.</p>	<p>Works to Scotch Corner are minor, centred around Middleton Tyas Lane approach. No changes will be made to the existing WCH provision which currently hosts shared cycle/footways and associated toucan crossings. The junction has recently undergone more extensive remodelling and improvement works as part of the Dishforth to Barton A1(M) upgrade which included WCH upgrades which were subject to road safety audit at the time. These will not be affected and will be retained. The current route across the junction is deemed to be safe and fit for purpose and no further grade separation is justified or proposed.</p> <p>The demand for equine use of the junction is not deemed to justify a full upgrade for passage of horses across the junction.</p> <p>The pedestrian route and crossing points are DDA compliant.</p> <p>The current proposals are subject to the road safety audit process both during the current preliminary design stage and during subsequent detailed design and construction stages. The</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stage 1 RSA undertaken during the current design stage did not flag safety concerns associated with the uncontrolled crossing point at Middleton Tyas.</p> <p>The issue raised in regard to Scurragh Lane is historic in nature and is not deemed to apply to the proposed A66 NTP project.</p>	
755	153833			Economics - Cost	A respondent expresses concern with the economic cost of the upgrade on the grounds that it is unnecessary and expensive.	<p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses. Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Document Reference 4.1).</p> <p>An overview of the economic assessment of the scheme is provided in the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2).</p>	No
841	153034, 154230	Middleton Tyas Parish Council	153948	Traffic, transport and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council expressing concern about the proposed traffic control measures, specifically mentioning that	Comments duly noted. Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have reviewed feedback, worked further on developing the design and completing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					the timing and sequencing of the existing traffic lights at the A66 and A1(M) junction causes traffic congestion.	<p>surveys. We have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design has been revised to improve aspects such as lane markings, signage, lighting and signal phasing. This will be further developed during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future. This model has been used to optimise the timing and sequencing of traffic lights to minimise overall delay to drivers. This information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7).</p>	
843	148590, 150456, 153335			Traffic, transport and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing concern about the safety of the junctions, specifically mentioning the curves and sharp bends in the roundabout junction, mentioning examples of HGVs tipping over on the corner of the roundabout.	National Highways acknowledges the range of views expressed. The proposed design has included HGV swept path analysis to ensure vehicles can move safely through junction. The scheme is designed to current standards and is subject to the road safety audit process at this stage and subsequent stages of design development.	No
851	154240			Engineering design and	Respondents expressing concern about the rest area saying it is not fit	A new service area for HGVs is not within the scope of the Project. Our Users and Communities Designated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				development - General	for purpose and that it is not beneficial to disabled people.	Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route as a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. This includes making roadside facilities more accessible for all our customers, for example increasing the number of disabled parking spaces.	
870	153327, 153365, 153800, 153833, 153863			Need case	Respondents expressing concern about the need for a junction upgrade, stating that it works well as it is and that recent improvements have already been made.	There will be a significant increase in traffic flows on the A66 approach to A1(M) Junction 53 as a result of the proposed upgrades to the A66. National Highways are therefore proposing to provide additional lane widening on the Middleton Tyas Lane approach to the roundabout, with some revisions to the road markings on the roundabout to accommodate future traffic growth. These minor improvements at the A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner would ensure that it meets the future needs of the area for years to come and can cope with the increased capacity of the new A66 once the Project has been completed. Please refer to the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2) and the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7) for more detail.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
873	153339			Land - Agricultural	One respondent expressing a general concern about agricultural land, stating that this scheme will result in destruction of farmland.	Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Document Reference 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land. National Highways has sought to reduce proposed land take and use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality.	No
912	153797			Community impact - People - general / not specified	One respondent expressing concern that the scheme would not deliver the projected quality of life benefits to local residents.	Benefits will arise from the removal of congestion on the A66, freeing up local access. The scheme also delivers localised benefits for communities such as improved accessibility, journey times and better local connectivity. Reduced congestion and fewer vehicles idling will reduce emissions, helping to improve localised air quality. More details of the scheme's impacts in the A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner area can be found in the Environmental Statement (Document reference 3.2) and the Case for the Project (Document Reference 2.2) accompanying the draft DCO.	No
1044		Northern Gas Networks		Construction - Infrastructure	Northern Gas Networks expressing concern that their infrastructure is at risk from the proposed Project and therefore providing advice about where to divert utilities should it not be able to be located within the new highways boundary. They state that, if gas	As part of the design process National Highways and their design team have been having ongoing discussions with utility providers and Statutory Undertakers to minimise risk from the Project to their apparatus. This engagement will be ongoing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>apparatus has to be diverted from the new highway boundary, new land acquired through the DCO should be used for diversion works and to guarantee future access.</p>	<p>throughout the detailed design and construction phases of the Project.</p> <p>On the Project it is known that continued liaison and agreement will be sought in relation to the protection or diversion of Northern Gas Network assets to enable the proposed schemes to be constructed. Where possible all attempts have been made to avoid such assets through optimal route selection. Due to the linear nature of the pipelines, some diversions are unavoidable. Where possible all diversion works will take place on secured DCO land to ensure access is maintained for the utility providers and contractors to undertake the works safely and without challenge.</p> <p>The draft DCO (document reference 5.1) contains protective provisions which National Highways consider to be appropriate to protect the undertakings of statutory undertakers. National Highways is continuing to engage with statutory undertakers, where requested, with a view to reaching agreed terms to protect their interests where this is appropriate. Further information on the Project's effects on statutory undertaker's interests is contained in the Statement</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						of Reasons (Document ref 5.8).	
1186	148616, 149380, 150185, 150189, 150456, 151496, 152243, 152266, 152911, 152944, 152946, 152977, 152996, 153038, 153316, 153814, 153844, 154243, 154458	Middleton Tyas Parish Council	151465	Traffic, transport and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including Middleton Tyas Parish Council suggesting changes to signage and traffic signals to improve traffic safety and reduce congestion. Suggestions include: improved road lane markings and signs on slip road from A1(M) northbound, on A66 eastbound and on Middleton Tyas lane to A1(M) southbound; improved lighting at junctions, diversion signs for times when junctions between A1(M) and A66 is closed; and, improved timing on traffic lights on the A1(M) and A66 junction.	<p>Since Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have now identified a number of opportunities in various locations where the design has been revised to improve aspects such as lane markings, signage, lighting and signal phasing. This will be further developed during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>The scheme will provide a two-lane flared approach on the Middleton Tyas arm to increase the capacity of this approach. The result of this capacity assessment is shown in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7). The traffic from the committed retail developments at Scotch Corner were included in this capacity assessment. Consideration was given to signalling this approach, however this would not be achievable as there is not sufficient space on the circulatory carriageway to store the queues between the Middleton Tyas and A1(M) North approaches. Providing greater capacity at the Middleton Tyas approach by holding traffic at the preceding signalised junction on the roundabout through a longer intergreen time would fall foul of a road safety audit, which would raise</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the issue of driver compliance at traffic lights as regular drivers would realise that they are being held back for no 'apparent' reason.</p> <p>The traffic signal timings are designed to provide the least total delay to all drivers, whilst reducing the chance of long queues on the A1(M) slip roads that block onto the A1(M) main line.</p> <p>The junction is designed to the latest design standards (known as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and is designed to minimise the total delay suffered by all drivers in a cost-effective manner.</p> <p>Street lighting will be modified on the approach from Middleton Tyas to accommodate the road widening.</p> <p>The scheme will remove the dual to single lane bottleneck and will also provide a grade separated junction at Moor Lane (to access Mainsgill Farm shop) so should therefore remove the congestion caused by these two bottlenecks.</p> <p>An assessment of the construction phase of the scheme is included within the Transport Assessment (Document</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Reference 3.7) as part of the Development Consent Order application. This also details the diversion routes that are planned. Where required, diversion routes will be signed along the diverted route and routes agreed in advance with host Local Authorities.	

Consultee comments raised in relation to the Autumn 2021 Consultation ‘Dualling the Remaining Single Sections A66’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
195	148564, 148568, 148574, 148593, 148608, 148615, 148617, 148637, 149351, 149353, 149362, 149372, 149378, 149380, 149394, 149397, 149401, 149406, 149416, 149420, 149782, 149795, 150174, 150178, 150197, 150202, 150429, 152217, 152221, 152225, 152257,		148623, 149368, 149788, 150173, 150187, 150421, 151490, 151510, 152236, 152932, 153040, 153050, 153052, 153381, 153845, 153920, 154190	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the Project on the grounds that it could result in reduced congestion along the A66. Respondents suggest that the dualling proposals would reduce journey times and reduce congestion in residential areas such as Barnard Castle. Others suggest that an extra lane would make it easier to overtake slow vehicles, thus improving traffic flow. Respondents also suggest that the proposals could reduce knock-on congestion on other national roads such as the M6.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Core Project objectives for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project are to improve safety, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people’s journeys. Please refer to the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7), which presents an assessment of the impact of the Project on the strategic and local highway network.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152267, 152905, 152997, 153044, 153056, 153311, 153312, 153325, 153338, 153342, 153343, 153346, 153384, 153386, 153389, 153793, 153841, 153898, 153909, 153925, 153939, 153960, 154240						
451	149366, 149370, 149371, 149378, 149796, 149798, 150189, 150192, 150462, 151346,		149355, 151465, 152984, 152988, 153568	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing support for dualling the A66 on the grounds that it could improve access for motorised traffic. Respondents state that regional connectivity would be improved by the proposals, especially on east-west routes and for HGVs heading north into Scotland. Others suggest that the proposals would reduce journey times, provide an alternative route in the area,	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project. Core Project objectives for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153078, 153384, 153909, 154471				and make access to junctions and slip roads easier.		
651	148577, 148578, 148590, 148616, 148642, 149350, 149351, 149782, 149786, 149787, 150146, 150199, 150414, 150422, 151348, 151495, 151503, 152174, 152208, 152213, 152224, 152238, 152246, 152266, 152911, 152923, 152949, 152953, 152954,	Transport for the North	148598, 149376, 151473, 152485, 152961, 153132, 153135, 153317, 153845, 153864, 153883, 153897, 153934, 153948, 154017, 154203, 154266, 154453	General / no reason given	Respondents expressing support for dualling the A66 without further clarification.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152966, 152968, 153078, 153322, 153324, 153333, 153353, 153380, 153576, 153617, 153798, 153826, 153836, 153851, 153868, 153872, 153877, 153903, 153929, 153944, 153949, 153956, 153975, 154220, 154224, 154233, 154240, 154245, 154262, 154341						
669	148566, 148568, 148575,		150187, 150421, 150438,	Get on with it / overdue	Respondents expressing support for the Project, in particular that upgrades are long overdue and should begin as	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	148588, 148600, 148604, 148640, 149365, 149380, 149388, 149773, 150165, 150427, 150456, 150465, 151352, 151450, 151492, 151497, 152173, 152268, 152902, 152909, 152911, 152944, 152995, 152997, 153028, 153037, 153055, 153056, 153335, 153386, 153804, 153909, 154216, 154471		151490, 153376, 153948, 154145, 154214, 154491		soon as possible, without providing further detail.		

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
694	148568, 148574, 148593, 148601, 148602, 148617, 148642, 148704, 149351, 149352, 149357, 149371, 149379, 149380, 149388, 149394, 149407, 149413, 149416, 149420, 149777, 149786, 149792, 149795, 149796, 150174, 150175, 150179, 150181, 150185, 150189, 150192, 150199, 150202,	Durham Constab- ulary North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue	148586, 148623, 148628, 149355, 149368, 149381, 149418, 149788, 150173, 151465, 151502, 151510, 152932, 152936, 153029, 153040, 153050, 153051, 153052, 153381, 153568, 153843, 153845, 153864, 153893, 153933, 153959, 154145, 154190, 154192, 154199, 154214	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents expressing support for the project believing that it would improve safety across roads, junctions and near local properties. In particular, respondents support the dualling as they believe that one of the primary causes of accidents on the A66 is due to the sections where it goes from single to dual carriageway. Respondents identify a number of areas that are currently particularly dangerous including: Mainsgill; Hayber Lane; Kemplay and M6 roundabouts; Kirkby Thore; Appleby to Brough section; Sandford; Warcop; Ravensworth; West Layton; Barnard Castle; and Center Parcs junction.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Improving road safety is one of the core Project objectives.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150426, 150427, 150429, 150435, 150437, 150458, 151339, 151342, 151353, 151454, 151463, 151464, 151489, 151496, 151501, 152200, 152205, 152207, 152217, 152221, 152227, 152242, 152257, 152264, 152270, 152903, 152905, 152913, 152917, 152919, 152922, 152924, 152971, 152996,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153045, 153048, 153056, 153061, 153305, 153311, 153312, 153316, 153318, 153335, 153338, 153342, 153346, 153371, 153377, 153378, 153386, 153391, 153800, 153815, 153823, 153829, 153834, 153837, 153841, 153851, 153858, 153859, 153863, 153868, 153869, 153872, 153874, 153901,						

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153909, 153911, 153924, 153939, 153944, 153960, 154204, 154240, 154251, 154253, 154264, 154458, 154461						
697	154251			Community impact - People - general / not specified	One respondent expressing support for the impact that the road will have on local communities, in particular stating that the road would pose less of an inconvenience to local residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
914	148588, 153035, 153829			Engineering design and development - General	Respondents expressing support for the design of the proposals, in particular, the plans to reduce crossovers and right turns in the upgraded sections of road. Respondents also support the upgrade, as they see the A66 as a major route and believe the improvements proposed to be suitable.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Improving road safety is one of the core Project objectives and the proposals remove existing potentially hazardous turnings.	No
924	149357, 149366, 150190, 150192,	Warcop Parish Council	152983	Economics - Local economy	Respondents expressing support for dualling the A66 on the grounds that the reduction in congestion would	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Supporting the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150199, 150200, 151342, 151496, 152200, 152267, 153815, 153861, 153944				provide a boost for the local and national economy.	and the Government levelling up agenda, as well as improving access to services and jobs for locals are objectives for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.	
928	149357, 152911, 152919, 153053, 153861, 153907		153568	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing support on the grounds of safer routes for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. In particular, respondents support proposals to improve local link roads and the addition of grade separated crossings which they believe are safer for people. Respondents mention the importance of safe crossings and cycle provision, where alternative routes are unavailable; Penrith to Temple Sowerby is given as an example of this.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved facilities, including safe crossing points, for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	No
972	152911, 153963	Warcop Parish Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents supporting improvements to crossings which they believe will allow greater access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Respondents also support new local roads which they say will provide more suitable and safer routes.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved facilities, including safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
985	148593, 149351, 153342		152983	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Air quality	Respondents expressing support for the proposals on the grounds that they believe it would positively impact air quality in the area. In particular, respondents believe that dualling would lead to a reduction in idling vehicles; and a reduced need for these vehicles to speed up or slow down, due to the removal of bottlenecks.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. An aim of the Project is to minimise adverse impacts on the environment and where practicable optimise environmental improvement opportunities, including to improve air quality by reducing pollution caused by congestion where possible. The effects of the Project on air quality are assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).	No
987	153337			Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Flooding / drainage	One respondent expressing support for the planned drainage methods. The respondent suggests that, if designed correctly, this could reduce the overall flood risk to local communities.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the drainage proposed for the Project. Flood risk has been considered as part of the Project design and a flood risk assessment (FRA) has been undertaken (see Appendix 14.2 of ES Volume 3 (Application Document 3.4)). The Project's Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2), set out the design measures that National Highways proposes to mitigate adverse	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>effects on the water environment during both operation and construction.</p> <p>The FRA shows the Project will not cause any increase in flood risk. <i>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</i></p>	
988	153337			Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Wildlife / habitats	One respondent expressing support for the project mentioning the commitment to net positive biodiversity which they believe supports wildlife and habitats. The respondent highlights that a net gain in biodiversity will likely provide an overall benefit to the river Eden.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The Project aims to achieve a minimum of no net biodiversity loss, maximising biodiversity where practicable. The assessment of the likely biodiversity effects of the Project is reported in the Environmental	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).	
1015			149368	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Cultural heritage	One respondent expressing support for the project on the grounds that it will protect cultural heritage sites. In particular, the respondent highlights that the planned route provides a balanced approach to ancient monument concerns.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The assessment of the likely cultural heritage effects of the Project is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
1016			149368, 149788	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Noise	Respondents expressing support for the project on the grounds that it will reduce noise pollution, mentioning that the current project has a comprehensive solution to the current noise issues faced.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The assessment of the likely noise effects of the Project is reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).	No
752	149358, 149374, 150435, 152232, 152900, 152955, 153324, 153365, 153559, 153833, 153840, 153894	Lake District National Park Authority	149788, 152216, 152980, 153129, 153927	Oppose	Respondents expressing general concern or objection to these proposals. Some of these respondent's state that they would support the project if it used a different route. Other respondents reject the principle of expanding or upgrading roads in general.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the Project going ahead in principle. Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the Project, and to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), which describes the development of the design for alternative routes and each selected route.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The proposal to upgrade the A66 is a Project at the heart of the Northern Powerhouse and UK Government levelling-up agenda to build back better and level up the North by improving infrastructure and boosting connections across the region. It is the best way to meet the future needs of those living, working and travelling along the corridor in the 21st century. Importantly the appraisal showed that the dualling is best able to meet the transport planning objectives by providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity.</p>	
201	148571, 148618, 149357, 152201, 152202, 152914,			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting that motorhome and rest facilities be incorporated into the engineering design of the project. These include overnight motorhome parking; rest stops for lorry drivers; scenic rest stops with toilet facilities; and accessible	A new service area for HGVs, motorhomes or car users is not within the scope of the project. All existing lay-bys affected by the Project will be replaced within the Project boundaries.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154198, 154211				parking. Respondents remark that facilities such as these could improve the economic benefits of the project, as well as improve user safety due to fewer tired drivers on the road.	Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route as a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.	
279	148612, 148629, 149367, 149374, 150182, 150439, 151339, 152916, 152931, 152976, 153365, 153797, 153817, 153821, 153901, 153966, 154194			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting that demand be reduced with regards to traffic, transport and junctions in the area. These respondents state that 'modal shift' is necessary, and that reducing demand on roads in the area would reduce necessity for the project. Respondents suggest that other forms of transport be promoted over cars, including public transport and active transport.	<p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>The northern Trans-Pennine routes strategic study concluded that full dualling options were expected to deliver the greatest level of strategic benefits, with the A66 full dualling option delivering particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Powerhouse economic growth agenda and supporting access to key tourist sites.</p> <p>The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) offers insight into the process of considering alternative transport solutions and how the A66 might support other forms of transport. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) provides further details on the need for this Scheme and our assessment of alternatives. In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith which could be upgraded as an alternative and the corridor has low bus service provision (partial coverage and infrequent services). Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>It is accepted that modal shift towards public transport and active travel should be encouraged, however users in rural locations, such as those served by the A66 are more dependent upon the private car than those in urban</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>areas. This is because public transport is more difficult to provide cost effectively within areas of low population density, and residents within rural locations are less able to make use of active travel options as they need to longer distances to access jobs and services. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities to support and encourage use of active transport for shorter travel distances.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	
452	150422, 151344, 151493, 152208, 152224, 153366, 153377, 153894, 153910,		149376, 149418, 150183, 154234	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents suggesting a variety of traffic control measures to improve the A66, either as additional improvements or as alternatives to dualling. In particular, respondents suggest speed limits be put in place along sections of the A66, similar to the 40mph limit already in place around Kirkby Thore. Average speed cameras are proposed as a way to enforce speed limits along	Reducing the speed limit of the road would increase the journey time along the route and would therefore hinder the achievement of the objectives of the Project, such as economic growth and strategic connectivity. The application of design standards and hazard assessments including Road	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153961, 154215				<p>the route. Respondents also suggested that signage and road markings along the route should be improved. A variety of sign improvements were suggested such as: marking towns such as Kirkby Stephen; marking new cycle routes that are near the road; and clear markings ahead of right hand turns off of the carriageway, particularly at the Greta Bridge turn off, the Low Lane turn off, and the Forcett Lane turn off. Restrictions on HGV, farm traffic and mobile homes are suggested with time restrictions or outright bans on such traffic as well as restricting use to the outside lane.</p>	<p>Safety Audits have not identified the need for reduced speed limits.</p> <p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs (including signs for local services and places of interest) will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detail in future Project stages. The new A66, side roads and junctions will be designed to latest standards with speed limits communicated by an appropriate signing strategy and enforced by the police.</p> <p>Restricting certain types of vehicles would hinder the achievement of the objectives for the Project including; to improve and promote the A66 as a strategic connection for all traffic and users, to improve access for tourism served by the A66 and to improve access to services and jobs for local road users and the local community (including landowners and farmers and their operational farming requirements for movement of vehicles).</p>	
453	150465, 152240, 152945, 153366, 154215		154484	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents making suggestions regarding safety in relation to traffic, transport, and junctions along the route. These include reducing the speed limit in the area and	Improving road safety is one of the core Project objectives. Since 2017, we have been working hard to deliver a safer, more connected A66 for local people, businesses, tourists and other	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					implementing bridges and underpasses. A respondent also suggests crash barriers on the A592.	<p>road users between Penrith and Scotch Corner.</p> <p>We will remove potentially hazardous turnings as part of the Project, providing new links – via the local road network – to safe junctions to provide safer journeys on the newly-dualled sections of the A66.</p> <p>To reduce risk, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reservation, removing right turns. We have included junctions, connected to the local road network, which enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network. Works on the A592, apart from tie-in works, are outside the Project scope. The Road Safety Audit undertaken for Scheme 1 M6 Junction 40 recommends that lane markings are revised on the A592 exit to ensure continuity but no specific recommendation of crash barriers on the A592 is made.</p>	
454	152911, 152953,			Environment - general (non	Respondents suggesting that general environmental mitigation be taken.	An Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152954, 152956, 153337, 153894, 153901, 154211			PEI REPORT) - Mitigate impact	These include mitigating: visual degradation; habitat loss; noise impacts and light impacts in Eden Valley and Penrith; and utilising land in the area for carbon capture.	likely significant effects of the Project on the environment. This includes details of the how any identified environmental mitigation could be implemented shown within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7). The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) - the noise impacts of the Project have been assessed within Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration, the effects on habitats is provided in Chapter 6 Biodiversity, the effect on climate and carbon are considered within Chapter 7 (Climate), and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual considers the potential for visual impacts of the Project, including from lighting. The use of land within the Order limits for the purposes of carbon capture is beyond the scope of the Project.	
456	150465, 154198, 154211			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents suggesting that the project should improve connectivity for traffic, in particular: making roads more convenient; improving access to wildlife ponds; and prioritising access	Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys. Previous National Highways appraisals showed that dualling is best able to meet the transport planning objectives by	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					for those who rely on the road, such as the Ministry of Defence.	providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor including MoD facilities and visitor attractions such as wildlife ponds. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times and providing journey time reliability. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity. Sections of de-trunked A66 will provide access for local residents so that connectivity along the route is maintained.	
671	148594, 148619, 149374, 150182, 150439, 151339, 152900, 152916, 152931, 152945, 153365, 153377, 153822, 153833,		152983, 154225	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents suggesting greater investment into sustainable transport alternatives for both cars and HGVs. In particular, respondents suggest that greater investment is needed in general public transport to enable alternative ways for people to travel. More detailed comments highlighted the use of rail for this purpose for both passengers and freight. Suggestions for rail projects included: Restoration of the Wensleydale rail line, and development of Trans-Pennine rail freight route.	National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153894, 153901, 153966, 154194					<p>Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>It is accepted that modal shift towards public transport and active travel should be encouraged, however users</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>in rural locations, such as those served by the A66 are more dependent upon the private car than those in urban areas. This is because public transport is more difficult to provide cost effectively within areas of low population density, and residents within rural locations are less able to make use of active travel options as they need to longer distances to access jobs and services. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities to support and encourage use of active transport for shorter travel distances.</p> <p>The Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1) offers insight into the process of considering alternative transport solutions and how the A66 might support other forms of transport. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) provides further details on the need for this Scheme and our assessment of alternatives. In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith, including the partial route coverage of the Wensleydale heritage railway which could be upgraded as an alternative, and the corridor has low</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>bus service provision (partial coverage and infrequent services). Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the PDOR.</p> <p>To improve the strategic east west links within the north there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. The east coast and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle.</p>	
692	150456, 152900, 152902, 152916, 153325, 153339, 153385, 153386, 153838, 153956		151350, 152980, 153953, 154491	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents suggesting that modifications be made to the engineering design of the project. Suggestions include underpasses; upgraded or grade-separated junctions; and bypasses for specific areas. Specifically, respondents suggest additional junctions at "choke points", such as Penrith, Kirkby Thore and Center Parcs, separating traffic to prevent mixed-speed vehicle scenarios, and only upgrading particularly dangerous parts of the route. Respondents also suggest more access points in the central reservations along the route.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), which describes the development of the Project from its inception. The Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project. The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document: 4.1) provides further information on other small intervention options considered at the feasibility stage of the project. (as part of the Trans Pennine Strategic Route Study – 2014-16) During this feasibility stage (as part of the Trans Pennine Strategic Route Study) a number of options were considered as alternatives to the full dualling of the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>A66. This included an assessment of individual highway interventions aimed at improving one localised part of the route, either a junction or a specific route sub-section. The outcome from the evaluation of these options is that they did not provide the wide ranging strategic benefits that the full dualling of the A66 would deliver in terms of Journey time savings, safety (reduction in accidents) and reliability.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North, and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>Widening of existing congestion points is also planned such as the approaches to and circulatory carriageway of M6 Junction 40 is planned, together with grade separation of Kemplay Bank Roundabout and the Center Parcs access, and a full upgrade of the section through Kirkby Thore.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The A66 dualling proposes to close gaps in the central reserve rather than create more. By closing gaps and providing either left in left out junctions or grade separated junctions, the road will be safer for drivers.	
702	152240, 152931, 153053, 153335, 153366, 153388, 153929, 154221			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents suggesting that the Applicant should ensure safety measures for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders are included in the project. These include ensuring there are dedicated cycle lanes; warning signs for drivers and non-motorised users; and safe pedestrian crossing points. Others suggest, in general terms, that horse-rider safety should be considered.	We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved facilities, including safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Any Public Rights of Way severed by the Project will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction or via an underpass or overbridge. We've also incorporated additional dedicated walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities within the proposals. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4). The new A66, side roads and junctions will be designed to latest standards and speed limits will be enforced by an appropriate signing strategy, which will also service WCH needs.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
705	148575, 149350, 149354, 149380, 150465, 151346, 152224, 152250, 152966, 153056, 153587, 154210			Engineering design and development - Additional improvements	<p>Respondents suggesting additional improvements to take place as part of the project. In particular, respondents suggest that the dualling of the A66 continue after Penrith across West Cumbria all the way to Workington.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that minor roads should be developed alongside the route for slow moving traffic and as a diversionary route.</p>	<p>The Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study area, which was the area identified for exploring the feasibility of different options to cross the Pennines (in 2014-2016) did not extend west from Penrith.</p> <p>In terms of the scope of the Project and comments regarding dualling the A66 further west, National Highways has carried out a rigorous process of evaluation of options and alternatives at earlier stages of the Project as part of the Trans-Pennine Route Strategic Study (2014-16) and evaluated alternative route alignments during 2016 to 2020 as part of PCF stages 1 and 2. It has continued the evaluation of route alignments for some schemes more recently in 2022 (the findings of which were presented at in the Autumn 2021 Consultation). The outcome from these assessments and the further development of the design for the DCO application demonstrate that:</p> <p>i) the A66 dualling delivers the greatest level of strategic benefits (compared with alternative highway interventions), with particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda, see the Project</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>ii) it makes a significant contribution to achieving the specific objectives around economic growth and strategic connectivity in terms of it economic, transport, social and environmental benefits in relation to cost, see the Case for the Project document (Application Document 2.2)</p> <p>iii) the route alignment that has been taken forward into the DCO application is in accordance with policy of the National Networks National Policy Statement, see the Legislation and Policy Compliance document (Application Document 3.9) and is preferred in relation to a range of environmental, economic, cost, transport and social criteria compared with alternative alignments, see the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>The Project design includes parallel local roads in many locations, and these are a combination of new local road construction, upgrade of existing local roads and the de-trunking of sections of the existing A66 which become local roads in the new arrangement.</p> <p>Restricting certain types of vehicles, including perceived slow moving</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						vehicles) would hinder the achievement of the objectives for the Project including; to improve and promote the A66 as a strategic connection for all traffic and users, to improve access for tourism served by the A66 and to improve access to services and jobs for local road users and the local community (including landowners and famers and their operational farming requirements for movement of vehicles).	
712	148620, 149359, 149379, 149407, 150467, 151469, 151486, 152206, 152211, 152218, 152238, 152903, 152930, 152931, 153053, 153320, 153326, 153377, 153799, 153809, 153852,			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	<p>Respondents suggesting ways to improve cycle paths, footpaths, and bridleways as part of the project.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that there should be increased provision for walkers and cyclists. In particular, respondents state that a cycle path should run adjacent to the A66.</p> <p>Others state that a designated cycle path should be created between Penrith and Scotch Corner, as well as from Penrith to Center Parcs.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that non-motorised routes should be designated as restricted byways and surfacing</p>	<p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, additional east-west WCH provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes which significantly improves Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) connectivity between Penrith and Scotch Corner (as well as the section between Penrith and Center Parcs).</p> <p>The current byway and Footpath at the Center Parks junction currently terminate at the existing A66. It is proposed to connect both routes to the new grade separated junction to enable onward journeys and connectivity, including St. Ninians. A parallel shared cycleway/footway is proposed to be provided on the north</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153874, 153894, 153907				suitable for horses be incorporated into any designs.	side of the A66 dual carriageway between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. Further details, including a plan of the proposed junction is provided in section 4.3.2 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) Detailed information on Proposals for PRow can be found are shown in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Document Reference (Application Document 5.19). The detailed design of these routes, including surfacing will be carried out at the next stage of design development, including their designations and National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders during that process.	
919	148612, 149350, 153851, 153885, 153887		152216	Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	Respondents suggesting alternative uses for the money that will fund the Project, such as public transport, service facilities, electric car charging, and other road improvements elsewhere. Respondents also suggest providing opportunities for the tourism sector, such as highlighting historic sites and a service station.	The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the Government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the UK. The cost of the Project is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>benefits that the project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information can be found within the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) that demonstrates in Chapter 7 that the benefits of the Project outweigh the costs.</p> <p>In terms of electric vehicle charging, the RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Route Network and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023. As part of the Road Investment Strategy 2 National Highways are committed to improving public transport where it can, such as by working with local authorities and service providers to make sure that public transport journeys on the Strategic Road Network works for everyone. Improvements to the A66 will also assist local residents within rural areas who have a greater reliance on cars in travelling the route and surrounding areas.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The objectives for the Project include providing improved access to key tourist destinations such as the North Pennines, Lake District and Yorkshire Dales. Impacts on historic sites will be mitigated to the extent possible and has been part of the considerations when developing the routes.</p> <p>New service/rest areas for HGV's or motorhomes are not within the scope of the Project. New lay-bys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards. Existing lay-bys will be retained where possible.</p> <p>Traffic signs (including signs for local services and places of interest) will all be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detail in future Project stages.</p>	
920	153852			Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Biodiversity	One respondent suggesting that any project should deliver a net gain for biodiversity. To achieve this, the respondent suggests a focus on expanding and connecting habitats and communities of species; utilising plant materials and seeds already prevalent in the local area; and natural regeneration alongside restoration techniques. The respondent states that planting should complement the existing AONB and should include	<p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where possible.</p> <p>Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>woodland planting; block planting; native hedgerows; boundary trees; species-rich grassland; and wildflower areas.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Projects; however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss.</p> <p>Outline details of all ecological and landscape mitigation are provided in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall scheme design principles. Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are secured through the Environmental</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p> <p>The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape. This includes restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland, and grassland planting. It also includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, linking, and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife.</p>	
969	153316			Economics - Alternative funding	Respondents suggesting alternative funding of the project, in particular capital funding to ensure the project has enough financing to meet required standards and is not subject to delay.	The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the Government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the UK. The A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project sits within the allocated funding.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further information can be found within the Funding Statement (Application Document 5.6)	
976	149366, 152268, 153037, 153888			Construction - Timescale	<p>Respondents suggesting that the construction timescale be expedited, and that work begin immediately. These respondents suggest that areas ready for construction begin immediately rather than see sections delayed because other sections are not yet ready for construction. In particular Kemplay is highlighted as an area where construction should be prioritised.</p>	<p>National Highways is committed to improving connectivity, journey reliability times and safety between the M6 and A1(M). We are committed to undertaking works across the A66 at the key pinch point areas to ensure a complete dual carriageway is created from east to west, helping to alleviate congestion and improve safety. If works were not carried out on all remaining identified pinch point areas, National Highways believes the full benefits of the Project would not be released and would prolong the construction works within the area, with delayed schemes needing to be carried out in subsequent years. We are committed to ensuring disruption is minimised and managed during the Project, with all schemes commencing within a compressed time period to seek out delivery efficiencies and reduce the overall net effects of undertaking the works.</p> <p>As part of the approach to delivering a successful Project, National Highways is aware of the detailed programming and sequencing required across the schemes to ensure efficiencies are realised, environmental impacts are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigated, and disruption is reduced. All the schemes on the Project involve a variety of different construction works, with each having their own unique challenges. In addition, due to the size of the works being carried out, all Projects will have varying durations. Such durations will be programme managed to ensure they are phased to support neighbouring schemes. With significant earthworks required on most schemes, it is likely that the type and amount of construction works will vary over the course of the Project, but this will form part of a programmed and coordinated approach to reduce additional material movements and prevent additional ecological impacts.</p> <p>Whilst programme optimisation will remain a key driver on the Project to reduce to duration of construction works, National Highways is also committed to undertaking the works safely. Whilst we will look to optimise the number of hours that can be worked on the Project, we must remain vigilant of the increased dangers the workforce is exposed to when working excess hours. In addition, we are also aware of the impacts caused to stakeholders of working continuously, 7 days a week. Where key elements require increased work patterns,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>appropriate provisions will be implemented above and beyond the standard 5 day working week.</p> <p>National Highways need to follow a statutory process and submit an application for a Development Consent Order to allow the works to commence. National Highways cannot therefore start immediately but is progressing the consenting process promptly.</p> <p>We expect the main construction developments to begin in 2024, following the Development Consent Order (DCO) statutory process, should our DCO Application be successful. National Highways are implementing the Government's Project SPEED initiative which aims to speed up work on major infrastructure projects and stimulate the economy following the Covid-19 pandemic. This has seen the Project move from an initial 10-year to 5-year construction period, scheduled to complete in 2029.</p>	
989	152931, 153388			Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents making general environmental suggestions regarding flooding and drainage for the project. These include tree planting. Respondents also suggest visual mitigation for the existing drainage</p>	<p>Following consultation feedback, the number of drainage ponds has been rationalised. Ponds have been sensitively designed in the landscape. The location and size of proposed drainage ponds, as well as their</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					measures, stating that the planned run-off ponds look unappealing and similar along the length of the route. Respondents highlight that Cumbria is prone to flooding.	context within the area and landscape is outlined in the proposed Environmental Mitigation Maps, (Application Document 2.8). The pond size and shape will be further refined at the next stage of the detailed design. The PEI Report presented preliminary environmental information required for the purposes of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The detailed assessment of the Project's potential road drainage and water environment impacts is presented in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). A detailed flood risk assessment has also been completed and is set out in the Environmental Statement Appendix 14.2 (Application Document 3.4). The FRA shows the Project will not cause any increase in flood risk.	
990	152174, 153388			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents suggesting that, when improving the A66, consideration needs to be given towards methods of travel for non-motorised transport along the same or a similar route. No specific suggestions are offered.	Any Public Rights of Way severed by the Project will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. this may be at a proposed grade separated junction or an underpass or overbridge. Most of the schemes have proposals for parallel shared WCH paths along the extent of the scheme, or along old de-trunked A66 where it will remain. National Highways, following Statutory Consultation and listening to feedback given, has looked to provide additional	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>provision for WCH where the opportunity exists.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
1038	152945			Economics - Reduce costs	Respondents suggesting that costs can be reduced while still achieving safer roads with less destructive proposals, without providing specific details.	<p>The preferred route has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the project objectives, whilst providing long term investment and benefits in the strategic road network. The cost of the Project is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the project will bring, in dualling the carriageway the schemes will enable a free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic. Further information on the alternative options appraisal can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	No
1069	148585, 150465			Traffic, transport, and	Respondents suggest a ban on horse-drawn vehicles and request provision	Horse-drawn vehicles are permitted to use the highway and should be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
				junctions - Vehicles	of additional support for HGV drivers on the route, without providing specific details.	<p>operated and maintained in accordance with standards set out in the Department for Transport's Code of Practice for Horse-Drawn Vehicles. A ban on horse-drawn vehicles is not within National Highways remit and would not support achievement of the Project objectives.</p> <p>All existing lay-bys affected by the Project will be replaced within the Project boundaries. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector, including opportunities to support HGV drivers. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route as a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p>	
158			153883, 154212	Community impact - Property	One respondent expressing concern about the impact the project will have on their property. In particular, whether it will lead to further risk of property damage.	The Environmental Assessment contained in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) considers the effects of both the construction and operational phases of the Project on air quality, noise and the safety of both users and residents. The assessment identifies the potential for significant adverse effects and describes the mitigation required during the construction or operation of the Project. Managements plans for the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigation proposed are set out in annex B of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and annex C Environmental Method Statements.</p> <p>The Project and its mitigation are designed to reduce the adverse effects so far as is practicable.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found going to the National Highways website and searching under their Publications section.</p>	
280	148594, 148610, 148611, 148619, 148629, 149358, 150182, 152233, 152900, 152916, 152931, 152981, 153339, 153365, 153387, 153797, 153840, 153868, 153871, 153872,		149376, 153379	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Climate impact	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the proposed project could increase car usage, particularly in this area. Respondents suggest that this would increase CO2 emissions, which is incompatible with climate change commitments. Respondents specifically mention the ongoing climate crisis, the figure of 3m tonnes of extra carbon, as well as COP26, as motivating factors for their concern.</p>	<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)..</p> <p>National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change, including an assessment of the significance of any increase within the context of the Government's carbon reduction plan targets.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements in the EIA Regulations.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153881, 153887, 153894, 153900, 153901, 153919, 153939, 153965					<p>The quoted 3 million tonnes of carbon relates to the values presented in the PEI Report. The GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) estimates that the upgrade will add 2,068,844 tCO₂e from increased journeys. The change from PEI Report results from the confirmation of the alignment of the Project, and the adoption of a future dataset on typical vehicle emissions, which considers more fully the effects of decarbonisation of road vehicles. The assessment concludes no likely significant effect in accordance with the NPSNN and DMRB LA 114</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction.</p>	
281	150429, 152257, 152931, 153365,		152980	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT)	Respondents expressing concern about the impact that the project could have on wildlife and habitats. In particular, respondents express	The Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153797, 153874, 153901, 153965			- Wildlife / habitats	concern about the possibility of severance as well as the destruction of habitat, especially that which is designated SAC or SSSI. Respondents express concern about wildlife being killed or driven off, especially red listed birds and scarce mammals.	<p>requirements relating to all ecological designated sites, including SACs and SSSI, and receptors potentially impacted by the project. The project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where possible. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements where possible. The assessment concludes there would be no significant effects on the majority of protected species; however, without a departure from standard to allow obstacle planting close than 4.5m from the edge of carriageway there is potential for significant effects to barn owls for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby and Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor Schemes.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting, and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						herptile species and aquatic species. The Project's Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects, including likely significant effects, of the Project as identified in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) (ES) and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental legislation. It sets out the measures, commitments and actions needed to manage and mitigate environmental effects identified within the ES during construction and operation of the Project.	
282	153797, 153894		152980	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern about the negative impact on cultural heritage in the area. Respondents expressing concern about the potential impact of the project on archaeological sites in the area. In particular, respondents express concern that there will be a repeat of the cultural damage that was done when the A66 out of Penrith was dualled.	The archaeological potential of the land within the Order Limits has been considered in the design, including significant archaeological trial trenching and recording and where there is the potential for impacts to occur, further comprehensive archaeological recording will be implemented prior to construction. This is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
283	149689, 150434, 152900, 153339, 153797, 153874, 153894, 153901, 154215		152980, 152985, 153962	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the project could negatively impact the surrounding countryside. Respondents expressing concern about the damage as a result of the building works; the disruption of views over the countryside; and the addition of more cars in the area. Respondents state that this area's landscapes are important for both residents' wellbeing, and for tourism on the grounds that countryside views are a key draw for visitors to the area. Respondents also state that the project will blight land that is designated as AONB.</p>	<p>An assessment of the effect of the Project during both construction and operational phases on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach to this Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the sensitive nature of the local landscape character and North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health and tourism is provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						3.2). In accordance with the standard LA 112 focus is on local communities rather than visitors to the area, although visitors are considered where appropriate.	
663	148577, 153322, 153380, 153387, 153798, 153826, 153837, 153903, 153960, 153965		152980, 153040, 153379, 153806, 153883, 153897, 153934, 153959	Community impact - People - general / not specified	Respondents expressing concern that the project will negatively impact the general wellbeing of local people on the grounds that it will: contribute to urban sprawl; detract from the rural character of the area; and be detrimental to local amenities.	National Highways believe that delivering this Project will bring far-reaching benefits to those that use and live near the route. In developing the route National Highways has considered and consulted with the local community to ensure that the chosen route bring as much benefit to as many as possible. Achieving these benefits are also part of the objectives set out for the Project and include: - Re-connecting currently severed communities and provide better links between settlements along the route, as well as improving access to services such as healthcare, employment areas and education. - Providing improved access to key tourist such as the North Pennines, Lake District and Yorkshire Dales. - Minimising noise levels for people living and working near the route and reduce the congestion currently occurring in the single carriageway sections. To minimise any potential negative impacts on the natural	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>environment and landscapes of the North Pennines and Lake District through sensitive design and where appropriate, mitigation.</p> <p>- To improve strategic regional and national connectivity, particularly for freight hauliers. Heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) account for a quarter of all traffic on the road and any delays to journeys can have a negative effect on business and commerce, including lost working time, loss of perishable goods, and missed shipment slots. Support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and UK Government levelling-up agenda.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health and tourism is provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). In addition the costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and economic benefits of the Project, further details are set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2) which demonstrates that the benefits outweigh the costs.</p>	
668	148570, 148637, 149361, 150422,		149376, 152236, 152261, 153029,	Traffic, transport, and	Respondents expressing concern that the proposals could create safety risks for vehicular traffic. Respondents suggest that dualling would increase	Since 2017, we have been working hard to deliver a safer, more connected A66 for local people, businesses,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152208, 152209, 152235, 152939, 153365, 153382, 153910, 153960, 154216, 154228, 154483, 162144		153065, 153962, 154212, 154484	junctions - Safety	the speed of cars which could result in more accidents, as well as increasing the speed at which motorists leave the road and join local road networks. Others express concern that dualling would make it more difficult for motorists to cross the carriageways, and that more lanes could increase the risk of collisions during bad weather.	<p>tourists and other road users between Penrith and Scotch Corner.</p> <p>We will remove potentially hazardous turnings as part of the Project, providing new links – via the local road network – to safe junctions to provide safer journeys on the newly-dualled sections of the A66.</p> <p>To reduce risk, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reservation, removing right turns. We have included junctions, connected to the local road network, which enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to maintaining an ongoing conversation about construction with local people, businesses, and organisations. We regularly monitor the safety of our network and work throughout the year to ensure our motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards.</p> <p>The route will be designed to the latest standards within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. New lay-bys will be provided in accordance with current</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>DMRB standards. Existing lay-bys will be retained where possible.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7) shows the accident analysis carried out. The observed accident rate (i.e., personal injury accidents per million km travelled) of a dual carriageway road is around half that on a single carriageway road. In addition to these accidents on dual carriageway roads tend to be less severe (on average) than on single carriageway roads. The results shown within The Transport Assessment outlines a saving of 281 accidents over the 60 year appraisal period, saving 15 fatalities, 123 serious casualties.</p>	
691	148585, 149358, 149689, 150182, 150439, 152209, 152246, 152251, 152900, 152930, 152939, 153316,		149376, 150183, 151350, 152236, 153029, 153065, 153379, 153883, 154491	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the dualling of the A66 could result in increased congestion on the road. Respondents state that the existing single carriageway sections are unsuitable and could create bottlenecks whilst dualling is taking place. Others state there would be an insufficient reduction in traffic, suggesting that dualling could entice traffic from other routes. Respondents express concern that congestion from</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner. The report shows that there will be an increase in journey time of approximately 5 minutes (9%) along the A66 corridor if the Project is not delivered. This is because the single carriageway sections near their capacity throughout the assessment</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153339, 153814, 153874, 154458, 154483				HGVs could increase during and after construction work, specifically mentioning concern that the A688 and the Abbey Bridge in Eggleston could experience particularly high congestion.	<p>period. The Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) of a Single Carriageway Road is typically between 22,000 to 23,000 AADT, and all single carriageway sections of the route exceed 22,000 AADT by 2046. The CRF of a Dual Carriageway Road is much greater (68,000 to 70,000 AADT) than a Single Carriageway Road and therefore the delivery of the Project will provide significantly more capacity. Journey time savings between M6 J40 and A1(M) Scotch Corner with the delivery of the Project. It is anticipated that users will save between 11 and 13 minutes (20-23%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. The Transport Assessment also shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network.</p> <p>National Highways is working with its Delivery Integration Partners to look at how the scheme can be built and to ensure that any disruption during the construction phase is kept to an absolute minimum. The Construction Management plan will take note of key events within the area and will look to ensure that works are programmed to minimise any disruption and key mitigation strategies are implemented where required. As part of this planning, Construction Traffic Management plans will be developed</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>to ensure traffic, including HGVs is controlled and where diversions are required, measures are put in place to prevent HGVs from using non prescribed and unsuitable routes. This will ensure local residents are not adversely affected by construction activities. Where possible independent haul routes will be established to remove additional large construction plant movements away from the A66 and surrounding villages. Construction Traffic Management Plans will look to be communicated to stakeholders, local councils and interested parties on a monthly basis to ensure everyone is well informed and further plans are adapted to reflect issues identified.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 4-7% due to the Project, which illustrates the main strategic benefits of the Project, which is its ability to provide more reliable, safer, and efficient strategic and local connectivity in the north of England, supporting economic growth and the Northern Powerhouse commitments and aspirations, as well as strengthening Union connectivity between English regions, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>The Traffic Assessment (Application Document 3.7) presents an</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessment of the impact of the Project on the strategic and local highway network, with Chapter 11 focussing on the assessment of the likely project construction impacts. It is anticipated that users will save between 11 and 13 minutes (20-23%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. The likely impact due to construction varies across the different construction scenarios (more detail provided in Section 11.7 of the Transport Assessment) but is expected to vary between an increase of 17 minutes to a saving of 7 minutes compared to a scenario without construction of the project (more details on measures proposed to reduce the impact of construction on traffic are provided in Section 11 of the Transport Assessment).</p> <p>The impact on the A688 north of Barnard Castle and A67 is one of a general reduction in traffic flow due to the improved A66 attracting more longer distance east west traffic from the A67. During operation, there is a decrease in forecast traffic on Barnard Castle Road (C165) across Abbey Bridge. This is because the traffic that accesses Barnard Castle from the A66 east has easier access to the B6277 Moorhouse Lane and less easy access to Barnard Castle Road, compared to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the existing situation due to the proposed junction arrangements at these locations. The speed limit increase on the A66 also makes it more attractive for vehicles to continue along the A66 for longer whilst the proposed new junction alignment at Rokeby Park means traffic must travel an additional 2.3km compared with the Do Minimum (without Project scenario) if using the C165 from A66 east towards Barnard Castle. During construction it is likely that during certain times, Abbey Bridge, Abbey Lane and the A688 will experience a temporary increase in traffic due to the likely diversion routes and existing restrictions at Bridgegate. A full description of construction impacts, including likely diversion routes is provided within the Transport Assessment.	
695	150414, 153874, 153894, 154253		149376, 152259, 152985, 153962, 154212	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern that the Project could lead to an increase in noise pollution. In particular, respondents are concerned about the increased level of traffic causing more noise and the disturbance, suggesting this will have an impact on the natural countryside and AONB.	National Highways has carried out traffic modelling throughout the development of the Project to inform its design and to understand its likely effects on traffic. The methodology and results of the traffic modelling is reported in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>character of the area. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, have been assessed and are presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES considers the baseline noise levels of the Project study area. Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration identifies that for the Appleby to Brough Scheme the vast majority of the AONB within the study area, negligible and minor increases in noise are predicted. However, a moderate increase in noise level is predicted north of the scheme at Hayber Lane and Felt Lane within a relatively small area of the AONB.</p> <p>No significant effects to the AONB within the study area for the Bowes Bypass Scheme were identified.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) has assessed how special qualities of the AONB, which include remoteness and tranquillity, would be affected by the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Project and concluded that there would be no change to the remoteness and tranquillity of the AONB as the existing A66 already impacts this special quality.	
696	148591, 150197, 153028, 153949, 154253		153806, 153927	Construction - Disruption	Respondents expressing concern on the grounds that disruption caused by the construction of the project outweighs the potential benefits of the project.	The potential likely impact of the Project construction has been considered and is presented within the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) and the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). National Highways takes note of the considerable construction work required to deliver the Project, which will generate some disruption or disturbance to A66 road users, local road users, residents and other stakeholders along the route. It is simply not possible to deliver a project of this size, which seeks to make significant improvements without some form of disruption. Whilst taking note of this, National Highways will ensure that the construction activities are closely monitored, managed, and regulated with stakeholder and road user concerns taken into account and approaches adapted to help mitigate problems or concerns. Proposed mitigation measures are identified in the Construction Traffic Management Plans, which forms annex B13 of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7), Construction works will be phased and programmed to cause the minimum amount of disruption, whilst being carried out in the shortest time periods possible. Traffic management routes and diversions will be carefully considered and evaluated, with road closures reduced where possible and day working operations maximised. On each scheme, we will look to have community liaison workers who will look to engage with stakeholders who have concerns or fears, with extra measures put in place to provide support. Our Principal Contractor is very experienced in delivering large technical projects with complex stakeholder requirements and needs.</p> <p>As well as improving journey reliability times, the Project will also improve connectivity both to and across the A66, whilst providing smoother more environmentally friendly road alignments. The new A66 route and associated structures will provide a better journey for commuters, helping to reduce emissions at source, reduce noise and ultimately help reduce the environmental impacts generated by the traffic. By undertaking the improvement works within a compressed timeframe, we seek to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>mitigate the number of diversions, roadworks, and disturbance to road users in the long term by undertaking the improvement works at key A66 pinch point areas.</p> <p>Further information on the controls to be implemented are contained in the EMP and its annex B.</p> <p>The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and economic benefits of the Project, Further details are set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2). which demonstrates that the benefits outweigh the costs of the Project.</p>	
701	151504, 153887		153317, 154453	Engineering design and development - General	Respondent expressing concern regarding aspects of the project design. In particular, respondents express concern about the proximity of some new sections of road to villages and suggest that the design will encourage more traffic, which could lead to congestion issues.	<p>Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), which describes options considered in the context of the development of the design for each selected route. An assessment of the likely Project effects on human health is presented in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Assessment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the scheme on reducing congestion on the route and improving</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner. The Assessment also shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network. The report shows that there will be an increase in journey time of approximately 5 minutes (9%) along the A66 corridor if the Project is not delivered. This is because the single carriageway sections near their capacity throughout the assessment period. The Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) of a Single Carriageway Road is typically between 22,000 to 23,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), and all single carriageway sections of the route exceed 22,000 AADT by 2046. The CRF of a Dual Carriageway Road is much greater (68,000 to 70,000 AADT) than a Single Carriageway Road and therefore the delivery of the Project will provide significantly more capacity. Journey time savings between M6 J40 and A1(M) Scotch Corner with the delivery of the Project. It is anticipated that users will save between 11 and 13 minutes (20-23%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. The Assessment also shows the impact of the scheme on the local highway network.</p> <p>While there may be an increase in the volume of traffic using the A66</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						following our planned improvements, the local road network can expect to see lower levels of traffic.	
704	152202, 154213			Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents expressing concern that the proposed design does not include any dedicated truck stop or service station provision. Respondents express concern that with the removal of the BP garage at Temple Sowerby there will be no service station on the route when complete.	A new dedicated truck stop or service area is not within the scope of the project. All existing lay-bys affected by the Project will be replaced within the Project boundaries. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route as a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. The Project will not include removal of the BP garage at Temple Sowerby and access to it will still be possible using the existing A66 (to be de-trunked).	No
906	150414, 152916		150183, 152985, 153962	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Air quality	Respondents expressing environmental concern that the project could lead to a decrease in air quality for the local area around the new route. In particular, respondents express concern that the increased traffic that will result from the project may increase the negative impact on air quality with additional pollutants and particulates for the surrounding area.	The impact of the Project on air quality is assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). Since the PEI Report submission, baseline air quality monitoring has been carried out at 16 locations across the Affected Road Network (ARN) in order to verify the model output. Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, as a result of the Project, are based on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>guidance in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has been carried out, using the assessment methodology set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Properties and ecological receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network have been identified and appropriate mitigation recommended where required. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes an air quality and dust management plan with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, daily onsite and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</p>	
907	152931, 153365		153962	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern that the project could increase flood risk in the area, through the additional concrete affecting groundwater and drainage.	<p>National Highways note the consultees concerns about flooding. Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project is an appendix to the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.4, Appendix 14.2).</p> <p>Impacts of the Project on groundwater receptors are considered within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy. The proposed drainage storage ponds and culverts have been rationalised within the scheme constraints and the final design will be settled at the detailed design stage.</p>	
908	149350		153806, 153962	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Agriculture	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the proposals would negatively impact the environment, specifically agriculture. They state that the project would destroy productive farmland and suggest that the loss of this land would incur a larger carbon footprint as food may have to be imported.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) details the agricultural land holding impact assessment undertaken for the Project. The assessment considers agricultural land within the Order Limits of the Project where land is required either permanently or temporarily in order to deliver the Project and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>identifies potential significant effects on agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. Where the scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p>	
909	148577, 149350		153379, 153934	Economics - Local economy	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the project could negatively impact local businesses in the area.</p> <p>Respondents expressing specific concern about the loss of farmland and the reduced desirability of the area for tourism due to the effects of the road on the countryside.</p>	<p>Chapter 13 (Population and Human Health) of the ES (Application Document 3.2) assesses the effects on local businesses. Although there are impacts identified, principally related to landtake from businesses during construction the impact during operation are overall positive as the Project is envisaged to provide minor beneficial impacts improving journey time reliability and safety, which would in turn serve to improve traffic conditions for businesses.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to minimise land take from farm businesses, but land will be needed, as described in Chapter 13 Population and Human Health of the ES (Application Document 3.2). For landtake and other effects on farms the ES identifies the following mitigation measures:</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. - To accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme where possible to avoid potential crop loss. - To maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible - To outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. <p>The Population and Human Health Chapter (13) of the ES (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the Project on the tourism sector for each scheme. There is also a route wide assessment within this Chapter which has concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During construction workers may utilise tourist accommodation, reducing the capacity to accommodate tourists 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>who would generate spend elsewhere in the economy.</p> <p>During Operation for businesses (including those in the tourism sector) the Project is envisaged to provide minor beneficial impacts by improving journey time, reliability and safety, which would in turn serve to improve traffic conditions in the local area. No significant effects are anticipated on tourism related businesses during operation unless specifically stated within the scheme by scheme assessment set out in Chapter 13 Population and Human Health of the ES (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
910	153339, 153966		153927	Traffic, transport, and junctions - HGVs	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the project would lead to more HGVs using the A66. In particular, respondents express concern that a fully dualled A66 could encourage more HGVs using the road instead of the more environmentally friendly option of rail freight.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment Report shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 4-7% due to the Project, which illustrates the main strategic benefits of the Project, which is its ability to provide more reliable, safer, and efficient strategic and local connectivity in the north of England, supporting economic growth and the Northern Powerhouse commitments and aspirations, as well as strengthening Union connectivity between English regions, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. National Highways have</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p>The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>To improve the strategic east west links within the north there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. The east coast and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle.</p>	
915	148629, 149397, 149407, 150434, 152219, 153068, 153833, 153888, 153919	Musgrave Parish Council	149376, 149418, 150183, 153927	Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern at the cost of the project. In particular, that the potential benefits do not justify the cost and that the cost is generally too high. Respondents also state that the project should not be a priority on the grounds that the national economy is stretched, particularly as a result of the pandemic.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the Project. The proposal to upgrade the A66 is a Project at the heart of the Northern Powerhouse and UK Government levelling-up agenda to build back better and level up the North by improving infrastructure and boosting connections across the region. It is the best way to meet the future needs of those living, working and travelling along the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>corridor in the 21st century. Importantly the appraisal showed that the dualling is best able to meet the transport planning objectives by providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity.</p> <p>The Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the Government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the UK. The cost of the Project is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including the free-flowing route from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways are implementing the Government's Project SPEED initiative which aims to speed up work on major infrastructure projects and stimulate the economy following the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Project Objectives relating economic benefits are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional: Support the economic growth objectives of the Northern Powerhouse and Government levelling up agenda. • Ensure the improvement and long-term development of the SRN through providing better national connectivity including freight. • Maintain and improve access for tourism served by the A66. • Seek to improve access to services and jobs for local road users and the local community. <p>The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and economic benefits of the Project, Further details are set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2). which demonstrates that the benefits outweigh the costs of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
918	152945, 152958, 152996, 153316, 153826, 153878, 153879, 153960		152980, 153806, 153927	Environment - general (non PEI REPORT) - General / reason not specified	<p>Respondents expressing general concern about the environmental impact of the project. In particular, respondents express concern about the cost of the project to the environment, both in general and relative to the benefits that dualling the remaining sections of the A66 would bring. Respondents also expressing concern as to the importance of environmental considerations and suggest that these were not fully accounted for within the project.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the Project, and to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), which describes the development of the design for each selected route. The preferred route has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the project objectives.</p> <p>National Highways want our roads to work more harmoniously with the communities that live alongside them, and the built, natural and historic environments that surround them. Every aspect of our business has a part to play in improving environmental performance, alongside ensuring we meet our statutory obligations.</p> <p>To support our commitment and approach an Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed to fully assess the effects of the proposal on the environment. The Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						economic benefits of the Project, Further details are set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2). which demonstrates that the benefits outweigh the costs of the Project.	
968	149350, 152206, 152913, 153326, 153388			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents expressing concern that the project may not improve, and could in fact worsen, access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders due to the loss of Public Rights of Way. In particular, respondents express concern about the road cutting through existing public rights of way without adequate plans to put in place either crossings or suitable alternative routes.	We are committed to provide improved facilities, including safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Any Public Rights of Way severed by the Project will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction or via an underpass or overbridge. We've also incorporated additional dedicated walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities within the proposals. Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
970	149407, 151346, 152233, 153841, 153909, 153911		152985	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents expressing concern that the project could limit access and reduce connectivity for local farms and villages. Respondents express particular concern about the reduction in junctions that provide local access to	Improving access to services and jobs for locals are objectives for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. The rural surroundings of the A66 mean there are many smaller communities, businesses and isolated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					the A66 could make it harder for people to get to farms and villages. This issue could then be compounded further due to the rural nature of the area meaning there are fewer alternative routes for people to access local areas.	properties that currently have direct access onto the A66. This results in more accidents as vehicles slow down to access exit points and can be dangerous when drivers join the route. We will remove these potentially hazardous turnings as part of the Project, providing new links – via the local road network – to safe junctions to provide safer journeys on the newly-dualled sections of the A66. To reduce risk, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reservation, removing right turns. We have included junctions, connected to the local road network, which enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network.	
998			148607, 150441	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing specific concern about the taking of high-value agricultural land for construction of the project, as well as the use of agricultural land for mitigation measures, such as wetlands. Specific farms mentioned include those at Sandford Junction B6259.	ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) details the agricultural land holding impact assessment undertaken for the Project. The assessment considers agricultural land within the Order Limits of the Project where land is required either permanently or temporarily in order to deliver the Project and identifies potential significant effects on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>agricultural land holdings. Where land can be returned to the landowner following completion of the construction phase it will be to allow for future agricultural use.</p> <p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation we were able to review the route alignment around Sandford Junction and reduce impact on the farms to the south of the A66 in that area</p> <p>Impact on farms and agricultural land holdings is an important consideration but is just one of the factors to be taken into account in determining the land that will be required for the Project. Other considerations include environmental and landscape impacts, safety, demolition or loss of property, geomorphology, impact on local businesses and the local economy, impact on communities and users, engineering, buildability and cost, carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement. If agricultural land is required then it would be in the context of these other considerations and the associated costs of the project.</p> <p>National Highways seek to acquire/possess as little land as</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>possible while still being able to deliver the scheme in a safe manner. Where the scheme infringes on individual properties, the land interests may be entitled to compensation.</p> <p>Further information on National Highways' property policies can be found in the publications section on the National Highways' web site.</p>	
1037	148582, 148637, 149354, 149366, 150462, 152902			Construction - Timescale	Respondents expressing concern at the proposed timescale of construction, including both the delay in the start of construction and the length of time that it will take to complete. In particular, respondents expressing concern about how long it has already taken to get to this stage.	We expect the main construction developments to begin in 2024, following the Development Consent Order (DCO) statutory process, should our DCO Application be successful. National Highways are implementing the Government's Project SPEED initiative which aims to speed up work on major infrastructure projects and stimulate the economy following the Covid-19 pandemic. This has seen the Project move from an initial 10-year to 5-year construction period, scheduled to complete in 2029.	No
1068	148620, 149407, 150467, 152240			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents expressing concern that the project will leave or render the route unsafe for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, particularly due to the increase in faster-moving traffic. This is in addition to the safety concerns that already exist due to the road. Areas of concern highlighted include walking	We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide improved facilities, including safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. Any Public Rights of Way severed by the Project will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>between Teesdale Way and Brignall and cycling between Brough and Bowes.</p>	<p>proposed grade separated junction or via an underpass or overbridge. Where possible we've also incorporated additional dedicated walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities within the proposals.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Design solutions will adopt the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges standard and be subject to a Road Safety Audit process to ensure they address hazard concerns. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>A shared crossing will be provided just west of Saint Mary's Church to aid walking between Teesday Way and Brignall. Cycling between Brough and Bowes will utilise existing providing as the Projects schemes do not extend between these locations.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘the Consultation’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
65	148699, 149380, 149781, 149794, 150144, 150185, 150473, 152243, 152248, 152939, 152944, 153055, 153316, 153954, 154136	Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council		Information & materials provided	Respondents expressing support for the quality of consultation materials and information. Respondents cited helpful Highways England staff and a high level of detail in the information provided.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the consultation materials. We have carried out a broad range of consultation and engagement measures and applied a variety of techniques to encourage broad-based participation in the evolution of design proposals. The information and materials for the consultation in 2021 afforded people an opportunity to get involved in a number of ways including our Citizen Space web page, online virtual consultation, consultation events, webinars, and telephone surgeries.	No
66	153316, 153377, 153851, 153978, 154136	Cumbria County Council Defence Infrastructure Organisation Eden District Council Electricity North West	152485, 153845	Process - Communication/ influence	Respondents expressing support for the consultation process, in particular the level of communication and ability for respondents to influence the process, including local residents and landowners, stakeholders, and councils.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the consultation process. We have carried out a broad range of consultation and engagement measures and applied a variety of techniques to encourage broad-based participation in the evolution of design proposals. During Project design development, the Project team has worked collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Historic England Homes England Transport for the North Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority				<p>parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route, using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. This broad-based engagement has provided the Project design team with enhanced knowledge and experience of each of the local areas along the road corridor and helped shape the overall vision and design of the Project.</p> <p>Feedback from stakeholders has informed the design of the Project presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation and we will continue our engagement up to submission, through the Examination process and post consent, should the DCO be made.</p>	
234	149378, 149412, 150144, 150165, 150185, 150189, 152213, 152243, 152942, 152947, 153047, 153952, 154247		149368, 151490, 152485, 153065	Events	Respondents expressing support for the quality of consultation events, specifically mentioning the level of detail in the information provided.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the quality of consultation events and level of detail of information provided.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
913	153028, 153939			General	Respondents expressing support for the consultation in general terms without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the general support expressed for the consultation..	No
1035	149780, 152948			Questionnaire	Respondents expressing support for the consultation questionnaire, including the provision of an additional comments section for respondents to complete.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the for the consultation questionnaire.	No
431	154332, 154334, 154335, 154366			Oppose	Respondents expressing opposition to the consultation in general terms without providing more detail.	. National Highways acknowledges the responses received.	No
73	152233, 153560, 153816, 153974, 153978, 153984, 153990, 153992, 153993, 153995, 153997, 154136, 154470	Eden District Council	152151	More engagement	Respondents suggesting that the applicant should engage further with affected landowners, interested parties and people generally as they progress the Project. This includes respondents who request feedback on issues that they raise in the consultation, such as: noise from traffic and construction; mitigation measures; land-take; impact on other utilities and infrastructure. Respondents also request that they be kept updated of the project progress and informed if any changes in the design occur. Respondents request that National Highways meet with them to discuss their concerns further and resolve	In regard to landowners National Highways seeks to acquire land, required by the Project, by negotiation where it is practicable to do so.. To support this, we have dedicated public liaison officers who have been meeting with landowners throughout the Project, and continue to meet with landowners, to understand impacts. We have written to all impacted landowners to ask them to enter into discussions with us about acquisition. In regard to other consultees that have requested feedback on issues, we have sought to respond with the publication of the Consultation Summary Report in March 2022 which summarised the feedback received during the Autumn 2021 consultation.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					issues before a development consent order is submitted.	<p>The report explains that all feedback received during the statutory consultation has been considered and that National Highways have continued to engage with affected landowners, stakeholders and local communities as the project progresses.</p> <p>This Consultation Report, submitted with the DCO application, includes a summary of all feedback received and National Highway's response that feedback through Annex N and Annex P.</p>	
88		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		More assessments	<p>Respondents suggesting that more assessments are undertaken in general, making specific requests which include: more traffic noise assessments; assessments of socio-economic impacts; assessments of the health impacts and assessments to stress test junctions.</p>	<p>As part of the autumn 2021 consultation, we published a range of assessment information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI). In addition, the Project Design Report was also published for consultation, which set out how the Project had progressed in light of the assessment work undertaken. This reflected the information that was available at that time and was sufficient to enable consultees to take an informed view in responding to the consultation. Following the statutory consultation our assessments were progressed further and are published in full as part of the DCO application. This includes the Environmental Statement in Volume 3 of the DCO application. The environmental impact</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						assessment process was undertaken in accordance with the Scoping Report and informed by ongoing engagement with consultees.	
218	149350, 149781, 149794, 150167, 150435, 150437, 151481, 151503, 151516, 151523, 152174, 152268, 153072, 153080, 153349, 153830, 153851, 153894, 153901, 154197		148628, 149376, 150196, 153376, 153864	Listen to locals	Respondents suggesting that the views of local residents should be given a higher priority as local people know best. Concerns expressed that local community views and concerns are not being heard and the project outcomes do not reflect local views.	<p>Feedback from local residents and communities has informed the design of the Project to-date and we have continued to engage with the community as the design has progressed, this is demonstrated in this Consultation Report, submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Extensive consultation and engagement took place with local communities. Both the Options Consultation (May-July 2019) and the Statutory Consultation (Autumn 2021) included events at locations accessible to local communities, which followed a range of initiatives to raise awareness of the consultation opportunities. In addition to these stages of consultation, ongoing engagement activities took place including with Community Liaison Groups and local parish councils where the views of local communities were sought.</p> <p>Following the statutory public consultation period, we reviewed feedback received, and as a result of views of local communities, we made changes, some of which were of a sufficient scale, environmental impact</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>or public interest to require further supplementary consultation. National Highways are required to have regard to all feedback to the statutory consultation and cannot give higher priority to feedback from certain groups.</p> <p>Following the statutory consultation we finalised our proposals and supporting information before submitting our Development Consent Order application to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	
1085	149773, 149791			Accessibility	Respondents suggesting improvement to the accessibility of consultation process by using different colours in the map books to assist with colour blindness.	<p>The Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which set out our agreed approach to the consultation following engagement with the hosing local authorities. We carefully considered the best way to share and present the consultation material that met the needs of all of the communities and people affected by the Project. The consultation brochure was produced in an accessible format, with alt text for images for example. Technical documents such as the PEI Report also had a non-technical summary.</p> <p>To support the community further, drop in events (along with webinars and a telephone number where the community and stakeholders could</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>meet and discuss their concerns directly with the Project team). This approach enabled people to ask the Project team questions and clarification to ensure the material was clear and understood.</p> <p>A phonenumber and email address were publicised through which consultees could request information in alternative formats.</p>	
1086	150146			Less engagement	One respondent suggesting that no further consultation is required.	<p>National Highways are required to consult on the Project as per the Planning Act 2008 and additional consultation is required in certain circumstances as is set out in relevant government guidance documents (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application Guidance). We also recognise the value of consultation and engagement and the feedback received in progressing the Project.</p>	No
1281	152489, 153576, 153907, 153928, 153978, 153982, 154019, 154134, 154136, 162143	Brougham Parish Council Cumbria County Council Dacre Parish Council	153390	Future engagement with statutory & non statutory stakeholders	Requests for engagement with stakeholders including statutory stakeholders, lead local flood authority, EA, NFU, National Trust, Operators, Emergency Services, Sport England, cycling clubs, National Park Authority, Parish Councils, tourist communities, Royal Mail etc., operators, Sport England. This included requests for future	<p>National Highways will continue to engage with stakeholders as the Project progresses, through our focus groups, community liaison groups and technical meetings on specific issues. This has included sharing project documents and assessment work with stakeholders. This includes through the Examination process and post consent, should the DCO be made.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Durham County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Health and Safety Executive, NSIP Consultations Historic England Natural England North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council			<p>engagement, including from the EA, at the next stage, on the EMP. Respondents suggesting that the applicant should engage further with statutory and non-statutory stakeholders as they progress the Project. This includes respondents who request feedback on issues raised in the consultation, such as: noise from traffic and construction; mitigation measures; land-take; impact on other utilities and infrastructure. Also requests that they be engaged on documents and request that NH meet with them before a DCO order is submitted. Respondents also request that they be kept updated of the project progress and informed if any changes in the design occur.</p>	<p>In regard to other consultees that have requested feedback on issues, we have sought to respond, feedback on the Autumn2021 Consultation has been provided through the Consultation Summary Report; the winter update; and updated map books that were published on our Project webpage in March 2022.. The Consultation Report provides detailed responses to all issues raised at the Autumn 2021 Consultation and supplementary consultation in 2022 in this Annex N and Annex P respectively.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Royal Mail Shell U.K. Limited Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority					
1282	153936	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Electricity North West Northern Gas Networks Northern Powergrid Holdings Company United Utilities Group PLC	153607	Future engagement with utilities	Requests for future engagement about utilities infrastructure and design elements.	In addition to the formal statutory public consultation that was carried out (as required under the Planning Act 2008), there will be continued engagement with the statutory undertakers and relevant PILs following the DCO submission.	No
1283	149778, 151499, 152139,		151350, 151517, 152151,	Future engagement with landowners	Respondents request additional engagement and clarification of how they will continue to be involved.	Consultation has been on the preliminary design information. Through National Highway's public	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153605, 153612, 153613, 153978, 154246		152153, 153039, 153341, 153561, 153572, 153603, 153606, 153609, 154003, 154006, 154007, 154009, 154016, 154017, 154184, 154185		<p>Concerns expressed in relation to lack of follow up after previous consultation and lack of meetings in advance of the statutory consultation to discuss proposals.</p> <p>More specifically, respondents raised concerns about the need for more detail to make judgements on the accommodation works to the provision of walls, fences to the settlement of drainage issues and provision of water, gateway positions and similar. Respondents suggest further consultation as soon as possible with each of the Clients in turn at proposed meetings.</p>	<p>liaison officers we will continue to engage with landowners, on matters of detailed design.</p> <p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation we have met with landowners as requested to provide further information and consider feedback received.</p> <p>This dialogue will continue as the Project moves forward.</p>	
1284	152207	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Durham County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire</p>		<p>Future engagement with the host local authorities</p>	<p>Comments relating to Local Authority engagement to date and the need for ongoing/additional engagement throughout the DCO and construction stage of the project. Respondents suggesting that the applicant should engage further with local authorities as they progress the Project. Respondents also request that they be kept updated of the project progress and informed if any changes in the design occur.</p> <p>This includes respondents who request further engagement around issues raised in their responses including noise from traffic and</p>	<p>We have continued our regular meetings with the Strategic Stakeholder Group, the statutory environmental bodies, focus groups, host local authorities and other organisations I authorities, and other organisations throughout the design development up to the DCO submission.</p> <p>In addition to regular engagement meetings, the host authorities are Section 42 consultees and were formally consulted, including officers who were responsible for co-ordinating the response from the Council and were dedicated to the A66 Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			<p>construction; mitigation measures; land-take; construction diversions; public rights of ways, design and layout of junctions, borrow pits, emergency services, health and socio-economic assessments, flood management measures and the Order limits. e. Also requests that they be engaged on document including the PDR, Incident Management Plan, the Order documents, the ES, the CMMS (now part of the EMP) and the EMP. . Respondents request that National Highways meet with them to discuss their concerns further and resolve issues before a development consent order is submitted.</p>	<p>In addition, officers from planning, environmental health and technical services were consulted and will continue to be involved and proactively engaged throughout the next stage of the Project, including throughout DCO and construction.</p> <p>National Highways has also published the Consultation Summary Report, design changes in the winter update and map book, to ensure that the wider community understand the changes proposed.</p>	
1285	153615, 153821, 153901, 154136	Health and Safety Executive, NSIP Consultations	153611, 154176	Request more engagement with residents, properties, community groups & local businesses	General request for more engagement at the local level with residents, properties, local businesses where they do not have enough information to fully comment at this stage.	<p>National Highways will continue to engage with stakeholders as the Project progresses, either through our Public Liaison Officers' engaging directly with landowners, tenants and businesses, focus groups (include business community), community liaison groups or meetings on specific issues.</p> <p>A comprehensive package of information was available at the Autumn 2021 Consultation where we presented our preliminary design. This was in a range of formats including</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						technical documents, non-technical summaries, consultation brochures, and also visualisations and SoundLab. Our consultation drop-in sessions also enabled residents and local businesses to come and talk through the proposals with the Project team, ask questions and provide their feedback. This was supported further by a Project phone line where the community and stakeholders could speak directly with the Project team.	
1287	148574, 151453, 153339, 153826, 153852, 153901, 154243, 154363	Musgrave Parish Council	153609, 153857, 153893, 153953, 154454	Alternatives suggested by consultees	How have alternatives, do nothing/do something and alterations been considered - proposals that have been discussed seem to have disappeared, discussions help with National Highways, but no further consideration or feedback has been provided on those. Respondents also refer to other alternative proposed routes which have not received enough attention or been ignored.	The preferred option as proposed by the DCO application has been selected following an extensive consideration of options and alternatives. National Highways undertook a public consultation to present and seek feedback on Project options, in May to July 2019. The options brought forward for the May to June 2019 consultation had been shortlisted from a longer list of options which had been assessed against a list of factors covering a range of matters including environmental designations, property conflicts and planning issues. Various options were discounted through this assessment process.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways considered that it was important that the Autumn 2021 Consultation made clear which options we were presenting as the proposed way forward, whilst providing information on the other alternatives which had been considered. This was included in Chapter 3 Alternatives of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report.</p> <p>Respondents were able to provide their views on the optioneering process as well as alternative options.</p> <p>The DCO application includes the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) which provides an overview of the optioneering process. In addition, further information on alternatives is set out in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement.</p>	
1288	153926, 154363			Lack of feedback on issues previously raised - Lack of communication	Respondents raised concern on lack of feedback on items previously raised such as: noise from traffic and construction; mitigation measures; land-take; impact on other utilities and infrastructure.	National Highways will continue to engage with stakeholders as the Project progresses, either through our PLO's engaging directly with landowners, tenants and businesses, focus groups (include business community), community liaison groups or meetings on specific issues.	No
1289	149428, 151456, 151520,		149788, 150173, 153561,	Adequacy of consultation materials	Respondents concerned about the consultation materials and the level of information provided (too little	Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152239, 152254, 153371, 153387, 153560, 153575, 153848, 153900, 153901, 153906, 153919, 153926, 153978, 153984, 154335, 154363, 154366		153602, 153606, 153610, 153627, 154254		and too much available) in a range of places. Respondents also raised concern about there being too much for people to digest. Requests for additional information so that informed feedback can be provided. Respondents also express concern about perceived lack of clarity around which routes are still being considered and the current stage of the consultation. Routes that were not previously consulted on being part of the statutory consultation exercise.	subject to consultation with the host authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the Project proposals was available in a range of formats and accessible online, at public events and local deposit locations. Staff were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and it is considered that it was appropriate in providing the information necessary for consultees to hold an informed view when providing feedback and for that feedback to be taken into account in the development of the Project. Evidence of this was the 'layered' approach to the detail provided, with the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEI Report) and the Non-Technical Summary, which could be accessed in digital and hard copy versions. Furthermore, the Consultation Brochure provided a useful overview document with clear signposts to where further detail, such as the individual chapters of the PEI Report could be found. We designed the non-technical summary and the consultation brochure to be accessible for less technical readers or people with less time to understand the	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Project and environmental impacts without needing the full detail of the PEI report. . .</p> <p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation made clear which options we were presenting as the proposed way forward, whilst providing information on the other alternatives which had been considered.</p> <p>Further to the announcement of the Preferred Route, further work and refinement was undertaken as part of the ongoing preliminary design stage. This included further development of the design of the Preferred Route, as well as the identification of alternative alignment routes considered in response to further work undertaken to understand the baseline environment and having regard to consultation and engagement responses.</p> <p>Subsequent to the Preferred Route Announcement (part 8 of Annex A of this document) it was determined that works were also required to the junctions with the M6 at Penrith (J40) and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner, in order to ensure the entire route achieves consistent standards and meets the project objectives. Details of the design refinements and alternative alignment routes considered since the PRA were provided in Section 5 of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Chapter 3: Alternatives of the ES (Application Document 3.02) and considered of the PEI Report, published as part of the Autumn 2021 consultation (Annex O of this document). Further details on the options considered were set out in the consultation document A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Route Development Report. (Appendix 3 of the ES (Application Reference 3.04).	
1291	150427		152216, 154331	Request for feedback / outcome of statutory consultation	Respondents requesting a response to their feedback on issues/concerns expressed in the statutory consultation feedback.	The summary consultation report and winter update provided a high-level overview of feedback received at the Autumn 2021 Consultation and the principal changes made as a result. This consultation report also provides a comprehensive response to comments received.	No
1357		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		DCO Consents	Respondents stating that the inclusion of a list of possible additional consents to the DCO in Paragraph 4.5.3 of Appendix 4.1 is welcomed and suggesting that the applicant should identify clearly within the DCO application which of these consents is being sought within the DCO and which will be sought at a later opportunity.	Our application for a development consent Order is accompanied by a Consents and Agreements Position Statement (document 5.4) which summarises the consents that are included in the draft DCO, and those that might be required separately to the DCO.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1358	154363			Review of FOI Request	Landowner requesting review of their request for information which was refused.	All landowner FOI requests have been responded to as appropriate. National Highways have responded to the request in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and in accordance with the principles behind the Act.	No
5	148581, 148699, 148705, 149373, 149385, 149388, 149687, 150144, 150186, 150189, 150435, 150460, 151456, 151484, 151503, 151504, 151520, 152215, 152239, 152242, 152265, 152900, 152906, 152974, 152998, 153035,	Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Musgrave Parish Council Natural England Richmond- shire District Council and North Yorkshire County	148628, 151468, 151510, 152259, 153379, 153556, 153574, 153601, 153603, 153606, 153620, 153623, 153624, 153625, 153628, 153806, 153842, 153847, 153927, 154005, 154017, 154180, 154191, 154232, 154357	Information & materials provided	Respondents expressing concern regarding the information provided in the consultation materials, including insufficient detail about mitigation measures; insufficient routes for non-motorised traffic; a perceived lack of detail in maps and diagrams; and that the documents were difficult to read and understand for a lay person.	Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the Local Planning Authority having regard to comments received in accordance with the Planning Act 2008. Information about the Project proposals was available online, at public events and local deposit locations. Staff were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining informed feedback on the Project proposals, and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. Non-technical information, published as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation included the consultation brochure, and the non-technical	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153134, 153305, 153315, 153323, 153326, 153333, 153343, 153371, 153377, 153388, 153560, 153604, 153605, 153614, 153618, 153619, 153621, 153622, 153797, 153812, 153814, 153816, 153828, 153838, 153855, 153860, 153870, 153872, 153888, 153894, 153900, 153901, 153906, 153919,	Council Rokeby, Brignall and Egglestone Abbey Parish' Shell Warcop Parish Council				<p>summary of the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report). We designed the non-technical summary and the consultation brochure to be accessible for less technical readers or people with less time to understand the Project and environmental impacts without needing the full detail of the PEI report. The non-technical summary and consultation brochure also referenced and signposted the technical information documents for those who wanted more detail, and the non-technical summary and brochure were prepared with appropriate headings so that people could find information on specific aspects and schemes if they wanted, without reading the full document.. Specific information on mitigation measures was outlined in the PEI Report, although mitigation measures have been further progressed since the consultation and set out in the DCO application (see Environmental Statement and the Environmental Management Plan).</p> <p>For the purpose of the Consultation and the DCO application, the Project has been split into eight geographical schemes. Map books with general arrangement drawings were published for the consultation, online and in hard</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153926, 153966, 153978, 153984, 154013, 154134, 154136, 154207, 154210, 154243, 154335, 154346, 154349, 154350, 154356, 154363, 154365, 154366, 154368, 154468, 162144, 162161					<p>copy at various drop-in locations. The books showed the layout of the proposed scheme including permanent works, new roads, earthworks, roadside features, environmental mitigation, provisional order limits and open space and replacement land. This level of information is in keeping with that required to demonstrate a preliminary design. Videos were available online to talk through the proposals and staff were available to discuss at drop-in locations.</p> <p>Further detail is presented in the DCO application.t.</p>	
54	151348, 151503, 151522, 152242, 153080, 153359, 153560, 154363, 154476, 155322		152261, 153033	Process - Lack of influence	Respondents expressing concern that their views are not being fully considered as part of the consultation process.	During Project design development, the Project team has worked proactively and collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, focus groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing engagement with each of the communities along the route (through	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the community liaison groups), using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement.</p> <p>Throughout the Project we have listened to feedback and amended our designs where feasible and in keeping with the objectives of the Project. Annex N of the Consultation Report, demonstrates where Project changes have been made that are relevant to the feedback received. .</p> <p>Feedback from stakeholders and communities informed the design of the Project and the preparation of the DCO application This is demonstrated by this Report, as submitted with the application..</p> <p>The Supplementary Consultation in March 2022 concerned changes to the Project, many of which related to the feedback received at the autumn consultation 2021.</p>	
235	151479, 152962, 153901		153864	Process - Lack of communication	Respondents expressing concern about the consultation process on the grounds that there was insufficient communication. Specific named stakeholders state that they own impacted land but were not sufficiently informed about the plans. Respondents also express concern about perceived lack of clarity around which routes are still	The Autumn 2021 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation and the Planning Act 2008. It included consultation with all of those known land interests as defined by Section 42 (1)(d) of the Act, with a letter setting out how information on the Project can be accessed and how to provide feedback.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					being considered and the current stage of the consultation.	<p>Annex H of the Consultation Report lists the persons with an interest in the land that were consulted on the Project and confirms how this corresponds with the Book of Reference. Ongoing engagement is being undertaken with land interests. Section 1.2 of the Consultation Report explains the process of ongoing engagement with landowners, which has taken place throughout the pre-application stages of the Project. Chapters 2, 3, 5 and 7 provide evidence of our continued engagement with landowners and PILs.</p> <p>The Consultation provided information on the preferred route and the alternatives previously considered. It also explained details of the design refinements and alternative alignment routes considered since the PRA. Chapter 3 of the PEI Report explained these alternatives and the various stages. Furthermore, some changes made following the Autumn 2021 consultation required further targeted supplementary consultation. The Consultation Brochures published as part of these consultations described this process. This process is further explained in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) submitted with the DCO application.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
264	150426, 150433, 152268, 152956, 153371, 154019, 154363, 154368, 154473, 154486	Durham County Council	149788, 153927	Process - Undue influence	Respondents expressing concerns that specific named stakeholders have had undue influence in the consultation process. This includes specific mentions of Historic England in relation to Rokeby Hall; Natural England in relation to the AONB; and large businesses along the route.	There have been opportunities for all parties to express their views and concerns on the proposals. The concerns raised about undue influence of specific stakeholders through the consultation process is noted. National Highways has taken a balanced approach to the all comments received when progressing the proposals, including those of the statutory bodies whilst acknowledging the important roles that they have with regards to the protection of the environment. It.	No
333	150200, 150435, 151522, 152922, 153080, 153369, 153558, 153826, 153872, 153888, 153894, 153915, 154195, 154335, 154363, 154459, 154467	Durham County Council Musgrave Parish Council Warcop Parish Council	153317, 153379, 153927, 153953	Process - Predetermination	Respondents expressing concerns that the outcome of the consultation process is predetermined. Respondents specifically refer to the presentation of certain routes as preferred and not others, some options not receiving enough attention/challenging the options appraisal process. Respondents also express concern about perceived lack of clarity around which options are still being considered and the current stage of the consultation. Project Speed has undermined the assessment process in terms of adequate time being given to options assessment.	Proposals for the improvement of the A66 between M6 junction 40 at Penrith and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner have been the subject of extensive study and consultation since 2017. The process of options identification and route selection leading to the Project was summarised in Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered of the PEI Report, published at the Autumn 2021 consultation. The process involved the following stages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor identification and initial sifting of corridors Development of route options within preferred corridors Route options appraisal and sifting to identify options to take forward for further appraisal 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection of route options, which were taken to non-statutory public consultation in Summer 2019 • The selection of the Preferred Route which was announced by the Secretary of State in May 2020 • Preliminary design stage assessment comprising further development of the Preferred Route, as well as some additional appraisal of alternative alignment routes for a number of the schemes <p>Throughout the process, a range of options for each scheme have been investigated and assessed against a range of engineering, economic, financial and environmental and property criteria. Part of this decision making is the preference expressed through consultation and engagement processes. This feedback was used to inform further design and development work on some elements of the project. Further engagement identified that there were opportunities to improve the design and its deliverability through further design refinement. Engagement with affected landowners and ongoing environmental assessment has also informed the amendments made.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Continued refinement of the Project, as described above, led to the need for further supplementary consultation in March-April 2022, providing further evidence of how feedback has continued to influence the Project. The Project Development Overview Report, submitted with the DCO application, provides further information on the ongoing design refinement process.	
339	153335, 153560, 153974, 153984, 153988, 153990, 153992, 153993, 153995, 153997, 154019, 154126, 154131, 154210, 154329, 154336, 154352, 154363, 154364, 155322			Timescale	Respondents expressing concerns about the timescale of the consultation. Respondents believe that six weeks is insufficient given that there are eight schemes and the complexity of the information. Respondents also expressing that the process has taken too long already. Comments also on timing of consultation given it was the summer, during the pandemic.	This scheme is important for safety and delaying the preferred route announcement and the statutory consultation would have had a detrimental impact on the timing of the whole programme for the A66. We also realise that our work on developing the A66 could lead to uncertainty for some residents and landowners along the route and the Preferred Route Alignment provided a level of certainty in this regard and allows us to engage with those directly affected in more detail. The Planning Act 2008 requires that a statutory consultation on a Project is required to be a minimum of 28 days. National Highways worked with the relevant local authorities on the Statement of Community Consultation,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>which set out the approach to the statutory consultation, as required by the Act (S47 (2)). This included matters relevant to the timing and duration of the consultation. In response to this engagement on the approach to the Consultation, we extended the original proposed duration from 30 days to 6 weeks.</p> <p>The six-week duration of the consultation is considered appropriate, given the scale and complexity of the Project, that there was a period of raising awareness in the lead up to the formal period of consultation as set out in Chapters 4 and 5 (evidence set out in Annex I, Annex L and Annex M of this Report) and that a range of ongoing engagement took place prior, during and following the formal period of consultation.</p>	
340	149405, 149409, 153391, 153855, 153960, 154363		153842, 154225	Previous consultation	<p>Respondents expressing concern related to the previous consultation about road development in the area. Respondents refer to a lack of information during the previous consultation and a lack of connection between the previous and current consultations. Lack of clarity on how issues raised</p>	<p>Proposals for the improvement of the A66 between M6 junction 40 at Penrith and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner have been the subject of extensive study and consultation since 2017. National Highways has followed a “you said, we did” approach through the evolution of the Project. As part of this we have published reports following each stage of consultation, which have summarised the feedback received,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					previously were considered. Lack of feedback sought at the time.	set out project progress and next steps. This included the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Preferred Route Announcement Report (Spring 2020) and the Summary of the Autumn 2021 Statutory Consultation (March 2022). Furthermore, this Consultation Report, as submitted with the DCO application sets out how we have had regard to consultation and engagement feedback. In addition, we have continued to engage with local communities and Stakeholders through the Project, as documented in this Report.	
412	149428, 153047, 153368, 153558, 153814, 154363		152961, 153927	Events	Respondents expressing concern about the consultation events, including: a perceived lack of detail and information; a sense that Highways England staff were not sufficiently knowledgeable of the local context or available; that events were poorly attended; Including consulting during the pandemic. There were also positive comments about the events and staff.	For the autumn 2021 consultation restrictions had been eased and face to face drop-in events were held. We introduced additional Covid safety measures, including facemasks for all the Project team on site, asking staff to take lateral flow tests before leaving home, individual hand gels for all Project team, disposable face masks available for attendees, disposable pens for signing in, hand gel around the venues, temperature checks on arrival, spacing out the information in the room to avoid clusters, pointers to reduce touchpoints on materials and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>encouraging social distances. All equipment was cleaned between use.</p> <p>We also used online resources, a virtual engagement room and webinars to engage with stakeholders and community who were not comfortable or able to attend in person events.</p> <p>All engagement and consultation and engagement will continue to be carried out in line with latest Government guidance.</p> <p>We recognise that not everybody has access to the internet however so hard copies of the brochure have been posted and leaflets distributed. We have also set up a dedicated A66 phone number for dealing with queries.</p> <p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation included a comprehensive range of material from visualisations and consultation brochure through to technical reports and nontechnical summaries.</p> <p>The drop-in events were attended by a number of the Project team, including stakeholder, public liaison officer, design, environment, district valuer and operations team to provide a broad range of expertise.</p> <p>The events were attended by over 1500 people.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
428	151341, 152268, 153335, 153894, 153900, 154485			General	Respondents expressing general concern about the consultation process, without providing further information.	Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the host local authorities (and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the scheme proposals was available online at public events and local deposit locations. Staff were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals. The material published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to the time of submitting the DCO application. In addition to the consultation brochure, the information provided included the Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEI Report) and its nontechnical summary, as well as plans of the proposals.	No
816	152268	Musgrave Parish Council	149790, 153065	Cost	Respondents expressing concern over the cost of the consultation process, including: producing materials to share; and the cost and value of producing sound samples of the A66 traffic.	Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the host local authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The approach to the consultation was robust, comprehensive and appropriate for the scale and complexity of the development proposed by the A66 Project.</p> <p>It was essential that we produced quality information, in a range of formats to ensure that the information was accessible to a wider range of stakeholders, landowners and the community. It is considered that the cost was proportionate to the scale and complexity of the Project and required to ensure that consultees were sufficiently informed to provide feedback.</p>	
1286	153838, 153888, 154363			Consultation Target Area	Concern that local villages were not part of the consultation	<p>Leaflets were sent to residents within a wide area (5km either side of the A66), known as the consultation target area, with further publicity of the consultation beyond this area. These leaflets informed the local community about the consultation. The consultation target area was based on our view on the area where we think that people are most likely to be affected by our proposals in combination with advice we received from local authorities. The consultation target area is shown in Appendix A of our Statement of Community Consultation (Annex G). The leaflet distributed within this area publicised the consultation and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						highlighted the website where materials were made available. The leaflets included dates and locations for the face-to-face consultation events and Engagement Van visits.	
1290	148605, 153075, 153560, 153613, 153901, 154207, 154363	Eden District Council Northern Gas Networks Temple Sowerby Parish Council	148607, 152216, 152961, 153383, 153561, 153602, 153607, 154254	Lack of engagement - Lack of communication	Respondents raised concern that requests for meetings/engagement historically that have had no response, perceived lack of engagement with particular groups for example, parish councils.	During the Project design development, the Project team has worked proactively and collaboratively with a variety of stakeholders through working groups, workshops, and one-to-one meetings with landowners and other interested parties. Design proposals have also been informed by ongoing consultation with each of the communities along the route (through the community liaison groups), using a variety of engagement techniques to maximise local involvement. Parish Councils were invited to join the community liaison groups.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General Comments about the Project - Community impact' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
242		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	162158	Community impact - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the Project on the grounds that it would improve general safety and wellbeing. Specific reference is made to welcoming National Highways' reference to health and safety principles in the 'Home Safe and Well' initiative.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
243	154136	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Community impact - Health	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing support for the Project on the grounds that elements of the Project would be positive for end users' health and the possible improvements to WCH provisions offer benefits to the local community to improve mental and physical health.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
699	153975	Cumbria County Council		Community impact - People	Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing general support for the Project as it will positively contribute to the delivery of the Council Plan (2018-2022) stated outcomes and improve the amenity for residents living on the remaining single carriageway sections.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
33	149350, 153384, 154148	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Community impact - People	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest that the Project should prioritise local community benefits including training and employing local people, reducing and avoiding community severance and ensuring communities are aware of construction works.	A range of jobs will be generated during the construction programme. These will include unskilled and skilled construction jobs as well as engineering, planning and management professionals. Individuals from within the study area who gain employment on the construction of the Project may experience positive health effects including improved mental health and increased ability to access healthy lifestyle choices through increased income. There is a potential for long-term benefits to health and wellbeing through training and improved future employment prospects. Individuals who are currently unemployed or in low-paid or insecure employment will have the highest potential for health benefits. The total number of construction jobs, and the proportion of jobs likely to be available to the local community, are not known at this stage and therefore the health effect is assessed as neutral. New spend within the local economy by construction workers is likely to benefit local businesses such as accommodation, retail and hospitality. While this is likely to be relatively small when compared with overall spend in the area, it could benefit local	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>businesses for the duration of the construction programme. Increased spend in these sectors may lead to increased employment opportunities and incomes, leading to positive health effects. The scale of indirect employment has not been quantified and therefore the health effects are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Regarding comments about severance, design for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders has been produced in consultation with local authorities to ensure a collaborative approach that meets the demands of the local population. Reducing the impact of the Project on severance for local communities is a Project Objective. Benefits for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders have been identified including a reduction in severance and an improvement in connectivity and local travel patterns through the provision of new walking and cycling routes during the operation of the Project. The Project design has identified opportunities to enhance local connectivity within Eden District which include an active travel link eastwards from Penrith and utilising sections of the de-trunked A66. Connectivity will be maintained throughout the Project with temporary</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>diversions in place during construction and permanent diversions during operation for footpaths and roads to ensure there is no loss of connectivity to and from local communities and assets.</p> <p>Regarding notification to communities about construction works, a Community Engagement Plan will be in place, and it will be the responsibility of the Community Relations Manager (CRM) to look after this. The CRM will hold overall responsibilities relating to engagement with the public, non-agricultural landowners, stakeholders and other interested parties, outreach and education, where appropriate. The CRM will keep local residents informed throughout the construction period on the planned construction activities and the progress made. Community Liaison Groups will continue to share information with local representatives.</p>	
308	162161	Eden District Council		Community impact - Listen to locals	Respondents including Eden District Council suggesting that the Applicant listen to local opinion, including through consultations and the establishment of an Oversight Committee to allow local communities to monitor construction of the Project.	Consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation, which was subject to consultation with the host authorities and Planning Act 2008 statutory requirements. Information about the Project was available online, at public events and local deposit	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>locations. Staff were on hand at exhibitions to talk through the proposals.</p> <p>The feedback received through the Autumn 2021 Consultation process was reviewed, coded and interpreted by a specialist analysis partner. This included comments received through the online and offline consultation feedback forms and those received by email and letter. All this information was collated into themes and passed to the relevant teams within the wider project team to have regard and to support and inform the design development.</p> <p>Regarding comments about an Oversight Committee, National Highway's approach will be set out in a Community Engagement Plan and it will be the responsibility of the Community Relations Manager (CRM) oversee. The CRM will hold overall responsibilities relating to engagement with the public, non-agricultural landowners, stakeholders and other interested parties, outreach and education, where appropriate. The CRM will keep local residents informed throughout construction of activities planned and progress being made. The Community Liaison Groups will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						continue to share information with local representatives. This approach does not involve an 'Oversight Committee, however it is deemed that the CRM and Community Liaison Groups will sufficiently provide this function.	
101	149350, 151481, 152923, 153560, 153797, 153851, 153904, 153965, 154197, 154368, 154461, 162161	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	150183, 153039, 153607	Community impact - People	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern about the potential impact of the Project on communities. Respondents state that their quality of life would not be improved by the proposals, and express doubt over the potential long-term benefits. Respondents raise concern on the impact on the temporary accommodation sector, construction employment sector and businesses directly or indirectly affected by construction and operation.	National Highways are committed to working closely with local people and businesses to understand how the Project will affect them. An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in National Highways document 'LA 112 Population and Human Health', contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, as the appropriate standard which provides a framework for assessing, mitigating and reporting the effects of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads projects on population and health. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Please refer to ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Regarding comments about temporary accommodation and businesses affected. New spend within the local economy by construction workers is likely to benefit local businesses such as accommodation, retail and hospitality. While this is likely to be relatively small when compared with overall spend in the area, it could benefit local businesses for the duration of the construction programme. Increased spend in these sectors may lead to increased employment opportunities and incomes, leading to positive health effects. The scale of indirect employment has not been quantified and therefore the health effects are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Regarding comments about the construction employment sector, a range of jobs will be generated during the construction programme. This will include unskilled and skilled construction jobs as well as</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>engineering, planning and management professionals. Individuals from within the study area who gain employment on the construction of the Project may experience positive health effects including improved mental health and increased ability to access healthy lifestyle choices through increased income. There is a potential for long-term benefits to health and wellbeing through training and improved future employment prospects. Individuals who are currently unemployed or in low-paid or insecure employment will have the highest potential for health benefits. The total number of construction jobs, and the proportion of jobs likely to be available to the local community, are not known at this stage and therefore the health effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>During operation, there is the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity may also be a significant effect for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>usability of community land and assets.</p> <p>During operation, through improved connectivity, we will improve access to community facilities and other services for rural communities, leading to a range of benefits on wellbeing.</p> <p>Two of the core objectives of the Project are to re-connect currently severed communities and provide better links between settlements along the A66, as well as improving access to services such as healthcare, employment areas and education, and to improve access to key tourist destinations such as the North Pennines, Lake District and Yorkshire Dales.</p>	
222	152923, 154132		153376, 153607	Community impact – Anti-social behaviour	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the Project will increase anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Respondents also raise concern about the potential for an increase in physical and verbal confrontations in Kirby Stephe due to traffic congestion and accidents during construction.</p> <p>Respondents also express concern about the conduct of drivers and that lay-bys would be used for toilet breaks and rubbish.</p>	<p>While National Highways recognises concerns relating to anti-social behaviour, addressing such issues falls outside of the scope of a highways scheme and is a matter for the local police service and local authority.</p> <p>During construction of the schemes between Brough and Penrith, the A66 will remain open: motorists travelling between Penrith and Brough are thus unlikely to seek diversion through Kirkby Stephen via the M6, which</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>would add of the order of an additional 35 miles to their journey.</p> <p>Upon operation the new road will be a free-flowing dual carriageway with quicker, more reliable journey times, resulting in less accidents and reduced driver frustration.</p> <p>Lay-bys along the route have been sited in compliance with design standards and they have been designed so as to minimise their size, to specifically discourage longer staying and overnight parking by HGV drivers which will minimise litter and using them as toilet stops. The responsibility for litter collection for this section of the A66 sits with Cumbria County Council.</p>	
290	153984, 154126, 154136, 154329, 154340, 154364, 154368	Cumbria County Council		Community impact - Health	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing concern relating to community health and wellbeing. Respondents stating that there would be a detrimental impact on physical health, such as cardiovascular and respiratory issues. Concerns include increased noise and air pollution and the severance of routes for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. Respondents also raise concerns that the Project could have significant effects upon population</p>	<p>The impact of the scheme on air quality has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2). An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health is also provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in National Highways document 'LA 112 Population and Human Health',</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					through the disruption and stress it could cause to the temporary accommodation sector, the construction employment sector and businesses that are directly or indirectly affected as a consequence of the construction and operational phases.	contained in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, as the appropriate standard which provides a framework for assessing, mitigating and reporting the effects of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads projects on population and health. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the scheme on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Chapter 13 Population and Human Health of the ES also details the potential impact of the Project on local businesses, local housing and accommodation during construction and operation. Mitigation identified includes an Accommodation Strategy, which will be prepared in consultation with the Local Planning Authorities. This will ensure that additional demand created by non-home-based workers does not place excessive pressure on the local housing market and visitor accommodation supply. This will be	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>based on a forecast of the number of people employed throughout the construction programme and the likely proportion requiring accommodation. Impacts on the local housing and tourism sectors will be evaluated and the strategy will set out proposals for the provision of high-quality accommodation for construction workers as required, either within construction compounds or off-site. The strategy will outline how the selected sites will be accessed by public transport, both for ease of access during construction and to promote future use of the sites should they be repurposed. It will also provide an assessment of impacts on local healthcare infrastructure and set out measures to equip services to cope with any increase in demand.</p> <p>A Skills and Employment Strategy will also be prepared and will outline how the Project will support training and upskilling of the local workforce to ensure their use is maximised during the construction phase. This will also help to leave a positive legacy for future employment opportunities whilst also ensuring any potential labour shortages are covered.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General Comments about the Project – Construction' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
183		Eden District Council		Construction - Construction documents	Eden District Council expressing support for the detail provided in the Construction Method Statement.	National Highways welcomes the support for the detail provided in the Construction Method Statement. Whilst this Construction Method and Management Statement (CMMS) will not be included as part of the DCO application, a number of construction related elements will be included within the Environmental Statement (ES) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP). Chapter 2 of the ES (Application Document 3.2) covers a notable amount of information, and this is supported by the Annexes within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) that cover construction related elements such as Materials and waste management, dust, noise and vibration, traffic management and site establishment.	No
848	154241	Historic England		Construction - Timescale	Respondents including Historic England expressing general support for the proposed construction timescale for the Project. Respondents support the 2029 completion target and the potential alignment of the Project to the Government's 'Project Speed Agenda'.	National Highways acknowledges and welcomes the support from Historic England for the proposed construction timescale for the Project. Project Speed has reviewed the end-to-end delivery process of previous National Highway related projects and by applying learnings across a number of case study projects has identified a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>package of reforms. One reform identified is potential significant time savings through more efficient and focused decision making, the appointed taskforce advised reforms could cut project delivery times by a third.</p> <p>The A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project is part of the Project Speed initiative and we have identified the opportunity to reduce the initial identified construction phase from a 10 years down to 5 years. We are working closely with our delivery partners to achieve our target of completion of the works on site by 2029.</p>	
107	162147	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Royal Mail</p> <p>Transport for the North</p>		Construction - Mitigate construction	<p>Respondents suggesting construction mitigations to address health and safety concerns, assessments of proposed diversion routes; replacement shuttle buses if construction restricts local bus routes; accommodation campuses that could be left as a legacy of the Project; and mitigations against excessive cut and fill; increased carbon emissions and noise, dust and disturbance on stakeholders and sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>Health</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is provided in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in the National Highways document LA 112 Population and Human Health, part of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges suite of documents, which provides a framework for assessing, mitigating, and reporting the effects of motorway and all-purpose trunk roads projects on population and health. The</p>	tco

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green space, traffic, severance, and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable.</p> <p>From the assessment carried out under chapter 13 of the ES the overall impact of the Project during construction, as you would expect with a Project of this size and complexity, will be negative. The Project will impact businesses with land loss, temporary access arrangements, disruption and longer journey times through some schemes. Construction activities will also impact local resident and visitors in terms of temporary diversion routes leading to longer journey times, increase in noise and dust levels during construction and the negative effects on resident's health and mental wellbeing. The construction period does also offer advantages in terms of work opportunities for local people and increased business from the presence of the work force across the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>In terms of the operation of the Project after construction the impact is positive. The Project will bring shorter journey times and less disruption for the public and local businesses. The dualling of the A66 will provide more resilience if accidents occur and will provide a safer environment will accident risks reduced. Better facilities will be provided for walkers and cyclist which should encourage people to use the facilities which then has a positive impact on mental health. There are negative impacts with increased noise, light and landscape visual impacts at a number or receptors.</p> <p>The Project must also implement an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) which compliments the ES. The plan provides clear guidance on how mitigation and management of environmental effects of the Project will be delivered and maintained, during construction. The EMP sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project as identified in the ES. An EMP, (Application Document 2.7), based on the preliminary design, is submitted as part of the DCO application. This document includes 15 Annexes</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>covering Noise and vibration, Materials and waste, heritage, construction traffic, construction worker travel and accommodation ,etc. The Principal Contractor (PC), in consultation with the relevant local authorities, is required to develop the EMP and associated annexes to ensure the mitigation measures can be delivered.</p> <p>Safety</p> <p>National Highways are committed to the highest level of safety for the proposed construction and operation of the Scheme, and also to minimise disruption to the public.</p> <p>In line with the Construction, Design and Management (CDM) regulation obligations we will appoint a Principal Designer (PC) who will be responsible to plan, manage, monitor and coordinate health and safety in the pre-construction phase of the Project. The design consultant has fulfilled this role through the preliminary design stage of the Project.</p> <p>We are also in the process of appointing four framework Delivery Integration Partners who will fulfil the role of PC as part of a partnership arrangement. The PC will co-ordinate the construction phase of the Project and will plan, manage, monitor and coordinate health and safety during this phase. The nominated PC will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>also look to ensure that the health and safety of stakeholders and road users is maintained at all times as part of their This will include the safe design and construction of the Project elements both from a permanent and temporary works basis, ensuring there is no danger caused to human health or property.</p> <p>During the construction phase, safety will be of paramount importance with works planned and phased to mitigate impacts and exposure to stakeholders and road users. Where identified, additional measures will be implemented to maintain safety, such as additional traffic management, change in construction approach or location. Please see section 2 of the EMP for more details along with associated Annexes.</p> <p>The EMP has a requirement for the PC to appoint a Traffic Control Officer (TCO) whose main responsibility is to update and ensure compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP lists the requirements for temporary traffic management across the whole Project during the construction phase. The TCO will ensure compliance of the CTMP. Other duties the TCO must perform include the management and implementation of temporary traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>management, management of site compound layouts, inspection of traffic management equipment and to ensure compliance with relevant Health and Safety directives.</p> <p>Diversion routes and shuttle buses</p> <p>The PC carrying out the works will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTM) (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. This will include requirements to retain two lanes running on existing dual carriageway lengths of the A66 and single running across the existing single carriageway extents throughout the majority of the construction works period. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes, with the exceptions being when key works are required on new or old sections of the A66. These key works include pavement tie in works, the construction of new structures or changes to existing structures or culvert, all of which cannot be carried out safely with the A66 traffic movements maintained.</p> <p>The identification of diversion routes will be carefully considered, and National Highways welcomes further</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>discussions about identified diversion routes with the relevant local highways authorities. As part of this approach, local access roads/routes will be assessed to ensure the implemented diversion does not generate key pinch points or encourage overuse of popular local access routes. Appropriate signage will also be used on the diversion routes to ensure drivers are appropriately informed, helping to prevent non approved routes from being used. Where there are concerns, key local access roads may also be closed during the short-term diversions, with local access only being permitted.</p> <p>While liaising with stakeholders over proposed diversion routes, traffic management specialists will also independently assess the condition and suitability of proposed routes taking note of health and safety concerns for local people, most notably children. Wider network impacts will also be considered for key connecting roads like the A6 and A685. Such wider impacts will be combined within diversion assessments to ensure the strategic road network is not adversely affected, with other critical roads being taken into consideration.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>During the construction process, it is likely that long term diversions will be required at key pinch point locations to enable the new A66 to be constructed. As part of National Highways commitment to maintaining the A66 traffic flows and mitigating impacts on residents and stakeholders, new temporary roads may be constructed. These may be in place for the duration of the works and will be removed when the new A66 is completed. The roads will be constructed in line with highways standards and will be fully compliant. Such additional measures will help mitigate significant short-term diversions, reduce the construction programmes, and prevent high traffic volumes in villages. Such planning will be carried out alongside engagement with local authorities and stakeholders. Based on the current proposals, it is not anticipated that local bus services will be adversely affected by the construction works, the implementation of shuttle busses is unlikely to be required. During the construction process the appointed Traffic Control Officer along with traffic management liaison officers will look to engage with stakeholders to understand particular concerns. The PC will be requested to look to maintain all current public transport services. The developed</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>CTMP PC will look to address public service impacts, should they occur, identifying the mitigation measures to be implemented.</p> <p>Accommodation</p> <p>The Project is expected to require a significant workforce, in excess of 1000 workers may be required during peak periods. Plans are currently being developed to establish where the workforce will be sourced from and the potential need for suitable accommodation close to the work areas.</p> <p>National Highways is aware of the potential impacts a large workforce can have on a small community, with proactive steps taken to ensure locals and tourists are not displaced by the demands of the workforce accommodation needs; this will include steps taken to ensure tourist-based accommodation are not consumed, with the workforce being guided when selecting accommodation that is in existence or required to be constructed. Locations for potential workforce accommodation have yet to be decided but legacy improvements will be considered as part of measures drawn up, with input from local stakeholders and Councils. Should an accommodation facility be constructed,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>at the end of its use, it will be reviewed to identify if it can be used as legacy asset to benefit local businesses/ stakeholders or if it should be removed.</p> <p>Earthworks and materials</p> <p>As part of the design process, National Highways remain committed to achieving the most sustainable route selection possible, looking to mitigate excessive cut and fill on the Project with the goal of reducing earthworks movements. Due to the challenging topography, significant earthworks are required on parts of the Project to facilitate the new road in providing a safe, compliant and economical journey for A66 commuters. Where possible, schemes on the Project will look to achieve a cut and fill balance, through changes in level to the road alignment to prevent the movement of material between schemes. Where material movement is unavoidable due to highway alignment challenges, limited storage availability or constrained boundary conditions, neighbouring schemes will look to be designed to incorporate additional material. As part of the Project, all material movements will be calculated, measured, and closely monitored with efficiencies being sought at every stage to help reduce plant movements,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>noise, and disturbance. Please refer to Chapter 11 Materials and Waste of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This chapter assesses the likely significant material assets and waste effects of the construction and operation of the Project</p> <p>As part of the requirements of the EMP the PC must appoint a Site Materials and Waste Manager for the Project whose duties include working closely with the Environment Manager for the Project to ensure the EMP is complied with, updating the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and updating the Materials Management Plan (MMP) Section 4 of the EMP requires the production of an Outline SWMP and MMP, refer to EMP (Application document 3.3) for further detail.</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>National Highways is committed to reducing the impacts of the Project in relation to greenhouse gas emissions, noise, dust and disturbance on stakeholders and sensitive receptors. Throughout the design and delivery process, we will actively engage with communities to make the appropriate decisions to mitigate any Project effects on road users and stakeholders , whilst taking note of the long-term benefits to the community</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and environment of undertaking this Project. It is widely understood the impacts large material movements have on the generation of emissions, therefore the Project will look to mitigate excessive material and plant movements through efficient design and value engineering solutions. This will be further supported through sustainable sourcing. Our environment teams have looked to assess the impacts generated by the Project and have identify ways such impacts can be reduced or offset.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the management actions that need to be implemented by the PC to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and operation, as identified in the ES, and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental legislation. The EMP provided with the DCO application is the first iteration and If DCO consent is granted it becomes a certified document, under the DCO. The detailed design consultant will continue to develop the EMP throughout the detailed design phase applying changes in environmental policy where necessary. A second iteration of the EMP is required to be submitted to the Secretary of State, for approval, prior to the Start of Works.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The EMP sets out measures to control lighting, dust, noise, spillage, and the movement of construction traffic on road, as well as other impacts/disturbances. It also sets out the requirements for the Principal Contractor to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team. The provisions of the EMP must be complied with, as a requirement of the DCO	
111	152224	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Timescale	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making suggestions relating to the timescale of construction. Respondents suggest that there should be a clear traffic management strategy, Temporary Traffic Management notification period included before construction begins, and that timescales should be extended to include the correction of defects following construction. Others suggest that work starts at the M6 and moves east.	The Project is one of the largest projects carried out by National Highways in the north of England for decades, involving work locations spread between Penrith to the west and Scotch Corner to the east. Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases. Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>practicable. Information on the proposed construction work timescales is explained within the EMP, (Application Document 2.7) (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO).</p> <p>The EMP includes at Annex B13 an extended essay plan outlining the requirements of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The Principal Contractor will be required to develop the CTMP to ensure disruption is minimised during the construction phase. The detailed CTMP will be managed during the construction phase by the appointed Traffic Control Officer (TCO),</p> <p>The CTMP as part of the communication plan for the Project will require monthly traffic management stakeholder meetings to be convened. Identified interested parties including the emergency services and local authorities representatives will be invited to these monthly meetings to discuss current and upcoming temporary traffic management issues. This will help ensure adequate notification periods are provided to affected parties.</p> <p>Due to the size of the schemes involved on the Project, staggered start</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>dates for each scheme will be considered to optimise construction practises and the sharing of resources and materials where required. Some schemes are reliant on other schemes for excavated materials and will require programming accordingly. The allocated construction periods for each scheme will also be realistic and reflective of the construction challenges, with some contingency for such challenges.</p> <p>For a scheme of this size, it would not be cost effective or viable from a disruption position to commence the works from one end of the Project and proceed through, working on one scheme at a time. Many efficiencies would be lost, increased environmental impacts would be generated and stakeholders would be impacted for a longer duration. As part of the Project's planning, construction timescales will be realistic and will account for the identified challenges during construction.</p>	
119	153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Construction documents	Respondents suggesting additions to the existing construction documents to include potential impacts on local roads, farms, blue light facilities, and delivery services. Request to ensure the ES and the CMMS are consistent, the submission of a draft	The construction information relevant to a CMMS is presented in ES Chapter 2 The Project (Application Document 3.2). The control of construction activities is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The associated annexes of the EMP set out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Royal Mail			<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan that also covers impacts on local roads and updates to the EMP as construction plans change.</p>	<p>detailed essay plans encompassing construction traffic management (Annex B13). The PC is required to develop the EMP in consultation with the relevant local / highways authority to ensure any disruption is minimised. The detailed CTMP will be managed during the construction phase by the appointed Traffic Control Officer (TCO), a role identified in the EMP.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Project will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing at acceptable speed limits. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p> <p>Whilst maintaining traffic flows on the A66 remains a high priority during the works, National Highways also remains committed to ensuring local access roads are not overused, with appropriate traffic management strategies being implemented.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1201		Environment Agency		Construction - Mitigate construction	The Environment Agency suggesting the requirement for an Ecological / Environmental Clerk of Works (ECoW / EcCoW / EnCoW) during construction and any changes to mitigation measures proposed in the Environmental Statement / Environmental Mitigation Plan go through appropriate consultation.	<p>The feedback on the scope and content of the PEI Report is welcomed and noted.</p> <p>An EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been produced as part of the DCO. As set out in the EMP, an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) is required to be appointed before the Start of Works of the Project, helping to ensure any change is acceptable and where required, wider communication with stakeholders takes place. The responsibilities of the ECoW is set out under section 2.2, Project roles, of the EMP. The ECoW will report to the appointed Environment Manager for the Project and will be made aware of any changes.</p> <p>The findings and conclusions of the ES will remain unchanged with the only changes being the inclusion additional control measures where necessary. The EMP will be developed during the detailed design stage by the Principal Contractor and design consultant team. Key stakeholders including the Environment Agency will be consulted, where required, to ensure all parties are aware and in agreement.</p>	No
168	154136, 154243	Cumbria County Council	153603	Construction - Infrastructure	Respondents expressing concern about the impact of construction on local infrastructure. This includes	As part of the Project, to upgrade the road network and associated new	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council Northern Powergrid Holdings Company United Utilities Group PLC			<p>utilities apparatus and the risks associated with interacting / building on or near these utilities. This also includes housing infrastructure availability for the influx of construction workers expected and how this will impact on housing availability. Suggestions made to develop a plan for workers accommodation.</p>	<p>structures, National Highways recognises that the Project may require certain utility infrastructure to be diverted, where it has not been possible to incorporate existing services as part of the design. Where this is the case, it will work with the relevant utility companies to seek to minimise disruption, with a view to ensuring any new diversions are in place prior to existing infrastructure being moved/switched off. This will be governed by the protective provisions for the benefit of statutory undertakers (SU's) contained in the DCO. The agreement of standard protected provisions has started, and all affect SU's have been sent copies of the standard provisions. This process is ongoing and where required additional provision clauses are being considered under side order agreements.</p> <p>At all stages during the construction process, regulations will be adhered to, with the Principal Contractors liaising closely with utility providers on where works are required, along with associated storage areas and haul routes.</p> <p>The Project is expected to require a significant workforce, in excess of 1000 workers may be required during peak periods. Plans are currently being developed to establish where the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>workforce will be sourced from and the potential need for suitable accommodation close to the work areas. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) includes extended essay plan B10 Construction Worker Travel and Accommodation plan. This will be developed by the PC in consultation with the relevant local authorities</p> <p>National Highways is aware of the potential impacts a large workforce can have on a small community, with proactive steps taken to ensure locals and tourists are not displaced by the demands of workforce accommodation needs; this will include steps taken to ensure tourist-based accommodation is not consumed, with the workforce positively encouraged to seek other alternatives that may include a bespoke worker accommodation facility. For more information on construction worker travel and accommodation plans, please refer to the EMP, Annex B10 Construction Worker and Accommodation Plan.</p>	
193	150146, 154241	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Construction - Timescale	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern relating to the construction timescale, including concerns about the length of time that it would take before the	Construction works are planned to commence in 2024 should our Development Consent Order application be successful, with all schemes targeted for completion by 2029 or earlier. Each scheme will not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Project would be completed and that there is insufficient provision of information on temporary traffic management and road closures.</p>	<p>take these five years to complete as the Project will be constructed in phases.</p> <p>Construction methods and phasing has been developed throughout the Project's design in order to minimise disruption as far as reasonably practicable. Information on the scheme durations is noted within section 1 of the EMP, (Application Document 2.7) (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO).</p> <p>The Principal Contractor carrying out the works will produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as required by the EMP (compliance with which is secured in the draft DCO) with the aim of minimising traffic disruption during the works, including minimising road closures where possible. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout the majority of the works. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes.</p> <p>It is usual practice for the existing carriageway to remain open at all times during construction in order to prevent traffic using local roads as diversion routes.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>In some instances, there may be a requirement to close the A66 or local roads in order to carry out some complex engineering works, however, these closures will be limited to weekend and off-peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance.</p> <p>Further information about traffic management and road closures will be developed and shared in detailed design. In all cases where applicable, the local authority will be kept informed in advance and consulted with on proposed traffic management.</p>	
194	153851, 154148	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust</p> <p>Royal Mail</p>	154180	Construction - Disruption	<p>Respondents expressing concern about construction disruption on the local road network, local communities, local services, and businesses. This includes concerns about the suitability of the local road network to accommodate diversion routes, connectivity maintained for communities, archaeological discoveries during the construction phase resulting in lengthy disruption, and dust pollution impacting on businesses.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Project, including this scheme, will be challenging to construct, but National Highways is committed to minimising traffic disruption on the road network, including on the A66 itself, and local communities, services, and businesses. National Highways is confident that it is possible to construct the Project whilst keeping traffic flowing, as far as reasonably practicable. Traffic management will be important and the Project will seek to keep all stakeholders informed of the plans as the Project progresses to minimise disruption.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Principal Contractor, in consultation with the local authority, will have to produce a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (a requirement of the EMP, compliance with which will be secured in the DCO) with the aim of minimising disruption during the works. This will include requirements to retain two lanes on the A66 throughout the majority of the works. This should minimise the need for the use of diversion routes.</p> <p>The identification of diversion routes will be carefully considered, and National Highways welcomes discussion about identified diversion routes with the relevant local highways authorities. As part of this approach, local access roads/routes will be assessed to ensure the implemented diversion does not generate key pinch points or encourage overuse of popular local access routes. Appropriate signage will also be used on the diversion routes to ensure drivers are appropriately informed, helping to prevent non approved routes from being used. Where there are concerns, key local access roads may also be closed during the short-term diversions, with local access only being permitted.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Whilst liaising with stakeholders over proposed diversion routes, traffic management specialists will also independently assess the condition and suitability of proposed routes taking note of health and safety concerns for local people, most notably children. Wider network impacts will also be considered for key connecting roads like the A6 and A685. Such wider impacts will be combined within diversion assessments to ensure the strategic road network is not adversely affected, with other critical roads being taken into consideration.</p> <p>During the construction process, it is likely that long term diversions will be required at key pinch point locations to enable the new A66 to be constructed. As part of National Highways' commitment to maintaining the A66 traffic flows and mitigating impacts on residents and stakeholders, new temporary roads may be constructed. These may be in place for the duration of the works and will be removed when the new A66 is completed. The roads will be constructed in line with highways standards and will be fully compliant. Such additional measures will help mitigate significant short-term diversions, reduce the construction programmes, and prevent high traffic volumes in villages. Such planning will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>be carried out alongside engagement with local authorities and stakeholders. Regarding walker, cyclist and horse-riding connectivity, it is likely that some Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will be required to be closed or diverted during the works.. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, alternative routes will look to be created during construction where possible. PRoW routes will look to be reinstated or improved following the scheme (s) completion. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>A dedicated Community Relations Manager will keep local residents informed throughout construction of activities planned and progress being made. Community Liaison Groups will share information with local representatives. For the travelling public, National Highways will post regular updates on the Project website and also consider other ways of providing information, such as through the development of a mobile app, displays in roadside services and use of variable message signs to indicate travel times.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Regarding comments about archaeology, further ground and archaeological investigations are scheduled to be carried out early in the detailed design stage of the Project to confirm the proposed design or to identify possible challenges to the permanent works design and layout. These investigations are essential and will help inform the detailed design process. The identified further investigations, are contained within Annex B3 Detailed Heritage Mitigation Plan Final environmental investigations and monitoring reports, of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). During construction works, the site teams will remain vigilant to any archaeology that could not be investigated prior to the main works particularly in areas where land access has been refused previously. Where required, work will stop to enable further investigations and, if required, possible changes to the design.</p> <p>Regarding comments about dust pollution, an EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been prepared as part of the draft DCO. The purpose of the EMP is to set out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project during construction and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						operation as identified in the Environment Statement. The EMP sets out measures to control lighting, dust, noise, spillage, and the movement of construction traffic on the road. The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractor and detailed design consultants into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project. Where local businesses and stakeholders are likely to be affected, representatives from the construction teams will look to engage to identify potential concerns. Where possible, appropriate steps will be taken to minimise or prevent issues such as dust, noise, or vibration.	
398	152998, 154243			Construction - Waste management	Respondents expressing concern relating to construction about the volume and management of spoil and questions about the plans for recycling demolished building materials.	The Project, due to its location and extents, represents many design and construction challenges attributed to by the topography and close proximity receptors. On the Project there are several schemes that require extensive amounts of earthworks to be carried out to facilitate the new dual carriageway whilst also looking to provide vertical and horizontal alignment improvements.. As part of the design, the new A66 alignment looks to smooth out the road, with notable embankments and cuttings being created to improve the driving experience and increase stopping sight	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>distances in line with modern highway standards.</p> <p>As part of the Project, all material movements will be calculated, measured, and closely monitored with efficiencies being sought at every stage to help reduce plant movements, noise, and disturbance. Please refer to Chapter 11 Materials and Waste of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This chapter assesses the likely significant material assets and waste effects of the construction and operation of the Project</p> <p>As part of the requirements of the EMP the PC must appoint a Site Materials and Waste Manager for the Project whose duties include working closely with the Environment Manager for the Project to ensure the EMP is complied with, updating the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) and updating the Materials Management Plan (MMP) Section 4 of the EMP requires the production of an Outline SWMP and MMP before the start of works, refer to EMP (Application document 3.3) for further detail.</p> <p>The Project will aim to achieve at least 90% (by weight) of material recovery of non-hazardous materials. Recycled demolition materials including brick and concrete will be crushed to use a subbase for tracks or roads. Chapter</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>11 Materials and Waste of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) covers the recycling targets for the Project.</p> <p>National Highway is not only focused on mitigating the impacts generated by excavated fill material, but also committed to reducing the volume of imported material required on the Project. Where possible the old carriageway and associated sub-base aggregate will be re-used on the Project, along with the proposed demolition arisings from select properties and buildings along the Project. Such material subject to suitability and contamination checks, will be crushed and re-used.. This will help to reduce the amount of material being imported on site from external locations, helping improve the carbon footprint of the scheme.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
950			153341	Construction - Construction compounds	Respondent expressing concern about proposed construction compounds and suitability of sites due to topography.	The proposed locations of the construction compounds were amended following feedback from Statutory Consultation and consultation with other stakeholders. The revised compounds were consulted upon as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>part of the Supplementary Consultation (A66 Trans-Pennine Supplementary Design Consultation: walking, cycling and horse-riding provision, landform and compounds) carried out from 16 February to 20 March 2022.</p> <p>For a project of this scale, a number of compounds will need to be established to manage the works from. The compound locations have been carefully selected to ensure limited impact on the local topography. A key factor is good, close links to the A66 via existing junctions. The access routes to compounds from the A66 should try to reduce the amount of traffic using the local road network and passing residential properties or local features. Where possible compounds will look to be located out of sight, utilising suitable areas of land to meet the needs of the compound.</p> <p>Earthworks will be kept to a minimum when forming compounds and access roads, to minimise disturbance and prevent significant changes to the A66 landscape.</p> <p>For further information about construction compounds, please refer to A66 Environmental Management Plan (EMP) Annex B15 Site Establishment Plan.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1212		Eden District Council		Construction - Disruption from discoveries during construction	Eden District Council expressing concern about the disruption that could be caused to traffic management if significant discoveries made during excavation and mitigation works.	Further ground and archaeological investigations will look to be carried out early in the Project to identify likely challenges with respect to the permanent works design and layout. Whilst these investigations are essential and help inform the detailed design process they are not conclusive. It is not practical or feasible to undertake such a detailed level of prior investigation to ensure no challenges are met during construction, thus a balance must be met and there remains a possibility of some discoveries during the construction process. Where discoveries are made, suitable plans will be implemented to reduced traffic management disruption where possible. For further information, please refer to the EMP, Annex B3 (Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy) on Heritage mitigation on how construction approaches will be reviewed should heritage discoveries be made.	No
1214	154243	Environment Agency		Construction - Project Speed	Respondents including the Environment Agency expressing concern relating to the project being part of Project Speed being a risk to measures to the quality of the project	Notwithstanding Project Speed, suitable mitigation has been developed and is secured as part of the DCO. The DCO application for the Project still has to meet all the requirements of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					including mitigation of the environmental effects of the development.	Planning Inspectorate including timescales and current legislation, Project Speed has identified timescale saving opportunities to speed up the delivery of projects through more efficient and focused decisions primarily during the design and construction phases of the Project.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘General comments about the Project – Economics’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
34	153844, 154132, 154136, 154146, 154148, 162147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England Transport for the North Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority		Economics - Economic benefit	Respondents expressing support for the Project due to its potential economic benefits. Respondents state that the Project would benefit the national and local economy due to increased connectivity, especially to the north-east and between the east and west of the country. Other respondents state that freight would be able to travel faster, and tourists would be attracted to the region, particularly to Cumbria. Respondents also state that the Project could provide better access to employment opportunities for local people.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project due to its potential economic benefits. Refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for the Project benefits and opportunities. The proposal to upgrade the A66 is a project at the heart of National Highways plans to tie into the UK Government's plans including 'Build Back Better: our plan for growth' published in March 2021 and 'Levelling up in the United Kingdom' – White Paper published in February 2022 by improving infrastructure and boosting connections across the North region. It is considered to be the best way to meet the future needs of those living, working and travelling along the corridor in the 21st century. Importantly the appraisal (refer to the Transport Assessment for appraisal information - Application Document 3.7) showed that the dualling is best able to meet the transport planning project objectives by providing a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						This dualling will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, and transporting freight. It is considered that Project will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times. The planned upgrades will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity.	
983	148576, 153833			Economics - Cost	Respondents expressing opposition to the Project due to its cost. These respondents state that the Project is too expensive to justify its construction.	The existing A66 is a key national and regional strategic link; it carries high levels of freight traffic, as well as being an important route for tourism and providing vital connectivity for nearby communities. There are no direct rail alternatives for passenger or freight movements along the corridor. Despite the strategic importance of the A66, the route between the M6 at Penrith and the A1(M) at Scotch Corner is only intermittently dualled. The route also carries local slow moving agricultural and non-motorised traffic making short journeys which can have an impact on other users, especially on the single carriageway sections. The A66 is also an important route for tourism, providing access to the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Yorkshire Dales and the Lake District National Park. The mix of road standards, together	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>with the lack of available diversionary routes when incidents occur, affects road safety, reliability, resilience, and attractiveness of the route. If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity and threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse agenda. The Project forms part of the UK Government's 'Project Speed' announced as part of A New Deal for Britain, which aims to bring forward proposals to deliver public investment projects more strategically and efficiently. Project Speed aims to ensure that the right things are built better.</p> <p>Refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for the need for the Project and the Project benefits and opportunities (transport, economic, social, and environmental). Section 5.2 of the Case for the Project Report provides an overview of the economic assessment, including estimated construction costs and monetised benefits.</p>	
32	152937, 154132, 154148, 162147	Cumbria County Council Eden		Economics - Local economy	Respondents suggesting that the scheme benefits the local economy through skills training for Higher Education institutions, using local suppliers and workers, road signs for	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project and is very supportive of opportunities to improve the local economy through training and new job opportunities	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		<p>District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Transport for the North</p> <p>Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority</p>			<p>local tourist sites and ensuring the workforce have suitable accommodation which can be re-purposed following the end of the Project.</p>	<p>such as the development of apprentices on the Project. National Highways will work with local authorities and our supply chain by identifying training and job opportunities throughout the construction period. A range of jobs will be generated and will include unskilled and skilled construction jobs as well as engineering, planning and management professionals. The total number of construction jobs, and the proportion of jobs likely to be available to the local community, are not known at this stage. Refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) for information on the jobs generated.</p> <p>New spend within the local economy by construction workers is likely to benefit local businesses such as accommodation, retail and hospitality. While this is likely to be relatively small when compared with overall spend in the area, it could benefit local businesses for the duration of the construction programme. Increased spend in these sectors may lead to increased employment opportunities and incomes. The scale of indirect employment has not been quantified at this stage.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Where the construction works would affect access to existing tourism receptors, temporary alternative access arrangements will be provided in agreement with the receptor. The EMP will ensure appropriate phasing of the construction works to ensure that access is maintained.</p> <p>The Project is expected to require a significant workforce, in excess of 1000 workers may be required during peak periods. Plans are currently being developed to establish where the workforce will be sourced from and the potential need for suitable accommodation close to the work areas.</p> <p>National Highways is aware of the potential impacts a large workforce can have on a small community, with proactive steps taken to ensure locals and tourists are not displaced by the demands of the workforce accommodation needs; this will include steps taken to ensure tourist-based accommodation are not consumed, with the workforce being guided when selecting accommodation that is in existence or required to be constructed. Locations for potential workforce accommodation have yet to be decided but legacy improvements will be considered as part of measures</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						drawn up, with input from local stakeholders and Councils. Should an accommodation facility be constructed, at the end of its use, it will be reviewed to identify if it can be used as legacy asset to benefit local businesses/ stakeholders or if it should be removed.	
112		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Northern Powergrid Holdings Company		Economics - Additional funding	Respondents suggesting that National Highways fund additional upgrades and improvements to local roads being de-trunked or used for diversion; to prevent horse-drawn carriages on the carriageway; to mitigate impacts on properties; and to support local councils to enforce traffic control measures.	National Highways continues to hold conversations with communities and local authorities to ensure the Project delivers benefits for local communities as well as across the region. National Highways are in on-going conversations with local authorities regarding Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding opportunities across the A66 NTP. The proposed improvements for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, including disabled users will include grade-separated crossings for safe crossing of the new A66 route where this severs any existing public rights of way. One of the objectives of the Project, as outlined in the A66 NTP WCH Design Strategy (National Highways, 2021) (Application Document 2.4), is that “all facilities for WCH users should be a betterment, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement Project.”	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>As part of the new works, significant lengths of de-trunked A66 will become available for horse-drawn carriages although it should be noted that horse-drawn vehicles are not prevented from using the new carriageway. Refer to the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) for further detail on how the de-trunked A66 can be utilised as part of these proposals. However the existing dual carriageway section is not within the scope of the A66 NTP. Upgrades to the local road network are for the local highway authorities to consider.</p> <p>Where possible the design will minimise land take and demolition of properties. The environmental assessment that has been carried out and considers the effects of both the construction and operational phase on air quality, noise and the safety of both users and residents. Refer to the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 Air Quality, Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 13 Population and Human Health for the respective points above.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to work closely with local councils to limit disruption to residents, businesses and road users during construction. Traffic diversion routes, road closures and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						enforcement will all be discussed and agreed with local councils and emergency services before works commence.	
650			154263	Economics - Compensation	Respondents making suggestions relating to compensation, including suggestions that the Applicant should provide local farmers with compensation for the loss of productive agricultural land.	<p>National Highways are committed to seeking to acquire the interests it needs in the land required to deliver the Project by negotiation. Section 42(1)(d) Statutory notification letters inviting relevant landowners to negotiate the acquisition of those interests were sent out on 20 September 2021. Compensation would be in accordance with the statutory compensation code.</p> <p>In relation to this Project, and in line with government guidance National Highways sees compulsory acquisition as a last resort. However, when seeking to deliver long linear Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, the guidance acknowledges that a request for authorisation of compulsory acquisition can be progressed alongside efforts to negotiate acquisition. To support this, we have dedicated public liaison officers who have been meeting with landowners throughout the Project to understand impacts. We have written to all impacted landowners to ask them</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>to enter into negotiations in relation to land acquisition.</p> <p>To the extent that it is able to do so based on the design information available at this stage, National Highways has sought to reduce land take and we have worked with landowners towards this goal.</p>	
739	149689, 149777, 151483, 152204, 153833, 153991, 153995, 162147			Economics - Facilities / alternative spend	<p>Respondents suggesting that funding for the Project is spent on alternative projects including investing in communication infrastructure; improving the existing road network; introducing electric vehicle charging points; enhancing public transport and moving freight onto railways.</p>	<p>All major highway projects are progressed through a standardised project life cycle. The initial phase of the lifecycle is the pre-project phase which identifies and prioritises potential transport issues, shaping, investigating and assessing the viability of solutions to the problems. As part of this Project a range of options were investigated and assessed against engineering, economic, financial, and environmental criteria, The options included alternative highway and non-highway solutions such as the A69 and the rail link between Carlisle and Newcastle. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the lifecycle process and the options assessed.</p> <p>The UK Government has allocated funds for National Highways through the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2)</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>to ensure that the Strategic Road Network (SRN) is safe, reliable, and efficient for everyone. The funding allocated is based on the wider reviews the government undertakes looking at what public investment would bring the most benefit to the UK. The Case for the Project Chapter 5 (Application Document 2.2) captures the economic assessment that has been carried out for the Project.</p> <p>In terms of electric vehicle charging, the RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the SRN and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023. RIS2 is also fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise freight including finding approaches to move the freight sector away from diesel. National Highways are also working to integrate better with other modes of transport including on improving connections with rail freight terminals. As part of the RIS2 National Highways are committed to improving public transport where it can, by working with local authorities and service providers to make sure that public transport journeys on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Strategic Road Network works for everyone.</p> <p>National Highways believe that delivering this Project will bring far-reaching benefits to those that use and live near the route. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) outlines the benefits and opportunities that the Project intends to deliver. Throughout the development of the Project National Highways has considered and consulted with the local community to ensure that the chosen route brings as much benefit to as many as possible.</p>	
219	149689, 151343, 151481, 153365, 153833, 153900, 153919, 153926, 154243			Economics - Cost	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the cost of the Project, including concerns that it is too expensive and that there is currently too much pressure on personal and government finance for it to be a priority. Respondents express concern that the dualling should not be a priority; that the costs are high in comparison to similar projects, such as the A1(M) upgrade at Scotch Corner and that costs are due to compressing the timescales of the project from 10 years to five years; that the costs shouldn't be that high because construction for the most part does not</p>	<p>The A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses.</p> <p>The economic benefits the Project will bring are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional benefits - support the economic growth objective of the Northern Powerhouse and 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>require night time working due to it being off-line; that different route combinations would be less costly in terms of land take, specifically that dualling is only needed in from Temple Sowerby to the M6.</p>	<p>Government levelling up agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the improvement and long-term development of SRN through providing better national connectivity including for freight. • Maintain and improve access for tourism served by the A66. • Seek to improve access to services and jobs for local road users and the local community. <p>Refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for the need for the Project and the Project benefits and opportunities (transport, economic, social, and environmental). Section 5.2 of the Case for the Project Report provides an overview of the economic assessment, including estimated construction costs and a monetised cost benefit analysis. The single largest contributor to the benefits is the travel time savings that will be realised by business users, which is most pertinent since the A66 is an important route for freight traffic, with HGVs comprising 25.5% of total vehicles on the route.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal, the benefits the Project will bring, and route selection</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Case for The Project (Application Document 2.2). The Project forms part of the UK Government's 'Project Speed' announced as part of A New Deal for Britain, which aims to bring forward proposals to deliver public investment projects more strategically and efficiently. Project Speed aims to ensure that the right things are built better.</p> <p>The Project includes full dualling of the existing A66 single carriageway lengths between Penrith and Temple Sowerby to allow resilience on the network, to facilitate overtaking slower moving vehicles, or continued access in the event of road closures due to accident or breakdown. Other options and alternatives were considered in earlier stages of the Project, as set out in detail in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). An alternative included partial dualling options for some lengths of the route. The overall conclusion from the consideration of various options was that the full dualling options were expected to deliver the greatest level of strategic benefits, with the A66 full dualling</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						option delivering particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse growth agenda and levelling up agenda.	
327	152904, 153560, 153567, 153604, 153844, 153947, 153965, 154342, 154368	Eden District Council	154185	Economics - Local economy	Respondents expressing concern about the general impacts of the Project on the local economy. Respondents state that the local economy would lose tourism revenue due to the destruction of protected landscapes, and that possible pollution would discourage visitors. Others state that there may be little local economic benefit, place a strain on the housing market due to construction workers, and place greater strain on local health funding.	<p>An overview of the economic assessment of the Project is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with the National Highways guidance under the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 Population and Human Health document, is set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2). This assessment considers how the Project will support Cumbria's Local Industrial Strategy and provides a high-level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project at a route wide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised. Also refer to ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual, ES Chapter 5 Air Quality and ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration for details of these respective</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessments and the details of appropriate mitigation where required. Improvements to the A66 will improve access issues for the local community and tourists, encouraging them to use local businesses and thereby boosting the economy. The proposed improvements to the M6 junction will ease congestion for those travelling to Penrith Town Centre, offering potential for economic growth. The Project improves access to key tourist destinations such as the North Pennines and Lake District. There are nearly 16 million visitors to the Lake District National Park each year with nearly 5 million visitors to the Yorkshire Dales National Park. While all journeys are not exclusively served via the A66, a significant portion of these journeys are currently made along this route, and as the road improves, this is expected to increase with perception of the route attracting more users.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), and Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) submitted with the DCO also considers the average and peak worker numbers at construction compounds and potential associated impacts. It is identified that any impact</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						that temporary workers may have on the local area is unlikely to be significant and may result in a minor beneficial effect due to increased local spending.	
476	153978		154010, 154180, 154184, 154254	Economics - Local economy - farming	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the impacts of the Project on the agricultural sector of the local economy. Respondents state that farming activity, such as grazing, would be interrupted by the proposals. They express concerns about potential job losses; landholding severance; higher insurance costs; and a loss of access to water supplies.</p>	<p>During operation of the new A66, there is the potential for positive effects such as improved connectivity for local businesses and the potential to attract businesses to the area as well as enabling development. Improved connectivity for agricultural land holdings and improved screening and vegetation may enhance the attractiveness and usability of community land and assets. An overview of the economic assessment of the Project is provided in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>During construction the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental legislation. The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors to the construction phase of the Project. The EMP will set out measures to control lighting, dust, noise, spillage and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>movement of construction traffic on road, as well as other impacts/disturbances. It will also set out the requirements for the Principal Contractor to have an open dialogue with the local community with a method of logging enquiries with the team. The provisions of the EMP must be complied with, as a requirement of the DCO.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with National Highways guidance under the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 Population and Human Health document, is set out in the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This chapter provides information on agricultural land holdings: the type, location, and number of agricultural holdings at risk of demolition or from which land would be required/access affected by the Project including disruption to drainage, irrigation, and water supply systems.</p>	

Matters raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General Comments About the Project - Engineering Design and development' and National Highways response

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
241	152175, 152248, 153316, 153384, 153829, 153936, 162144	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmond- shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Transport for the North United Utilities Group PLC		Engineering design and development	<p>Respondents express support for the Project due to the engineering design and development aspects.</p> <p>Respondents specifically express their support for: the proposed visual mitigation measures; lighting proposals; drainage ponds; electric vehicle charging points; layby design; and central reservation safety features.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) is not within the scope of the Project. However, the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023. National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. Road travel provides a convenient, low cost and practical way to deliver goods around the UK. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads are an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network.</p> <p><i>The outline drainage design is presented within the DCO application, including within Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Document Reference 3.4). An indicative design is also shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Document Reference 2.5) demonstrating how the drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</i></p>	
35	148567, 148573, 148580, 148602, 148608, 148610, 148705,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Motorhome / rest facilities	Respondents suggesting that the engineering design include the provision of rest facilities for motorhome and HGV drivers, which could encourage tourism, offer local employment, and provide a safe place for HGV drivers to rest during bad	<p>A new service area for HGVs or motorhomes with electric and hydrogen re-charging points is not within the scope of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways Users and Communities Designated Fund</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152202, 152204, 152223, 152914, 152917, 152923, 152937, 153036, 153078, 153079, 153081, 153331, 153936, 154148, 154198, 162147	Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Transport for the North Warcop Parish Council Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority			weather. Respondents suggesting water, waste disposal, and sleeping facilities, alongside electric and hydrogen recharging points.	<p>supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and this would be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p> <p>In terms of electric vehicle charging and alternative fuels, the RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Route Network and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023.</p>	
70	148640, 152204, 153035, 153339, 153560, 153567, 153829, 153978, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153626, 153627, 154180, 154185	Engineering design and development - Modified design	<p>Respondents' suggestions about how the Project design could be modified. These include:</p> <p>Greater use of underpasses along the route;</p> <p>Constructing wide lanes;</p>	<p>The design of the roads is prepared in accordance with the latest Design Manual for Roads and Bridge (DMRB) standard.</p> <p>Underpasses and overbridges have been provided where necessary to supplement the main grade separated junction strategy. The choice between underbridge or overbridge is driven by</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Keeping the layout simple and intuitive for drivers;</p> <p>Bridges for local roads to cross the A66;</p> <p>Adjusting the alignment of slip roads so they are less acute; and</p> <p>Expanding the red-line boundaries to include all associated work and how the old A66 is de-trunked.</p>	<p>a number of factors including environmental considerations such as visual impact, and engineering considerations such as balancing earthworks cut and fill volumes.</p> <p>All new roads (strategic and local roads) will be designed to current national design standards and where required by standards, will include widening e.g., widening of lanes on some curved sections of 2-way local roads and private means of access to improve visibility.</p> <p>Through design iteration and stakeholder liaison and consultation, the layouts have been developed to be as simple and intuitive as possible while still achieving the strategic aims such as improved road safety. A sensitive approach is taken to visual integration of the Project and of the experience of individual receptors (people) and groups of receptors in relation to the Project. This extends to the simple design approaches for structure and civil engineering elements, and use of landscape earthworks and where appropriate, planting to integrate engineering features and acoustic barriers within their surrounding visual context. Please refer to the Project Design</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Principles (Application Document 5.11) for further information.</p> <p>All junctions and slip roads will be designed to current national highway standards including consideration of slip road angles.</p> <p>All land required to construct the Project is included within the DCO Order Limits (red-line boundary) including works to the de-trunked section of the old A66.</p>	
104	148616, 150146, 153078, 154363, 162147	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p> <p>Yorkshire Dales National</p>		<p>Engineering design and development - Futureproofing</p>	<p>Respondents suggesting futureproofing measures to be incorporated into the design of the project.</p> <p>These include physical longevity measures, such as those to make sure that the road does not deteriorate due to use and weather conditions, as well as from climate change.</p> <p>Other suggestions include those to make sure that the road can meet the needs of future users. These include electric or alternative refuelling locations along the route and scope for additional lanes for increased capacity.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees' concerns about longevity of the proposed works, including the risk of climate change.</p> <p>The road, including road pavement will be designed in accordance with current national design standards to achieve the required design life of individual elements as stipulated in specific design standards.</p> <p>Risk Assessment developed and agreed with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authorities has been carried out as part of the DCO submission (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>We have assessed our design in areas of potential flooding, whether that is</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Park Authority				<p>from groundwater, river water, surface water or from sewer sources. Local people have helped guide our flood modelling by providing their insight into flooding hotspots. We have mapped all these sources in the surrounding area and identified flood issues our design might cause. A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed and is set out within the ES appendices (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). The assessment identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>We have also surveyed environmentally designated watercourses that will be crossed to understand their structure and the processes that happen within them (known as geomorphology). This initial assessment is important for us to understand the habitats and species that use the watercourses and to inform our design process to avoid or reduce risks.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Chapter 14 the ES (Application Document 3.2) presents a full impact assessment in relation to the road drainage and the water environment. The chapter describes the baseline conditions of the existing water environment in the study area and the methodology used to assess potential impacts during the construction and operational phases of the Project, before presenting the results of these assessments and any further mitigation measures or monitoring deemed necessary. It considers the potential effects on the quality and quantity of surface and ground waters, geomorphology and flood risk that may result from construction activities, operational road drainage and accidental spillages.</p> <p>. All structures and culverts under the new road will be designed to accommodate future flood events.</p> <p>Comments on EV or alternative refuelling locations are noted. The RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Route Network and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						charging services and energy storage by 2023. Electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) is not within the scope of the Project.	
166	153036, 153874, 154136, 154365, 162147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - Mitigation	Respondents suggesting various mitigation measures to counteract potential impacts of the route. These include noise mitigation, in the form of screening, baffling and quiet road surface; dust mitigation, through using 'cleaner' materials, and light mitigation, through screening and alternative bulb colours for streetlights. Respondents also suggest implementing mitigation measures on the A6 and A685 on the grounds that they would become diversion routes. Other respondents request further general mitigation, without providing further details.	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes use of modern road surfacing, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the Project and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out how the impact of construction on the environment, the road network and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>local communities will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments set out within it will be implemented in full. The EMP Annex B13 Construction Traffic Management plan sets out an extended essay plan which the PC is required to develop, in consultation with the relevant local / highways authorities, at detailed design to ensure disruption is minimised.</p> <p>Any required temporary diversion routes associated with construction of the works will be determined during the detailed design and construction planning phase.</p>	
167		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire</p>		<p>Engineering design and development - Visual mitigation</p>	<p>Respondents suggesting that the engineering design include further visual mitigation measures, including the use of local materials such as stone, and ensuring such mitigation efforts are appropriate for the scale of the project.</p>	<p>The Project design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the local area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>The Project landscape architects, and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where possible, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. In some instances, the design has included increased heights</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council				<p>of bunds to remove the need for acoustic barriers and remain in keeping with the local landscape character. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials. All structures have been designed to be safe to construct and maintain. Stone facing of large structures is not appropriate as they require regular inspections of the structural elements which lie behind the stone face.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) incorporate the overall Project design principles.</p>	
655		Cumbria County Council		Engineering design and development -	Respondents suggesting that the engineering design involve the use of green materials, including low carbon road materials.	National Highways is committed to reducing carbon emissions and has considered carbon throughout the design stages of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council		green materials		ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) as well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, highlights any carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions during construction and operation.	
1135	153078			Engineering design and development - Holding areas	Respondent suggesting holding areas are provided for use when the route is closed due to inclement weather. They would provide suitable parking for several HGVs to wait for the re-opening of the route. Suggestion would be at each end of the route. It would allow vehicles to be informed that the route is closed before they get onto the route and stuck.	Holding areas to facilitate management of closures due to poor weather are not within the scope of the Project. However, the Project includes provision of grade-separated all movement junctions which will allow for vehicles to turn around in the event of a closure to enable drivers to re-route. The Project will also provide additional variable messaging signs to inform drivers of closures and diversions. Therefore, whilst no holding areas are planned as part of the Project, the proposals will improve the management of traffic when the route needs to be closed.	No
1136		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - De-trunking	Respondents suggesting that the legacy structural assets identified by the Project to be passed to the Councils as part of the de-trunking shall be of a standard satisfactory to the highway authority and commuted	The Project team is engaging with Local Authorities on a de-trunking strategy and an agreement on the principles of de-trunking is being sought.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					sums are provided to support future upkeep.		
1213		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Engineering design and development - De-trunking strategy	<p>Respondent suggesting that National Highways produce a de-trunking strategy as part of the project to record the consultation and specific agreements which the Examining Authority will need to see.</p> <p>Respondents stating that there is a risk that agreed plans will be subject to different funding and may not be delivered unless they are agreed in principle through the DCO process.</p> <p>Respondents also suggest that further work is required to explore options as to how the road will be used in the future and that the condition of the de-trunked sections are assessed to understand deterioration of the asset.</p>	We have been working with local authorities to agree the approach to de-trunking of the existing A66 section and we will prepare plans together with local authorities which outline the extent of the section to be de-trunked and will agree a scope for surveys on the existing carriageway to agree the standard prior to the work. Conversations regarding de-trunking and standards will continue and will be concluded during the detailed design stage.	No
20	152152, 152939, 152998, 153130, 153339, 153560, 153567, 153900, 154243, 154350, 154368, 162161	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153376, 153627, 153953	Engineering design and development	Respondents expressing concern about the engineering, design, and development aspects of the Project. Respondents state that the current design is too short-term and would not sufficiently reduce traffic. Other concerns include that alternative design options have not been adequately considered; that additional bypass routes could be included; layby designs may be insufficient; limited EV provision has been incorporated; and	The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) describes the development of the route design and alignment for the Project. In addition, The Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3 Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) describes the alternatives that have been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>the design may put pressure on roads such as the A6 and M6.</p>	<p>considered throughout the Project development process.</p> <p>Option appraisals have been carried out through a staged process and a Preferred Route was announced in March 2020. Following the Preferred Route Announcement in 2020 work commenced on the preliminary design. The preliminary design, which is presented by the DCO application, has been informed by a range of surveys, consultation and engagement, ongoing design refinement through the assessment of alternatives and the EIA process. This has meant that design has been developed, assumptions tested and validated, and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) carried out in support of this application for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity and may threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse initiative (Transport for the North, 2019) and the achievement of the Government levelling up agenda.</p> <p>The design of the Project is underpinned by traffic modelling, which</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>has demonstrated the need for the proposed upgrades and informed the alignment of the routes and junctions. The traffic modelling carried out is set out in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Application Document 3.8). A full Transport Assessment has been completed and is presented in the Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The traffic assessment demonstrates that the proposed improvements will operate adequately in the Design Year of 2044 (15 years after opening). Typically, highways projects are designed to have a materials lifespan of between 20 and 40 years before any significant maintenance and upgrading is required, dependent on material properties, maintenance, and usage. Elements including structural concrete and steelwork have extended design lives of up to 120 years.</p> <p>In terms of electric vehicle charging, the RIS2 is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Route Network and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						charging services and energy storage by 2023.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘General Comments About the Project – Environment’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
75		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	A respondent expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to outlining the potential impact of the Project on cultural heritage assets. Respondents state that appropriate statutory standards for this section have been considered and that appropriate information sources drawn upon.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scope and content of the PEI Report. The potential impact of the Project on the historic environment is reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No
78	153566	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the ecological impacts of the Project. Respondents state that appropriate statutory standards for this section have been considered and that appropriate information sources drawn upon.	National Highways acknowledges the support scope and content of the PEI Report. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
82		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the impact of the project on air quality. Respondents comment that the information provided is adequate for this stage of the consultation and state that appropriate statutory standards for this section have been considered and that appropriate information sources drawn upon.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
83		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England Natural England Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report as providing adequate information for the current stage of the Project. Respondents comment that it provides suitable detail and uses appropriate assessment methodologies, although further information may be required in the future	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
121		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the effects of the Project on road water and drainage. Respondents comment that the information provided references appropriate statutory standards and is of an appropriate level of detail.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
129		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - community impacts	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report in relation to community impacts. Respondents support the range of groups considered in this section, and that the content complies with existing guidance.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
131		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Noise and vibration	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report in relation to noise and vibrations from the project. Respondents support the inclusion of appropriate regulations, stating that the level of detail and breadth of information is satisfactory. Respondents also express support for the use of Best Practicable Means mitigation measures in this section.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
134		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Material assets and waste	Respondents expressing support for Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the material assets and waste impacts of the Project. Respondents state that appropriate statutory standards for this section have been considered and that appropriate information sources drawn upon.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
135		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the landscape and visual impacts of the Project. Respondents feel the mitigation proposed is appropriate.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
148	153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District		PEI Report - Geology and soils	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the geology and soils impacts of the Project. Respondents feel the	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council Natural England Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council			methodology used and the documentation provided complies with the appropriate statutory standards. Respondents feel the mitigation proposed is appropriate.	Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	
153		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Climate change	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report in relation to the impacts of the Project on climate change. Respondents comment that the information provided is adequate for the current stage of the Project and the mitigation measures are appropriate.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report is noted. The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in Environment Statement Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2).	No
240		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Transport for the North		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing support for the cultural heritage aspects of the Project. Respondents state that the plans have considered heritage sites in depth, and that the impact on such sites would be minimised. Others specifically support the inclusion of Whinfell Forest and Murton Pike in the consultation documents.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology and identified mitigation within the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
257		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - Public Rights of Way	Respondents expressing support for the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report in relation to Public Rights of Way. Respondents support that the PEI Report contains measures to safeguard PRow connectivity across the Project, through the grade separated junctions.	The positive feedback regarding the scope and methodology of the PEI Report is noted. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4)	No
647	154147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment – general (non PEI Report) – Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing support on the grounds that the design of the Project will be beneficial to the visual landscape, including the use of cuttings and ecological enhancements.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the design of the Project. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4)	No
649	148596, 153316, 153901	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England Transport for the North Yorkshire Dales National	162158	Environment – general (non PEI Report) – General	Respondents expressing support on the grounds that the design of the Project is beneficial for the environment. Respondents comment that the Project has taken into account potential concerns about the environmental impact, and that reducing congestion will have wider environmental benefits.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4)	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Park Authority					
223	153567, 153839, 153871, 153900, 153965, 154128, 154344, 154348, 154351, 154352		154357, 154457	Environment – general (non PEI Report) – Climate impact	<p>Respondents expressing opposition, due to the potential increase in CO2 emissions generated by the Project. They say that this would exacerbate the ongoing climate emergency.</p> <p>Respondents oppose the construction of any additional roads, commenting that there is a need to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and focus on sustainable transport instead.</p> <p>Respondents highlight the commitment to achieve net zero carbon emissions and believe that the Project would make this more difficult to achieve.</p>	<p>The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>An assessment of likely significant effects is made by comparing Project emissions with the relevant UK Government carbon budgets (up to the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-2037), which is the Carbon Budget furthest most in the future available for comparison). As per the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) and the requirement of DMRB LA 114, the GHG emissions assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) concludes that the Project will not have a likely significant effect on Climate in terms of GHG emissions.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 project</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction.	
67		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report – Population and human health – business and tourism	Respondents suggesting further information be provided in the PEI Report in relation to business and tourism. These include: a Skills and Employment strategy; a socioeconomic assessment; Business Support strategy; plans to reuse construction buildings for employment opportunities and a complete set of skills requirements so that local workers can be utilised for the project.	<p>An assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with DMRB LA112 guidance, is set out in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3). This assessment provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project at a routewide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised.</p> <p>The ES also considers the average and peak worker numbers at construction compounds and potential associated impacts. It is identified that any impact that temporary workers may have on the local area is unlikely to be significant and may result in a minor beneficial effect due to increased local spending.</p> <p>Opportunities to reuse any redundant construction spaces during operation have been explored and where sites are appropriate for repurposing into housing or employment sites it is noted within the ES Chapter.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Annex B12 of the EMP (Document 2.7) provides an outline Skills and Employment Strategy which will be prepared prior to construction to upskill and maximise the use of a local workforce and supply chains. This will be supported by the Principal Contractor seeking to maximise opportunities to benefit the local supply chain and support local businesses during construction. The Skills and Employment Strategy will outline how the Project will support training and upskilling of the local workforce to ensure their use is maximised during the construction phase. This will help to leave a positive legacy for workers' future employment opportunities whilst also ensuring any potential labour shortages are covered.	
71		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents suggesting changes to the PEI Report, specifically relating to landscape and visual effects. These include: i) referencing DMRB LD119, Appendix 3 and 4 in TGN 06/19 and how guidance has been applied; ii) defining the study area and justification for the study area, additional viewpoints, more clearly defining areas visually affected by issues such as construction (including	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects. i) LD119 has been withdrawn and provides very generic design advice. The ES also references LD117 but has this has also been withdrawn. Viewpoints within the ES have been produced in accordance with TGN 06/19.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			<p>consideration of temporary storage areas, construction compounds and haul routes);</p> <p>iii) providing timeframe-specific visual impacts (construction at its peak, daytime and night-time scenarios as well as the winter year 1 (opening) and summer and winter year 15 (design year) scenarios);</p> <p>iv) identifying the criteria used to determine significance, sensitivity to change and magnitude;</p> <p>v) Presenting the findings of the assessment in full using photomontages and sections; and</p> <p>vi) identifying the landscape and visual effects arising from an individual scheme or combination of schemes and proposed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The Project has been assessed using prescribed guidance, LA107, incorporating aspects of GLVIA3 where it provides clarity. All references used in the production of the ES are provided.</p> <p>ii) The study area is illustrated within supporting figures and explained within ES Appendix 10.3: Study Area. While the wider area and a range of viewpoints have been approved by stakeholders through the TWG meetings and considered, only significant effects have been assessed within the ES. The ES considers all temporary construction effects including compounds, storage areas and access roads.</p> <p>iii) The assessment incorporates consideration of night-time effects, construction effects as well as year of opening (winter) and year 15 (summer).</p> <p>iv) The ES explains the methodology and assessment process including the definition of susceptibility, sensitivity and value and criteria for significant effects.</p> <p>v) Photomontages have been produced to illustrate representative views and the effect of any mitigation and illustrative sections form part of the Project Design Report (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Document 2.3). Representative viewpoints and those that have been developed into photomontages have been agreed with each relevant local authority through Technical Working Group meetings. Photography has been taken in accordance with the Landscape Institute's current guidance. The level of visual representation is selected to best illustrate the effects of the scheme and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>vi) A cumulative impact assessment has also been carried out and takes into consideration the impact if more than one section of the scheme is visible as well as any other significant developments in the area.</p>	
1413		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p>		<p>PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects</p>	<p>Respondents suggest there should be consideration of the effects of the project on Landscape Character Units (LCU) as a whole including where appropriate other Schemes. Respondents also request identification of where LCUs are sourced from.</p> <p>Details of boundaries of NCAs are requested to be shown and a request is made for clarification as to why the North Pennines NCA has been scoped out of the assessment.</p>	<p>A figure is provided within ES Chapter 10 (Application Document 3.2) which identifies designations and the study area along with the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV).</p> <p>The ZTV identifies the extent of potential impact upon LCU and where multiple schemes would impact upon landscape character.</p> <p>All references used in the production of the ES are also provided.</p> <p>The North Pennines NCA is not scoped out of the assessment and has been assessed where relevant, as</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Details of mitigation measures within a landscape management plan is also suggested which is joined up with biodiversity objectives.	<p>high value but low susceptibility due to the existing infrastructure corridor affecting the special characteristics. It is concluded within the assessment that the magnitude of impact, given the context of the works would not be significant. It should be noted, the assessment has been carried out on a scheme by scheme basis and some of the scheme assessments have scoped out impacts to the North Pennines NCA as they are beyond the study area and therefore significant effects are unlikely.</p> <p>Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.7) as an illustration of how the required mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Measures in relation to ecological mitigation and landscape planting are also set out within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
1414		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents suggest that a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment should be carried out to BS5837 and proposals should be	This request is noted. The baseline assessment of landscape features forms part of the Landscape Character Assessment. Any important landscape features have been identified and where practicable measures included	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council			based on a detailed topographic survey.	to maintain and protect them. The assessment has also identified important and veteran trees along the route with a view to protecting and retaining as many as possible. A full arboricultural survey to BS5837 however has not been carried out at this stage.	
77	153566, 153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats	<p>Respondents suggest provision of mapping identifying the location of habitats and species, and how species significance has been determined.</p> <p>Respondents suggest mitigation of impacts on watercourses to protect otters, water voles, and fish eggs; and to prevent invasive species like crayfish. Other respondents suggest protecting flight paths for bats and birds, and crossings and ledges for badgers, hedgehogs, hares, and polecats.</p> <p>Respondents also request transparency on the approach taken in regards the achievement of a 10% biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. This includes consideration of potential impacts on habitats including watercourses and species including otters, water voles, fish, bats, birds, badgers, hedgehogs, hares, and polecats. Potential impacts relating to fish eggs and embryos relating to construction vibration have also been assessed. Figures accompany the ES Chapter which identify ecological habitats and survey results.</p> <p>The ES Chapter and associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) explains the methodology and assessment process including the definition of sensitivity and value and criteria used to identify significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>effects, in accordance with DMRB LA 108 guidance and CIEEM guidance.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out measures to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts on habitats including watercourses, and species and seeks to employ best-practice methods for dealing with habitat loss, habitat severance, disturbance and species mortality. Measures for dealing with invasive species and implementing biosecurity measures are also incorporated in the EMP.</p> <p>Species specific crossing points, planting / additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species.</p> <p>Details of all ecological mitigation are provided in the ES Chapter 6: Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits and the EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures mitigation proposals. The</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>project team have consulted local authorities and statutory environmental bodies in relation to the development of proposed ecological mitigation, alongside the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss.</p>	
80		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Durham County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Natural England</p>		<p>PEI Report - Air quality</p>	<p>Respondents making suggestions relating to the air quality aspects of the PEI Report. Suggestions include:</p> <p>i) The use of the published guidance NEA001</p> <p>ii) Providing further information on the underlying datasets used to identify the qualifying features and that unique verification factors are developed for specific route sections or locations along the preferred route corridor to ensure that model error is minimised as far as possible. These include public access (e.g. footpath) and sensitive receptors (e.g. residential</p>	<p>The PEI Report presented a preliminary air quality impact assessment.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report, the air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) has been updated following updates to the traffic model and Project design.</p> <p>i) Discussions have been on-going between National Highways and Natural England on a national level regarding the use of NEA001. The air quality assessment has been carried out in line with current guidance, DMRB LA 105; however, NEA001 has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>properties, schools and hospitals). Respondents note monitoring data should be collected for NO2 and particulates within the 'vicinity of the project' ratified and bias corrected and annualised by Eden District Council.</p> <p>iii) Respondents request identification of the extent of the study area based on the draft DCO boundary be shown in a series of figures including specific human and ecological receptors.</p> <p>iv) Respondents request a commitment to the application of LA105 and a programme of NO2 and particulate monitoring in the Penrith area to provide further evidence and supporting information to address the modelled exceedances.</p>	<p>been used to inform the assessment, and in accordance with national discussions between National Highways and Natural England regarding DMRB LA 105 and NEA001, the consideration of ammonia has been incorporated into the air quality modelling through application of the National Highways ammonia tool to the air quality modelling.</p> <p>ii) Further detail is provided within the ES Chapter in regards the baseline data used and the model performance statistics. Route/location specific verification factors are based on available monitoring data. As identified within the ES, the selection of human receptor locations considered within the assessment has taken a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in DMRB LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Air quality impacts on receptors beyond this</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>distance are considered to be negligible.</p> <p>OS AddressBase Plus and MasterMap data, obtained from National Highways in January 2022, has been used to identify the location of sensitive human receptors within 200m of the ARN. Committed development data compiled in January 2022 has also been used to inform the assessment. For existing receptors, sensitive human locations have been adjusted accordingly to ensure they are on the building façade closest to the ARN.</p> <p>Where significant impacts on sensitive receptors within 200m of the ARN are identified, mitigation measures are included in the Project's EMP (Application Document 2.7), submitted as part of the DCO application. A site specific monitoring programme was carried out for NO₂ and this is presented in the ES. Monitoring of PM₁₀ / PM_{2.5} has not been carried out as concentrations are considered unlikely to exceed the relevant Air Quality Objectives.</p> <p>iii) ES Figure 5.1 identifies the Air Quality Study Area and identifies human receptors and ecological sites.</p> <p>iv) Project specific baseline air quality monitoring has been carried out for NO₂ and is presented in the ES.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Monitoring of PM ₁₀ / PM _{2.5} has not been carried out as concentrations are considered unlikely to exceed the relevant Air Quality Objectives .	
1416		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Air quality	<p>Respondents request a full assessment along with appropriate mitigation measures that ensure that the deposition of nitrogen does not lead to significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Respondents request that on receipt of complete ancient woodland, veteran tree and flora survey dataset the determination of the ARN is re-examined.</p> <p>Consideration of potential impacts on Crosby Ravensworth Fell SSSI and Asby Complex SAC.</p>	<p>The Affected Road Network (ARN) in the PEI Report was defined using the screening criteria outlined in DMRB LA105 and was refined using updated traffic data for the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The air quality assessment for the Project is provided within ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Within the ES, the impact of nutrient nitrogen deposition on sensitive ecological receptors (designated ecological sites including Crosby Ravensworth Fell SSSI and Asby Complex SAC) within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) has been re-assessed following the guidance in DMRB LA 105. The additional contribution of ammonia (NH₃) emissions from vehicles to deposited nitrogen has also been determined. No likely significant effects are identified.</p>	No
1417		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents request a commitment to implement a Project Air Quality Action Plan.	As no likely significant effects have been concluded in the ES, in-line with DMRB LA105, a project air quality	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Durham County Council Eden District Council Natural England				action plan (PAQAP) is not considered necessary .	
1418		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents request consideration of the cumulative construction phase impacts particularly for the schemes in more built-up areas.	Construction phase impacts are considered in the air quality assessment within ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2). Consideration of approved committed development is accounted for in the future baseline traffic model and therefore considered in the assessment.	No
1419		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents request the qualification of the method used to determine the type and level of mitigation required to ensure amenity and human health protection for each scheme. Noting, the mitigation measures required for the J40 and Kemplay Bank Schemes could be quite different to those required for more rural schemes and	The air quality assessment for the Project is provided within ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2). The assessment was undertaken in accordance with DMRB LA 105. The assessment identified the baseline conditions and assessed the likely impact of the Project. Mitigation measures have been identified, where	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Natural England			generic measures may not be sufficient.	required, to mitigate any significant effects. As no likely significant effects are identified for operational phase impacts, no mitigation measures are proposed. Construction based mitigation has been set out on a Project wider basis, rather than scheme by scheme, as detailed in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
1420		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Air quality	Respondents also note that construction-related traffic cannot be scoped out of assessment in the ES and they welcome the commitment to further work to characterise the potential impacts as part of the EIA once detailed data are available.	The air quality assessment for the Project is provided within ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2). This assessment is underpinned by the Project traffic modelling which includes both construction and operation traffic.	No
85	153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Geology and soils	i) Respondents suggesting that clarification is provided as to whether the permanent loss of soils and agricultural land is considered as a potential impact as a result of the construction phase or operational phase.	i) Temporary and permanent Impacts to soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are considered within ES, Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). Impacts to temporary and permanent loss of the soils is considered to take	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Environment Agency Natural England			<p>ii) Respondents suggest further justification is required as to why a detailed UXO assessment is provided.</p> <p>iii) Respondents requiring further information on the refinement of the baseline in the absence of the Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) information.</p> <p>iv) Respondents requesting further detail on the Ground Investigation Scope and how this has been agreed and that it is appropriate to characterise baseline conditions.</p> <p>v) Request for the project to consider Eden District Council 'Development of Potentially Contaminated Land and Sensitive End Uses. An Essential Guide for Developers'.</p>	<p>place during construction and has been assessed as such. By the operational phase the soils have been lost and no further impact is anticipated.</p> <p>ii) The information presented in the Preliminary Sources Study Report (PSSR) (Highways England, 2019). was reviewed as part of the environmental scoping exercise and it was identified that there is not likely to be a significant risk of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and therefore the risks associated with UXO were scoped out for geological purposes, as such risks will be managed as for any other construction-related risk. This was reported in the Scoping Report and confirmed in the Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>iii) ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) provides further detail in regards the refinement of the baseline in the absence of PSSR information. A Phase 1 ground investigation and ALC soil survey have been carried out and inform baseline conditions in addition to third party reports which have been reviewed to further support to the baseline data.</p> <p>iv) The extent and limitation of the current Phase 1 Ground Investigation (GI) is detailed within the ES chapter, along with the engagement with</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stakeholders, carried out to inform the methodology and scope of the assessment. Post submission, further GI and Phase 2 investigation will be scoped and agreed with the relevant authorities to inform detailed design, as is standard practice. However, the level of GI obtained to date is sufficient to inform the baseline for the purposes of the assessment.</p> <p>v) The assessment for the Project has considered and had regard to the Local Authority Guidance 'Development of Potentially Contaminated Land and Sensitive End Uses. An Essential Guide for Developers'.</p>	
1421	153978	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Natural England</p>		<p>PEI Report - Geology and soils</p>	<p>Respondents suggest that contaminated land and areas of geo-environmental concern along the Project corridor are characterised within the ES and Eden District Council and Cumbria County Councils should be consulted upon any aspect of the geotechnical design that affects an asset of interest to them at the DCO application stage.</p> <p>Respondents request that any remediation works are agreed with relevant regulatory authorities.</p>	<p>A Phase 1 preliminary GI has been carried out along the route, to identify baseline ground conditions within the Order Limits. Post submission, further GI and Phase 2 investigation will be scoped and consulted on with the relevant authorities to inform detailed design, as is standard practice. However, the level of GI obtained to date is sufficient to inform the baseline for the purposes of the assessment. This is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Further ground investigation will enable consideration of risks from possible historical contamination areas and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>those areas where elevated chemical concentrations were identified during the Phase 1 GI. Where risks are deemed to be significant, remediation options and strategies will be developed accordingly and agreed upon with the regulatory authorities, (to include the Environment Agency and the local councils, where relevant).</p> <p>The request to discuss the geotechnical design that affects an asset of interest authorities at the DCO application stage is noted. The geotechnical interpretative reports including a geotechnical hazard risk register for each scheme is appended to ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.4).</p>	
1422	153978	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Natural England</p>		<p>PEI Report - Geology and soils</p>	<p>Respondent request that the presence of peat is reference within the baseline and peat loss is detailed looking at both temporary and permanent loss.</p>	<p>An assessment of agricultural and soil resource within the Order Limits has been carried out and is detailed within ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). The assessment is based on desk study information and a soil survey that has taken place within the Order Limits. The soil survey has identified the ALC Grades and recorded any peat, where present. No significant areas of Peat were identified in the soils survey. The larger deposits are typically located outside the Order limits.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Methods for restoring land impacted by the temporary construction activities have been considered in this chapter. An aftercare programme, enabling a satisfactory standard of agricultural after-use to be reached will also be in place and is a commitment in the operational monitoring phase, detailed within ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). The requirement for a Soil Management Plan is secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
1423	153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Geology and soils	Respondents request that a full intrusive soil survey is carried out and results agreed with landowners with Grade 2 soil loss to be avoided. Respondents also request a restoration plan to be prepared including soil monitoring over a 5 year period with a pre-construction soil statement for each agricultural holding.	A Soil Survey has been completed within the A Soil Survey has been completed within the Order Limits and the findings are considered within the ES. Appropriate mitigation and embedded design measures are applied to mitigate impacts such as the loss of Grade 2 and Grade 3a BMV soils, where practicable. However, very large permanent losses of soil are unavoidable due to the online nature of the Project and limited mitigation measures are possible. Temporary soils will be reinstated to baseline conditions. Subsequent completion agreements. The Project design seeks to minimise the area of land required both temporarily and permanently. Land acquired for temporary use will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						returned to its former use. A Soil Management Plan will be produced prior to works commencing by the Principal Contractor and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment. The potential for the Project to affect agricultural land is set out in ES Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2). Verification reports shall be produce following completion of the work. The quality of the land restoration is not subject to consideration.	
1424	153978	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England		PEI Report - Geology and soils	Respondents request reference is made to proposed design, mitigation and enhancement measures for soil resources and note there is no reference to soil reuse opportunities.	Essential mitigation and enhancement measures are secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The primary measures to mitigate the impacts on soil resources would be set out in a Soil Resource Plan (SRP), as set out in the Soils Management Plan, Annex B9 of the EMP and secured by the DCO. The plan will confirm the different soil types (based on the soil surveys already carried out); the most appropriate re-use for the different types of soils; and the proposed methods for handling, storing and replacing soils on-site. The aim of the SRP will be to re-use displaced soil resources on-site in the detailed design of open spaces and green infrastructure. The quality of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>soils retained on-site would be maintained by following good practice guidance on soils handling and storage, particularly to avoid compaction and biodegradation of soils.</p> <p>With the adoption of appropriate mitigation for the handling and restoration of soils in the SRP, most soils will be able to continue their various ecosystem functions on the Site, principally as a medium for producing biomass; for storage and cycling of water and carbon; and for supporting habitats, biodiversity and landscape planting.</p>	
86		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Natural England</p>		<p>PEI Report - Road drainage and water environment</p>	<p>Respondents' suggestions relating to road drainage and water environment as outlined in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. Respondents request that more detailed information is provided in the Environmental Statement, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) information about the impacts on the water environment; ii) the importance of receptors; iii) the effect of climate change; iv) mitigation proposals; v) flood risk assessments; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water, have been assessed in detail and consider potential impacts to flows and impacts on water quality. This is reported in detail in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices 14.1 – 14.9 (Application Document 3.4) ii) ES Chapter 14 identifies the methodology carried out within the assessment including the approach to identifying receptors and the specific 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>vi) opportunities to improve water quality and the extent of the study area.</p> <p>vii) geomorphological; surveys (e.g., light and water); and</p> <p>viii) monitoring; as well as consulting further with key consultees (e.g., Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council).</p>	<p>criteria for establishing importance (value) and risk (significance of effect).</p> <p>iii) ES Chapter 14 also sets out how the assessment considers potential climate change impacts</p> <p>iv) Details of all Water mitigation are provided in the ES Chapter 14: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures mitigation proposals.</p> <p>v) Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document Number 3.4) is included as appendix to the ES chapter and presents the flood risk assessment for the Project and how Project drainage could be implemented within the Order Limits.</p> <p>vi) Water quality impacts are considered within Appendix 14.3: Water Quality Assessment (ES Volume 3, Application Document Number 3.4). These documents provide suitable evidence for the Secretary of State to apply the Sequential Test and Exception Test. Enhancement opportunities related to the Project including water quality are presented in the ES and its supporting appendices.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>vii) The Hydromorphology Assessment (Appendix 14.4: Application Document 3.4) presents details on the hydromorphology of watercourses within the study area which have the potential for interaction with the Project. Dissolution impacts are also considered within Appendix 14.6: Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.2) and mitigation proposed where required. Extensive surveys of Light Water have been carried out (River Corridor Survey, macrophyte/LEAFPACS surveys, fish habitat assessment, aquatic macroinvertebrate, electric fishing and riverine eDNA) and are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>viii) Water environment monitoring measures are detailed within the ES Chapter and will be conducted across the Project during the construction phase at appropriate locations to detect changes in the water environment from construction, and to determine locations for mitigation measures, as part of the management plans that are required by the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Engagement has been carried out through Technical Working Groups,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						responses to the Autumn 2021 Consultation and information requests submitted on behalf of National Highways. This consultation and engagement have informed the development of the Project and environmental assessment. Through discussions in the Technical Working Groups, details on Natural Flood Management schemes have been shared with the A66 Project team and will be considered through the Designated Funds process.	
87		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - community impacts	Respondents suggesting changes to the PEI Report relating to the community impacts of the Project. Respondents request that a full Health Impact Assessment is carried out and that this should identify socio-economic impacts and consider the benefits of active travel. Respondents also recommend that the Traveller community are considered as a vulnerable group; that justifications should be provided for sensitivity ratings and that further details should be provided regarding health indicators and the impact on road safety.	The potential effects of the Project on population and human health is assessed within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health. The assessment is prepared in accordance with the latest Design Manual for Roads and Bridge (DMRB) standard LA 112 and considers active travel provision. This ES Chapter also provides further details regarding health indicators and the impact of the Project on road safety A socio-economic appraisal of the Project is not presented in the ES as this sits outside the scope of works for the LA 112 guidance, and an assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with DMRB LA112 guidance and The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, is set out in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3). This assessment provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project at a routewide level.</p> <p>The Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) considers the impact of the Project on vulnerable groups such as the travelling community. Sensitivity of receptors is determined in line with LA 112 guidance.</p>	
100		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>United Utilities Group PLC</p>	153561, 153607, 154010	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	<p>Respondents suggesting flooding and drainage mitigation measures, including reducing the number of independent drainage ponds; upgrading the drains being transferred to Council ownership; ensuring new drains are integrated into the landscape; reconnecting farm drains correctly and maximising mitigation in flood-prone areas.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) set out the drainage strategy and preliminary drainage design that National Highways proposes to mitigate adverse effects on the water environment for the preferred Project route. The designs make allowance for climate change. The EMP (Document Reference 2.7) secures that the detailed drainage design must be in accordance with DMRB LA113 and the Flood Risk</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Drainage ponds have been designed in accordance with current Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards and in coordination with National Highways Operations team, to ensure the drainage assets will function effectively and can be maintained safely.</p> <p>DMRB standards require separate drainage systems for Local Authority and National Highway roads wherever possible. However, dialog with Local Authorities is ongoing and the DCO does not preclude the combining of ponds at a later design stage if agreement can be reached.</p> <p>Details of the existing drainage assets are held within the National Highways GIS database which has been made available to Local Authorities.</p> <p>During construction any land drains encountered will be managed through construction drainage. Following construction existing land drainage will be connected wherever possible with replacement drainage designed to appropriate drainage standards. Should this not be possible alternative solutions will be sought.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The proposed drainage system incorporates pollution control measures as directed by DMRB standards. Predominantly this is in the form of wet ponds with sediment forebays supplemented by swales and silt traps where required by calculations.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that a detailed drainage design in accordance with DMRB LA113, the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy will be implemented at detailed design stage (which are located within ES Appendix 14.2 (Document Reference 3.4)).</p> <p>The detailed drainage design and maintenance strategies will be developed at the detailed design stage and Lead Local Flood Authorities will be consulted through-out this development to ensure the solution is agreeable to all.</p> <p>Drainage ponds will be sensitively designed in the landscape. The location and size of proposed drainage ponds, as well as their context within the Project and landscape is outlined in the proposed environmental mitigation maps (Application Document 2.8).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
122		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p>		<p>PEI Report - Noise and vibration</p>	<p>Respondents suggesting ways that the noise and vibration section of the PEI Report document could be improved.</p> <p>i) Respondents suggest that more clarity on Noise Impact Areas (NIA) should be provided,</p> <p>ii) Respondents request further details on the approach to construction traffic noise assessments and confirmation of the noise and vibration assessment study area.</p> <p>iii) Respondents also ask for details on how significant noise impacts have been identified and request identification of potentially impacted receptors and potential mitigation requirements.</p> <p>iv) Other requests include details of the noise model used and the baseline data gathered.</p>	<p>The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation provided a preliminary assessment of the Project's potential significant environmental effects. The PEI Report provided an appropriate and robust assessment of the Project to inform statutory engagement.</p> <p>The PEI Report noise chapter identified potential noise sensitive receptors (residential and non-residential) and where receptors would potentially experience a significant effect with mitigation required to reduce the potential effects of noise change.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts of the Project.</p> <p>i) Noise Impact Areas (NIA) have been classified and assessed as part of the EIA, this is reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>ii) The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out in line with relevant guidance including the consideration of construction traffic and identifies the construction study area as 300m from Order Limits. The ES chapter also considers construction traffic beyond the Order Limits, i.e. off-</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>site, and diversion routes. Following DMRB LA 111 the operational study area is defined as the area within 600m of the centrelines of the new, bypassed or altered roads and 50m of the centrelines of other road links with potential to experience a short-term Basic Noise Level (as defined by Calculation of Road Traffic Noise) change of more than 1dB(A) as a result of the Project.</p> <p>iii) The ES Chapter identifies the methodology used to identify sensitive receptors and how modelling has been used to predict potential project effects, including their significance. The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors, which are discussed within the ES Chapter and presented in tabulated form as part of the associated ES Appendix. Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects.</p> <p>iv) The ES Chapter provides further details on the noise modelling used and baseline data gathered.</p>	
128		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Population and human health -	Respondents' suggestions relating to public rights of way as outlined in the Preliminary Environmental Information	The PEI Report presented a preliminary assessment with details of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council		Public Rights of Way	Report. Suggestions include that impact surveys should extend beyond 500m, identify frequency of use of different routes, and assess safety impacts for users. Respondents also request further information on the accessibility of routes during construction and request justifications for any route closures.	<p>temporary diversion routes to inform the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of impacts and effects on PRowS or WCH during construction of the Project and assumes that all permanently impacted PRowS would have appropriate diversion routes in place during the works if closures are required. The assessment is compliant with DMRB LA112 and engagement has been with key stakeholders and survey data utilised to identify the frequency of use of different routes. Where diversions are known they have been discussed within the ES Chapter and are secured by implementation of the EMP (Document Number 2.7) which provides an expanded essay plan of the Public Rights of Way Management Plan which the PC is required to further develop, in consultation with the relevant local authority, a detailed design.</p> <p>National Highways continues to work with local walking, cycling and horse riding groups to agree how the effect on PRow can be managed throughout the design and construction of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) also considers safety of WCH. It should also be noted that the Project design has provided grade separated crossings for PRoWs that are severed or that terminate at the new dualled sections, removing the need for WCH to cross the dual carriageway. Proposed grade separated crossings are either via a new grade separated junction, utilising an accommodation underpass, or a designated WCH bridge or underpass.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3) also assesses WCH routes within the 500m study area in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112 guidance. Where required an assessment of those routes outside of the 500m study area has been carried out, for example where other environmental topics such as air quality, noise or landscape identify impacts potential impacts.</p>	
133		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Materials assets and waste	Respondents making suggestions relating to material assets and waste as outlined in the PEI Report. Respondents state that more information should be included in the report, such as: local plans from local authorities; more regions in the	An assessment of the likely significant Waste effects of the construction and operation of the Project is set out in ES Chapter 11, Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2). The amendments required to table headings within the PEI Report are	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Environment Agency Natural England			<p>baseline section; up to date data and information; more information to back up NH claims; and the inclusion of waste water in the plans for waste materials. Others state that the PEI Report could do more to adhere to the CL:AIRE code of practice, and DEFRA standards for use of soils.</p> <p>Respondents also state that errors within table headings within the PEI Report should be amended.</p>	<p>noted and have been addressed within the ES.</p> <p>This assessment has been carried out with reference to the relevant national policy, local planning policy and legislation.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report the ES assessment has been updated with new information on the recovery of construction and demolition waste. References have also been included to recycled aggregate targets for North West region.</p> <p>Waste generation during the construction phase of the Project will be managed through a detailed Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The SWMP will meet relevant legislative, policy and health and safety requirements.</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils addressed contaminated land, the management of which (applying CL:AIRE) is secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The non-waste environmental effects associated with the transportation of materials (including the quantification of the movement of fill materials) are addressed in the other Chapters of the ES (Chapter 7 Climate Change</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 3.2) and Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2)). Potential impacts from wastewater are considered in ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Soils will be managed in accordance with DEFRA Standards. ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) considers the effects of the Project with regard to soils.</p>	
151		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p>		<p>PEI Report - Cultural heritage</p>	<p>Respondents suggesting that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report involve more detail on cultural heritage, including potential negative hydrogeological impacts on buried assets, including Roman and Bronze Age sites, and mitigation measures should these be discovered. Respondents also suggest further detail on how aerial photos have been used. Other respondents suggest that the historical nature of the route be used for educational purposes.</p>	<p>As part of the public consultation materials, National Highways published the PEI Report which provides information to enable the general public and stakeholders to understand the potential environmental effects of the Project, how these affects are proposed to be assessed and potential measures proposed to avoid or reduce such effects. The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are now reported in the ES.ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) provides an assessment of the Project with regard to archaeology and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>heritage assets. The methodology for use of the Zone of Visual Influence is set out within the ES Chapter, with the methodology of how aerial photographs have been utilised set out in the Aerial Photography and Lidar assessment report (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of an Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>In regards the utilisation of the Project for educational schemes/benefits, a Research Framework (Application Document 3.4) has also been produced and considers how the Project delivers public benefit in terms of the historic environment. The methodology by which that public benefit is achieved is identified within the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7)..</p>	
154		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Climate change	<p>Respondents suggesting that the PEI Report include further measures to mitigate for climate change.</p> <p>Respondents suggest that National</p>	ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) follows the requirements within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 Climate	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council			Highways need to: justify the emissions sources and construction materials used in order to reduce further pollution, liaise with landowners to mitigate against wildfires, and use both local and regional weather data to assess any further mitigation needed.	<p>(DMRB LA 114) and the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN).</p> <p>Within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA114 outlines that "The principles of PAS 2080:2016 specification on infrastructure carbon management (with the exception of setting project level carbon reduction targets) shall be used to inform the assessment of projects on climate and supplement the guidance contained herein."</p> <p>PAS 2080 lifecycle stages have therefore been included in the ES where appropriate.</p> <p>Aligned with DMRB LA 114, the total greenhouse gas emissions associated with each scheme have been presented as part of the ES Climate chapter, broken by life cycle stage rather than material category.</p> <p>As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed scheme, the ES highlights any carbon mitigation included within the design and identifies further mitigation measures which could reduce emissions during construction and operation. There is a further opportunity to mitigate emissions through the construction of the Project as part of the detailed design post</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>DCO. National Highways have appointed a Principal Contractor and Principal Designer who will develop the detailed designs as defined under CDM 2015. The Principal Contractor and Designer have been given a target to reduce GHG emissions from construction and will be required to produce a strategy to implement reductions.</p> <p>The ES climate chapter also identifies mitigation measures to ensure the Project is resilient into the future climate conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation for wildfires are included within the existing National Highways emergency response procedures.</p> <p>DMRB LA114 sets out that "The assessment of a project's vulnerability to climate change shall use published historical regional weather data to demonstrate the current climate impacts on a study area".</p> <p>It goes on to state "The Met Office provides information on observed and future climate change relative to the baseline period of 1961-1990, based on the latest scientific understanding UKCP18".</p> <p>The DMRB LA 114 guidance requires "climate trends associated with the UKCP high emissions scenario (50%</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>probability) projection" which requires use of the UK CP18 RCP8.5 projections, which is therefore outlined in the ES chapter.</p> <p>This precautionary approach, as presented in the Scoping Report and PEI Report, is aligned with DMRB LA 114. The existing historic baseline used within the ES is therefore considered to be robust in representing the local historic climatic conditions. It is not considered that presenting finer detailed local weather station data within the ES climate assessment would enhance the assessment. This is because, although the information may provide additional background information, it is the future climate projections that are used in the methodology to make an assessment of climate change resilience.</p> <p>The IEMA Climate Change Resilience and Adaptation guidance is referred to within the ES Climate chapter's Vulnerability of the Project to Climate Change sections. With regards to ICCI, ES Chapter 7 has followed the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 Climate (DMRB LA 114) and the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). DMRB LA114 does not set out an ICCI assessment</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						as part of the climate assessment. As set out in the Scoping Report and PEI Report each discipline considers the potential for climate impacts to influence the impacts identified. This consideration is set out in each EIA topic's section of the ES.	
208	152901, 153365, 153566, 153901, 153982	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Forestry Commission		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	Respondents suggesting that the Project mitigate against potential harm to wildlife and habitats by: creating habitats to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain; the construction of animal bridges; ensuring construction avoids National Parks, AONBs, and ancient woodlands; protecting watercourses and aquatic ecology.	As part of the Project, it is proposed to plant new woodland, grassland, trees and hedgerows to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. These habitats will be in keeping with the AONB and have been carefully designed to improve habitat connectivity and biodiversity. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors and designated sites relating to nature conservation, where practicable. This includes avoidance to all ancient woodland sites, Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and includes measure to ensure the projection of watercourses, aquatic ecology and to avoid fragmentation impacts with the installation of green overbridges (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. The design has been informed by the principles of habitat replacement (i.e. replacement ratios) set out in Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2).</p>	
238	150162, 153901, 154147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	<p>Respondents making suggestions relating to the landscape and visual environment .</p> <p>i) Respondents suggest that any new roadside cutting exposures have appropriate space and barrier</p>	<p>i) Potential benefits to creating cuttings and new exposures which allow interested parties access to view the geological exposure for the purpose of benefitting scientific studies are noted and details of measures to protect</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>protection for pedestrians to access and study them in safety.</p> <p>ii) Respondents request further visual mitigation and that the road should be integrated with the landscape.</p> <p>iii) Others suggest that landscaping be conducted along the route to improve user experience, and that the route should follow the natural boundary line of the North Pennines AONB.</p>	<p>parties during such events would be consulted on with local authorities at detailed design stage.</p> <p>ii) Landscape architects and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid and engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. In some instances, the design has included increased heights of bunds to remove the need for acoustic barriers and remain in keeping with the local landscape character. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) incorporate the overall Project design principles.</p> <p>iii) The landscape-led approach to the Project has brought together</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the landscape and the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance landscape characteristics, and the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.	
239	153567, 153797	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage / Landscape and visual	Respondents making suggestions relating to cultural heritage aspects of the environment. Respondents suggest that national parks should be preserved and enhanced. Others state that heritage assets should be preserved, and that Roman roads should be protected.	The impacts on the historic environment are considered fully in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). Since the PEI Report further trenching has been done to understand the presence of Roman remains such as Roman roads. A Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy forms part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and details the type and location of mitigation required for cultural heritage resources. National Highways will continue to engage with Historic England and local authorities to ensure that appropriate mitigation is applied where impacts have been identified. In designing the Project, National Highways has recognised and reflected on the key characteristics of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the landscape. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects. The assessment considers impacts on national parks, but it should be noted that The Lake District National Park is 2.7km from the Project and the Yorkshire Dales National Park is 3.2km from the Project and no significant effects are identified.	
244	153852	Cumbria County Council Historic England	153626, 153627	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Information / details / cultural heritage / Landscape and visual	Respondents suggesting that further detail is included in environmental mitigation proposals, including how hedgerows will be managed, a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for the Project as part of the wider Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the use of the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (CLCG). Respondents also note that landscaping should protect the setting of cultural heritage assets.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of visual effects. The scheme has been assessed using prescribed guidance, LA107, incorporating aspects of GLVIA3 where it provides clarity and with reference to the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the Project intent, and provides an indication of how landscape mitigation could be implemented. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) has been developed and sets out a framework in which the successful establishment of these measures can be managed and ensured.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Further detailed setting assessments have been carried out to inform the ES. The impacts of the Project on the historic environment and proposed mitigation measures are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	
274	149367, 153078, 153567, 153901, 153987, 154148, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Transport for the North		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents making suggestions relating to the environment and climate impact. Respondents suggest that the Project should be carbon neutral and that sites and opportunities for carbon offsetting should be explored. Others suggest that funding should alternatively be spent on countering climate change, specifically suggesting that funding be used to create carbon-capturing peat bogs. Respondents suggest that net zero goals should be adhered to.	The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). National Highways is required by the NPSNN to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes an assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (the EIA Regulations). The ES Chapter follows the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 Climate (DMRB LA 114) which states "the environmental assessment shall identify how the project can be adapted to protect it from future climate scenarios."	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The ES climate chapter identifies embedded mitigation, including design standards which are aligned to future climate projections, and any additional mitigation measures required in light of the climate change resilience assessment.</p> <p>The ES Chapter presents a breakdown of the emissions calculated for the Project, and a comparison against UK Government carbon budgets, to determine the significance of emissions. It is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets and no likely significant effects are predicted.</p> <p>The National Highways Net Zero Plan, sets out the future intentions for decarbonisation, including that "Net zero for us means focusing on cutting greenhouse gas emissions to zero or near zero rather than offset" and setting a target for net zero construction by 2040. The A66 Project will be constructed by 2029, which sits ahead of this National Highways target and so the Project is not intended to offset/to be net zero in construction.</p> <p>The Scheme will also take account of Decarbonising Transport (Department for Transport, July 2021), which is the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Government's strategy to decarbonise transportation to net zero by 2050.	
301	152901	Forestry Commission United Utilities Group PLC	153626, 153627	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Tree planting / rewilding	Respondents making suggestions relating to the environment and tree planting/rewilding. Respondents suggest that more tree planting is included to offset the need for species rich grassland, and that trees should be native species. Others suggest that planting should be conducted to a UK Forestry standard, and that suitable species are planted near water mains and sewage systems.	Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions. Guidance for planting near services has been followed and regard has been had to other guidance such as the UK Forestry Standard. Since the PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed/refined and include a combination of proposed new broadleaved woodland, species-rich grassland, trees, native species-rich hedgerows and wetland habitats as appropriate, to help preserve and create additional habitats in the local area. Opportunities to maximise environmental enhancements as part of this have been sought where practicable. The planting proposals submitted with the DCO are illustrated in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and are secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Any planting around	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						water mains and sewage systems will be subject to maintenance regimes that ensure these systems are not compromised as set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).	
402	152901, 154136	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General	Respondents making suggestions relating to the environment in general, including suggestions that any environmental impact needs to be minimised and mitigated against. Suggestions also include that an Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out, and that noise mitigation measures are included in the Project.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is now reported in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) and includes details of proposed mitigation measures. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. Where a likely significant effect has been identified within the ES Chapter, an assessment of the viability of providing a noise barrier in the form of a fence or earthwork/earth bund has been carried out where appropriate, in line with DMRB LA 111.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of project activities on the environment, such as noise, as well as other environmental impacts, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	
693		Cumbria County Council		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	A respondent's suggestion relating to air quality. These include suggestions that air quality should be monitored and controlled along the route, and if air pollution reaches an unacceptable level, traffic reductions to increase air quality.	No significant impacts have been identified and therefore there is no requirement for future monitoring of air quality during the operational phase as a result of the Project.	No
1249		Environment Agency		PEI Report - Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats	Respondents suggest that the scope of the reporting could be expanded to include identification of all potentially impacted abstractions and confirmation of the peak velocity of piling in the river bed.	Impacts of the Project on groundwater receptors including abstractions are considered within ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and associated technical appendices (Application Document 3.4). Annex C1 Working in and near SAC Method Statement, Annex C2 Working in watercourse method statement and Annex C4 Piling Method Statement set out extended essay plans which are secured through the EMP (application Document 2.7). The PC will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						required to develop these method statements at detailed design stage to ensure the control measures to protect water environment are applied,	
1262		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondent identifying that the PEI Report is reviewed and updated specifically noting column headings which do not match the content of a table.	This comment is noted and edits has been made to address this within the ES where relevant.	Yes
1263		Natural England		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondent noting it would be preferable to refer to the Conservation Objectives and Supplementary Advice http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5935614042046464?category=4582_026845880320 rather than the Natura 2000 Data Form and in particular the Site Improvement Plan.	This is noted and has been considered within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).	Yes
1264	153566			PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondent noting that ecological surveys should be carried out in accordance with published methodologies/best practice guidance and should be recent, given the protracted project timeline.	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the Project would affect wildlife and habitats, and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. All surveys to support the assessment have been carried out in accordance with current industry standards and best practice guidance or through engagement/agreement with Natural England where a bespoke approach has been required. Full survey results, modelling outputs, construction	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						timescales/methodologies, where known and available, and associated outline ecological mitigation designs are provided within the ES Chapter.	
1265	153978			PEI Report - Details / materials/land	Respondent noting they are pleased agricultural holdings likely to be impacted are identified.	This comment is noted. The potential for the Project to affect agricultural land is set out in ES Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, Application Document 3.2.	No
1266	153566, 153978			PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondent noting they would like to better understand the project methodologies and its underlying assumptions and hence amount of habitat creation and the position on biodiversity net gain. Respondent requesting the use of a biodiversity net gain metric specifically noting Defra v3.0 metric and the presentation of survey data in UK Habitat format.	Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project. The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. The design has been informed by the principles of habitat replacement (i.e. replacement ratios) set out in Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2). upon in any of the assessment.	
1267		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report – Details / materials	Respondent requesting confirmation that the Defra LAQM.TG(16) method has been used for the air quality model verification.	The air quality assessment is set out within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) and it is confirmed it follows the Defra LAQM.TG (16) method.	No
1268		Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents also note that any deviation from standard methodologies and classifications should be identified in the ES.	This comment is noted. Further details on the EIA methodology carried out are provided within ES Chapter 4, EIA Methodology (Application Document 3.2).	No
1269		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials/cons truction	Respondents request further details on the construction process, sequencing, compound locations timing and hours of working.	More details on Compounds can be found within the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and EMP Annex B15 Site Establishment Plan. A description of proposals for construction of the Project is included within ES Chapter 2, the Project (Application Document 3.2). Subject to securing a DCO, preliminary works are planned to commence in 2024, with all schemes to be completed by 2029 or earlier. The Project is likely to be delivered in a phased approach, with the construction of schemes delivered in parallel or consecutively. Most construction works will be carried out during standard day working hours of 07:30 until 18:00 Monday to Friday,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>and 07:30 until 13:00 on Saturdays. In some instances, it may be essential to undertake works at night or on Sundays and Bank Holidays due to traffic management restrictions, with additional traffic management or closures required for works such as road connections or interface points, bridge beam lifts and deck pours.</p> <p>Where work is required outside of the core working hours, the Principal Contractor will liaise with the relevant Local Authority to agree the procedures for notifying local residents and any site-specific constraints that need to be applied. This process will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan for the Project.</p> <p>For a Project of this scale, several access points and independent haul routes, work areas and compounds will need to be established. ES Chapter 2 The Project (Application Document 3.2) sets out the compound locations per scheme. Storage areas will be proposed where large fill requirements are needed or where key structures are required further details are provided within Chapter 2. Details are also provided within this chapter in regards construction haul roads, satellite compounds and soil storage.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1270		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents request greater detail on the impacts of the Project and what mitigation is proposed to address them, within the Environmental Statement.	This comment is noted. Further details on the Project are included within the ES, refer to ES Chapter 2, the Project (Application Document 3.2). As required by EIA Regulations the ES sets out a full environmental impact assessment of the Project and where required identifies mitigation measures to be implemented (refer to the ES, Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).	No
1271		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents request that a clear distinction is provided within the ES between impacts and effects.	As required by EIA Regulations the ES identifies the distinction between impacts and effects and this is discussed within Chapter 4, EIA Methodology (Application Document 3.2).	No
1272		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents request that any limits of deviation should be clearly presented in the ES and that a worst case approach is used for the EIA. Noting this is particularly relevant for ecology surveys which may not have been completed by DCO submission.	The DCO defines the Order Limits, the boundary within which the development of the Project will take place. It also sets out the Limits of Deviation (LoD), which allow some flexibility for the final design (in order to address any issues arising from pre-construction surveys or detailed design) whilst ensuring that the Project is delivered within an approved 'envelope' and within the Order Limits. The approach to this, and how it is addressed in the ES is set out in ES Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology (Application Document	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						3.2) Where there is uncertainty, due to the necessary flexibility within the DCO, each topic within the ES defines the worst-case scenario that would reasonably apply to that topic. The approach to limits of deviation in regards biodiversity is detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).	
1273		Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents request that the long-list of committed developments be updated long-list search for the ES stage.	The long list considered within the ES has been updated. Planning authorities were contacted in January 2022 to identify development proposals within the ZOI (2km buffer around the Order Limits and up to 5km for major developments requiring Environmental Impact Assessment) that could potentially generate cumulative effects with the Project. Information was requested on planning applications received within five years preceding the date of the request. Each of the developments and allocations in the longlist identified under Stage 1 have been considered in terms of whether they are likely to generate impacts which could combine to result in cumulative effects. Please refer to ES Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects (Application Document 3.2) for further information.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1274		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents suggest the need for consistent headings when summarising potential impacts.	This comment is noted and edits has been made to address this within the ES where relevant.	Yes
1275		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials/alternatives	Respondents suggesting further details required such as the methodology taken in the consideration of alternatives. Respondents request that a full assessment is carried out of the preferred scheme identifying all likely significant effects and required mitigation and potential enhancement measures consistent with the nature of the impacts caused by the Project, and the quality of the receiving environment. Noting the importance of receptors should be confirmed using further baseline data when available.	National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. This process has included consideration of potential environmental impacts of the Project. Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information. The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project and outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. Since the PEI Report the Project design has undergone refinement. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is reported in the ES and includes details of all surveys and modelling used to inform the assessment and updates to baseline data. The Project has considered opportunities to deliver environmental enhancements. and where these are part of the Project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						they have been included in the DCO application and considered as part of the EIA. Other enhancements which that are additional to the main Project may be referenced in the ES but sit outside the DCO application. Where this is the case, it is made clear where an enhancement referenced sits outside the DCO and it is not relied upon in any of the assessment.	
1276		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials/air quality	<p>Respondents suggest that the 200m study area buffer in relation to the ARN should be shown in relation to the existing and preferred route alignment. Respondents also note that the potential AQMA at Castlegate in Penrith, which is a compliance link for the purpose of national reporting under the EU Directive 2008/50/EC, is not shown on an air quality figures within the PEI Report.</p> <p>Respondents also note that several ancient woodland and veteran tree sites are not included across the preferred route alignment and request that County Wildlife Sites (CWS) should be identified and assessed in the ES.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) considers a 200m study area from the draft Order Limits in relation to the Affected Road Network (ARN) and this is identified within figures which support the ES Chapter (Application Document 3.3). The potential AQMA Castlegate is not considered or mapped within the ES as no AQMA has been declared at Castlegate.</p> <p>ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of how the Project would affect wildlife and habitats, and sets out mitigation measures proposed to reduce adverse effects. All ancient woodland, known veteran tree sites and CWS are identified and considered within the ES.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1277		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents ask that details of the SMP be included within the Outline EMP. Respondents suggesting the draft DCO should allow for, as a Requirement to the DCO, an EMP to be produced for each Scheme as appropriate prior to construction commencing. Stating there is a risk that changes to the Project may be necessary once the examination has closed and a Requirement is the most appropriate mechanism for ensuring that such changes are captured.	The EMP (Application Document 2.7) submitted with the DCO covers the entire Project. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented. To ensure consistency, there will be one EMP but specific obligations will be developed on a scheme by scheme basis as appropriate, accounting for local conditions for each scheme. A Soil Management Plan, as secured by the EMP (Application Document 2.7) will be produced prior to works commencing by the Principal Contractor and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment.	No
1278		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents suggest there is potential double counting of receptors within the PEI Report, and watercourses should be considered as designated and non-designated.	ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) considers each designated and non-designated watercourse separately.	No
1279		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Details / materials/traffic and transport	Respondents request a traffic and transport chapter should be produced and that the scope of the traffic and transport chapter should be informed by suitable guidance such as the 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic' produced by the Institute of Environmental	In order to define the need for the Project, to refine the design, and to understand the effects of it, detailed operational traffic modelling and assessments have been completed at each Project stage. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) presents the outputs of the traffic	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					Management and Assessment (IEMA). This assessment should ensure that communities are not disrupted and affected by significant changes to the public transport system and identify opportunities to promote and facilitate increased public transport usage.	modelling and assessment carried out to date, considering both the changes to traffic on the A66 itself but also the changes to the local road network and the wider strategic network. The traffic modelling is reported in full in the Transport Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application and follows relevant guidance. The Transport Assessment includes consideration of severance, driver stress and delay, pedestrian and cyclist amenity, journey times and delay, collisions and safety and fear and intimidation. Impacts to the public transport system are also considered and opportunities to promote the use of public transport are identified. The output of the traffic modelling is utilised within the environmental impact assessment of the Project and underpins the modelling used within the noise and air quality assessment.	
1280		Cumbria County Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire		PEI Report - Details / materials	Respondents request cross sections of the Project should be provided within the ES and respondents request the inclusion of photographs and photomontages which should be in-line with Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Landscape Institute, 2019). 11.20. The use of winter views is requested to show a	A landscape and visual assessment of the Project is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). Photography has been taken in accordance with Landscape Institute guidance with the level of visual representation selected to best illustrate the effects of the Project and the proposed mitigation.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council			worst case and views should show the full extent of the site/development.	Representative viewpoints and those that developed into photomontages have been agreed with each council through Technical Working Group meetings.	
1292		Eden District Council		PEI Report - Biodiversity	Respondents suggesting that Biodiversity Net Gain should be 10% in line with the Environment Bill and that consultation should be carried out with Councils and Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre on the emerging Cumbria Local Nature Recovery Strategy to inform Biodiversity Net Gain. It is also noted by respondents that within the Eden Local Plan no net loss should only be applied once the mitigation hierarchy has been followed.	Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project. The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. Regard has also been given to the Eden Local Plan.	No
1293		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report - Traffic and transport	Respondent requests that uncertainties or limitations related to transport data should be discussed in the Traffic and Transport chapter	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) within Appendix A, Uncertainty Log details the uncertainties and limitations related to transport data.	No
1294		Historic England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Information / details	Respondent suggests that National Highways will need to develop a significant level of detailed information prior to the determination of the DCO in order to meet their aspirations for Project Speed. Particularly, in seeking	ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) set out the cultural heritage surveys, baseline and assessment completed to date. Annex	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					to reduce Requirements discharged post-consent.	B3 Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy of the EMP (application Document 2.7) sets out the further cultural heritage surveys to be completed. National Highways will be providing the same level of information as would be required to discharge Requirements (Application Document: 2.7).	
1355	154136			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Areas of tranquillity	Respondent suggests that the applicant should clarify whether relevant stakeholders were consulted before the conclusion that no designated areas of tranquillity are located within the study area was reached.	Consideration of impacts to tranquillity have not been scoped out of the assessment and ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential impact of the Project on Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) tranquillity areas.	No
1356	154136			PEI Report - Lack of detail/traffic and transport/WCH	Respondent suggests that the PEI Report provides assumed impacts and should contain the detail available from the traffic assessment, walking, cycling and horse-riding survey and input from owners and users of community assets to inform the assessment of sensitivity or significance.	The PEI Report contained an appropriate preliminary assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on the environment to inform statutory engagement. The ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) provides a full environmental impact assessment of the Project. Traffic modelling has been carried out by National Highways and the traffic modelling methodology and results are reported in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). This traffic modelling is considered within the environmental assessment and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						underpins the noise and air quality modelling used within the assessment. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of impacts and effects on PROWs or WCH during construction of the Project. The assessment is compliant with DMRB LA112 and engagement has been with key stakeholders and survey data utilised to identify the frequency of use of different routes.	
52	153316, 153339, 153560, 153562, 153567, 153797, 153974, 153976, 153983, 153984, 153987, 153991, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 154126, 154129, 154136, 154332,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Lake District National Park Authority	154219, 154254, 154357	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Landscape / visual	Respondents expressing concern about the potential impacts the Project may have on the landscape and visual aspects of the area. Respondents express concern, in general terms, that the Project could blight the landscape. Others specifically express concern that the Project would damage the visual beauty of the Yorkshire Dales, Lake District, River Eden SSSI, and the North Pennines AONB.	ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the Project. The Lake District National Park is 2.5km at its nearest point to the M6 end of the Project, from that distance there would be no perceptible change within this area and no significant impacts are identified. Similarly the Yorkshire Dales National Park is 4km from the Order Limits and due to intervening topography and planting would experience no perceptible change. No significant impact is identified. The Eden Valley SSSI is an ecological designation however as an area of landscape character the landscape and visual assessment includes NCA 9 Eden Valley which has been fully	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154335, 154345, 154346, 154349, 154356, 154365, 162147					<p>assessed and no significant landscape and visual impacts are identified.</p> <p>The landscape-led approach to the Project has brought together specialists and stakeholders from a range of disciplines to reach a balanced design solution that responds to the landscape and the sensitive nature of the North Pennines AONB. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance landscape characteristics, and the special qualities and landscape character of the AONB. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p> <p>Landscape architects and engineers have adopted the principle of slackening slopes, where practicable, to avoid an engineered look and to allow the works to tie into the local landform. In some instances, the design has included increased heights of bunds to remove the need for acoustic barriers and remain in keeping with the local landscape character. Illustrative sections are included within the Project Design report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>The landscape-led approach has allowed design interventions on all aspects of the Project to reduce its</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>impact on the landscape and visual resource, with the careful location and sensitive design of structures and use of locally appropriate materials.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). These plans, alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) present the overall Project design principles.</p>	
74		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council</p>		<p>PEI Report - Cultural heritage</p>	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the cultural heritage section of the PEI Report document. Respondents state that key information is missing such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) reasoning for why certain assets have been scoped out of surveys; ii) how values of heritage assets have been determined; iii) whether hydrogeological changes have been considered, and iv) why the survey locations have been chosen. v) Others feel that the assessment presented lacks detail, and that the result of the geophysical survey is needed before decisions can be made. 	<p>The PEI Report presented a preliminary assessment of the effects of the scheme on the historic environment. The PEI Report was based on the information available at that time and was sufficient to satisfy the purpose of gaining feedback on the scheme proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing development of the scheme up to submission of the DCO application. Since the PEI Report the scheme design has been refined and further surveys and assessment have been carried out and are fully reported in the ES. Chapter 8 of the ES, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>vi) A typo is also noted in Table 8.5 on the Palaeolithic line which should read 10,000 BC and not 0,000 BC.</p>	<p>robust assessment of the potential impact of the Project on heritage assets.</p> <p>i) and iv) The study area comprises a buffer that extends 1km from the Order Limits. This buffer was selected, and agreed with statutory stakeholders, on the basis of professional judgement and experience and reflects the fact that, by their nature, linear road schemes would sit within a landscape and are likely to be visible for short stretches of their overall length. As such, they are highly unlikely to alter the setting of heritage resources to a degree that would result in either a significant adverse or beneficial effect beyond 1km.</p> <p>All designated heritage resources within the 1km study area are considered within the Cultural Heritage assessment. In addition, where designated resources such as registered park and gardens (RPG) straddle the limit of the study area, any designated heritage resources that are associated within them that could experience effects are also included in the assessment.</p> <p>The scope of surveys used to support the assessment was detailed within the Evidence and Survey Strategy</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>shared with stakeholders through Technical Working Group meetings.</p> <p>ii) The ES Chapter provides further information in regards the methodology for the Cultural Heritage assessment which follows the guidance set out within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment (DMRB LA 106) (Highways England, 2020) and the ClfA's Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2020).</p> <p>Both of those documents establish that the environmental value (sensitivity) (commonly referred to as 'significance' outside of the DMRB) of heritage resources is the sum of their archaeological, architectural, historic and artistic interest.</p> <p>iii) In regards to potential for hydrogeological changes, liaison has been carried out with the Road Drainage and Water Environment Team who have confirmed that there are no dewatering effects predicted in areas with potentially sensitive archaeological deposits.</p> <p>v) During the course of the preparation of the ES, technical stakeholder engagement has taken place with Historic England and the Planning</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Archaeologists at Durham County Council, Cumbria County Council and North Yorkshire County Council.</p> <p>Substantial survey work has also been carried out to inform the ES, including geophysical survey, trial trenching and geochemical survey, the details of which are set out in the ES.</p> <p>vi) National Highways notes the identification of a typo within the PEI Report and this has been rectified within the ES.</p>	
76	153982, 154350	<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p> <p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Natural England</p>	153602	<p>PEI Report – Biodiversity, wildlife and habitats</p>	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the PIER document content relating to biodiversity, wildlife and habitats. Respondents state that the data provided for priority habitat rivers is incomplete. They also note that there is no indication within the main PEI Report chapter what surveys have been carried out and a lack of detail as to the rationale as to why some surveys have been carried out and others omitted.</p> <p>Respondents also state that no quantitative information has been provided from bat surveys and bat fragmentation is not adequately described.</p> <p>Respondents also query whether crayfish DNA surveys have been carried out.</p>	<p>The biodiversity assessment presented within the PEI Report was preliminary and based on what was available at the time. A full assessment of both construction and operational effects has now been completed, and is presented in ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Document reference 3.2). All required field surveys to inform the assessment have been carried out in accordance with guidance/industry standards, or through engagement with key stakeholders where a bespoke approach was required, and are presented in the ES in full. This includes a full suite of aquatic surveys within watercourses potentially impacted by the Project (including Phase 1 Habitat surveys, riparian mammal surveys, fish habitat</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Respondents also note that there is no reason provided for the search radius of 2km from the boundary of all land required for construction for European Sites.</p> <p>Respondents also note that it would be useful to understand the timing of construction works and potential impacts on breeding birds and salmonids.</p> <p>Respondents also note that the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0 has been updated and Biodiversity Metric 3.0 should be used. .</p>	<p>assessment, fish surveys, river condition surveys (MoRPh), River Corridor Surveys, macrophyte surveys, aquatic invertebrate surveys and white-clawed crayfish surveys).</p> <p>A full suite of bat surveys to inform potential impacts of the Project on bats, including fragmentation effects, has also been carried out and presented in the ES (including bat roost potential assessments, emergence and re-entry surveys, activity transect surveys and static bat detector surveys).</p> <p>DNA surveys have been completed, including crayfish DNA surveys, to inform the ES.</p> <p>The 2km search radius for European sites (30km for bat related SACs) is in accordance with guidance (CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland) and was deemed appropriate to assess potential impacts on European sites as a result of the Project in the ES. A Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been carried out.</p> <p>Details relating to timing of construction to inform potential impacts on breeding birds and salmonids have been included in the ES.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. The design has been informed by the principles of habitat replacement (i.e. replacement ratios) set out in Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2). Proposed mitigation is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7). National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.	
81		Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report – Air quality	Respondents expressing concern about PEI Report content relating to air quality. This includes: i) That the information provided does not describe how the committed developments have been identified and assessed and how they may impact both the construction and operational phases. ii) That no performance statistics are provided and the method for the	The air quality assessment reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2), The air quality assessment has been carried out in line with current guidance, DMRB LA 105. i) Committed development data compiled in January 2022 has also been used to inform the assessment and further detail is presented within the ES Chapter, including the impact	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Natural England			<p>definition of sensitive receptors is not clear because the underlying datasets used are not described.</p> <p>iii) That the model adjustment during verification appears to have been completed using a single adjustment factor for the entire route which they advise is not robust.</p> <p>iv) That features on the Pollution Climate Mapping (PCM) road network that meet Defra's interpretation of the Air Quality Directive are not identified on scheme drawings in Figure 5.1 of the PEI Report and that localised drawings would have increased understanding of local dust impacts.</p> <p>v) That it is not clear how NH3 (ammonia) will be assessed.</p> <p>vi) Concern that construction timing could result in overlapping of single study areas at different times and therefore different baseline conditions.</p> <p>vii) That sufficient information is not provided to determine construction traffic emission impacts.</p>	<p>at both construction and operation phases of the Project.</p> <p>ii) Model performance details are set out in ES Chapter 5. A proportionate approach has been taken in the selection of sensitive human receptors to be used in the assessment, identifying those properties (for example, residential, schools, hospitals, care homes) which have the potential to adversely affected by the Project through their proximity to the Affected Road Network (ARN) and any areas of construction activities and are considered to be representative of potential worst-case impacts in the respective areas. Regarding sensitive ecological receptors, those identified within the ARN and near to any construction areas are listed in the ES Chapter 5 and illustrated in the relevant accompanying Figures. .</p> <p>iii) Model verification has been carried out to represent the range of conditions across the route and the approach carried out is considered to be robust. Two different factors have been used in the ES assessment to represent the separate urban and rural settings.</p> <p>iv) Sensitive (human and designated ecological sites) receptors within 200m</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>of the Affected Road Network are identified following the DMRB LA 105 guidance and shown on the Project drawings presented in the ES. Features on the Pollution Climate Mapping (PCM) road network that meet Defra's interpretation of the Air Quality Directive are also shown within the ES Chapter – all of which are illustrated in the accompanying Air Quality Figures.</p> <p>v) The ES Chapter includes an assessment of potential ammonia emissions, using the National Highways released toolkit, following DMRB LA 105.</p> <p>vi) Construction phasing impacts are considered within the ES Chapter. The ES Chapter 5 considers the potential quantitative impacts of construction-related vehicle emissions on air quality and sets out the basis for the data. The assessment considers a robust construction phasing scenario, to ensure any potential impacts are not underestimated and the assessment presented in the ES Chapter 5 is conservative. Further details on the construction traffic management can be found in Application Document 2.6) Construction Method and Management Statement</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						vii) The ES Chapter 5 considers the potential quantitative impacts of construction-related vehicle emissions on air quality and sets out the basis for the data. Potential impacts on sensitive human and ecological receptors within 200m of the ARN are identified and no likely significant effects are concluded.	
84		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153953	PEI Report - Details / materials	<p>Respondents expressing many specific concerns relating to lack of clarity, missing or inappropriately presented information, and insufficiently studied impacts within the PEI Report.</p> <p>Concerns include:</p> <p>i) The statement that the reasons stated within the PEI Report for Major Accidents and Disasters being scoped out is not wholly reflective of the SoS's response and an assessment of this should be provided including consideration of ground instability.</p> <p>ii) The likely effects of the cumulative assessment are not provided and the PEI Report does not describe how committed developments have been identified and assessed.</p> <p>iii) The absence of a detailed mitigation strategy results in the respondent being unable to provide</p>	The Preliminary Environmental Information Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation is not required to provide a full environmental assessment of the Project. The PEI Report was a preliminary assessment of likely significant effects, prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project based on information available at the time so that they could make an informed response to the 2021 Autumn Consultation. This included information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time. The PEI Report also set out the measures that were proposed to avoid or reduce any likely significant environmental effects.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>further commentary on potential impacts.</p> <p>iv) A dedicated transport assessment and socio-economic assessment has not been provided.</p> <p>v) Sufficient details are not provided on environmental gain.</p> <p>vi) Information is not provided on the construction phasing of schemes.</p> <p>vii) Information on non-designated assets is not provided.</p> <p>viii) Limits of deviation are not provided.</p> <p>viii) Details of cycle provision is not clear.</p>	<p>The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are reported in the ES. The ES includes further details in regards surveys, modelling and baseline data used. Where suggestions have been made in regards the presentation of assessment/data within the PEI Report these have been noted and addressed within the ES where appropriate.</p> <p>i) A preliminary appraisal of the Major Accidents and Disasters impacts that could arise from the Project was presented in Appendix 5.1 of the Scoping Report (see ES Appendix 4.1: EIA Scoping Report (Application Document 3.4)). This concluded that the Project is unlikely to result in an unacceptable risk of significant environmental effects from major events not otherwise considered within other topic chapters or mitigated through project design and the requirements of existing legislation. Therefore, by virtue of the nature and location of the Project it was considered that the topic of major events should be scoped out of the assessment. Notwithstanding, there were some additional potential major</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>risks identified in the Scoping Opinion that should be considered using the same approach adopted in the Scoping Report. To address these additional potential risks, the referencing and shortlist appraisal table presented in Appendix 5.1 of the Scoping Report has been used below in Table 4 2 within ES Chapter 3 Methodology (Application Document 3.2) to address these outstanding points including aspects such as Ground instability risks associated with Gypsum mines at Kirby Thore.</p> <p>ii) In regards committed developments planning authorities were contacted within January 2022 to identify development proposals within the ZOI (2km buffer around the Order Limits and up to 5km for major developments requiring Environmental Impact Assessment) that could potentially generate cumulative effects with the project. Information was requested on planning applications received within five years preceding the date of the request. Each of the developments and allocations in the longlist identified under Stage 1 have been considered in terms of whether they are likely to generate impacts which could combine to result in cumulative effects. Please refer to Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>iii) ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) sets out the effect of the Project on heritage assets and the field surveys carried out to characterise the archaeological potential of the Project corridor.</p> <p>iv) Traffic modelling has been carried out by National Highways and the traffic modelling methodology and results are reported in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>A socio-economic appraisal of the Project is not presented within the ES as this sits outside the scope of works for the LA 112 guidance, and an assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with DMRB LA112 guidance and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, is set out in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3). This assessment provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project at a routewide level.</p> <p>v) Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss.</p> <p>vi) A detailed description of proposals for construction of the Project is included within the accompanying Construction Management and Method Statement (Application Document 2.6). Subject to securing a DCO, preliminary works are planned to commence in 2024, with all schemes to be completed by 2029 or earlier. The project is likely to be delivered in a phased approach, with the construction of schemes delivered in parallel or consecutively.</p> <p>vii) The Cultural Heritage assessment within ES Chapter 8, Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) considers non-designated heritage resources within 300m of the Order Limits. This study area is based upon professional judgement and that non-designated resources are less likely to experience significant adverse effects as a result of changes to their settings beyond</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>this distance, because of their lower environmental value (sensitivity).</p> <p>vii) The DCO defines the Order Limits, the boundary within which the development of the Project will take place. It also sets out the Limits of Deviation (LoD), which allow some flexibility for the final design (in order to address any issues arising from pre-construction surveys or detailed design) whilst ensuring that the project is delivered within an approved 'envelope' and within the Order Limits. The approach to this, and how it is addressed in the ES is set out in ES Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>viii) ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides details of the proposed WCH provision.</p>	
1411	153978	Durham County Council Cumbria County Council			<p>Respondents expressing many specific concerns relating to lack of clarity, missing or inappropriately presented information, and insufficiently studied impacts within the PEI Report.</p> <p>Concerns include:</p> <p>i) An aboricultural survey has not been carried out and a detailed topographical survey is missing.</p>	<p>The PEI Report set out a preliminary assessment of likely significant effects, prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project based on information available at the time so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>ii) Rationale for cultural heritage surveys is not clear and there is concern the proposed surveys may not be sufficient.</p> <p>iii) There is a discrepancy within the PEI Report which states surveys have been used to inform the assessment and latterly the PEI Report states they have not.</p> <p>iv) Baseline traffic flows in and around the potential AQMA are not included in the PEI Report on key affected links such as Ullswater Road, Clifford Road, Haweswater Road and Castlegate which prevents the comparison with the flows with the preferred alignment in place.</p> <p>v) The consultation document states the Blue option has a greater effect on bats, otters and Tutta Beck, but this is not reflected in the PEI Report.</p> <p>vi) Driver user experience is not considered.</p> <p>vii) Contaminated land and areas of geo-environmental concern along the Project corridor are not at this stage adequately characterised.</p> <p>viii) It is not clear how agricultural drainage has been assessed.</p>	<p>information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time. The PEI Report also set out the measures that were proposed to avoid or reduce any likely significant environmental effects.</p> <p>The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are reported in the ES. The ES includes further details in regards surveys, modelling and baseline data used. Where suggestions have been made in regards the presentation of assessment/data within the PEI Report these have been noted and addressed within the ES where appropriate.</p> <p>i) The baseline assessment of landscape features forms part of the Landscape Character Assessment. Any important landscape features have been identified and where practicable measures included to maintain and protect them. The assessment has also identified important and veteran trees along the route with a view to protecting and retaining as many as possible. A full</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>arboricultural survey to BS5837 however has not been carried out at this stage; the protection of all retained trees is a requirement of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and where required arboricultural surveys will be completed at Detailed design stage to ensure require Root Protection Zones are implemented,</p> <p>ii) The scope of surveys used to support the assessment was detailed within the Evidence and Survey Strategy shared with stakeholders through Technical Working Group meetings.</p> <p>iii) The discrepancy within text in the PEI Report is noted. Where surveys had been carried out prior to the PEI Report these informed the proposed assessment scope and the potential environmental effects of the Project.</p> <p>iv) ES Chapter 5, Air Quality considers a 200m study area from the draft Order Limits in relation to the Affected Road Network (ARN) and this is identified within figures which support the ES Chapter. The potential AQMA Castlegate is not considered or mapped within the ES as no AQMA has been declared at Castlegate.</p> <p>v) The blue option alignment results in additional potential impacts associated with severance to potential bat</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>crossings, loss of potential habitat for otters and additional discharges to Tutta Beck in comparison to the black option alignment. Principally this is due to the larger physical extent of the blue option and the relocation of the junction at the western end of the scheme, in comparison with the black option.</p> <p>Please refer to the ES Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1 for further information.</p> <p>vi) The project recognises the importance of the A66 as an historic route and for the scenic opportunities it affords for road users. Where practicable views from the road have been a consideration in alignment design and have been considered alongside other environmental and engineering constraints and benefits that inform the overall design. In accordance with the design objectives outlined in LD117 chapter 3, the landscape design seeks to strike a balance between creating a positive driver experience, with retained and new vistas; allowing the route users to experience the landscape setting while minimising the impact of the new road</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>on local receptors. This has been achieved by an analysis of the key views along the route and providing well designed and planned outward views. Refer to ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p> <p>vii) A Phase 1 preliminary GI has been carried out along the route, to identify baseline ground conditions within the Order Limits. Post submission, further GI and Phase 2 investigation will be scoped and consulted on with the relevant authorities to inform detailed design, as is standard practice. However, the level of GI obtained to date is sufficient to inform the baseline for the purposes of the assessment. Further ground investigation will enable consideration of risks from possible historical contamination areas and those areas where elevated chemical concentrations were identified during the Phase 1 GI.</p> <p>viii) ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme in relation to water. Where land drainage from agriculture is encountered during construction, actions will be taken to divert the flow to an appropriate location, such as the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						construction drainage network. Prior to completion of the Project, these field drains will be reinstated to the original locations, where practically possible, or diverted to an appropriate discharge location. These measures are secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
1412	153560, 153566, 153978,	Natural England Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council Cumbria County Council	153953		<p>Respondents expressing many specific concerns relating to lack of clarity, missing or inappropriately presented information, and insufficiently studied impacts within the PEI Report.</p> <p>Concerns include:</p> <p>i) Sufficient information is not provided on the ecological assessment carried out and information provided is generic and information is not provided on competition from non-native species/introduction of disease, change in flow or velocity regime and the possible creation of barriers. Impacts on the designated features of the SAC are not adequately described.</p> <p>ii) Photomontages have not been provided.</p> <p>iii) Assumptions are not provided for the ALC desk based assessment.</p>	The Preliminary Environmental Information Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation is not required to provide a full environmental assessment of the Project. The PEI Report was a preliminary assessment of likely significant effects, prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project based on information available at the time so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time. The PEI Report also set out the measures that were proposed to avoid or reduce any likely significant environmental effects.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>iv) For land take a conclusion is not provided of the likely significant effect of the Project.</p> <p>v) Changes in key indicators of conservation value (water quality, etc) – the impacts for the operation phase have not been included.</p>	<p>The PEI Report outlined where further environmental survey information was required or was being carried out. The findings of the surveys and the full Environmental Impact Assessment are reported in the ES. The ES includes further details in regards surveys, modelling and baseline data used. Where suggestions have been made in regards the presentation of assessment/data within the PEI Report these have been noted and addressed within the ES where appropriate.</p> <p>i) ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effect of the scheme on wildlife and sets out mitigation and enhancement measures designed into the scheme to reduce the effects of the scheme on wildlife. Measures for dealing with invasive species and implementing biosecurity measures are incorporated in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Methodologies and timing of works in/near water are detailed within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Impacts will be minimised through sensitive timing of works and best practice construction, such as low impact piling methodologies. Further detail of the designated features of European sites that could</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>potentially be impacted by the Project is provided within the accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5).</p> <p>ii) Photomontages have been produced to illustrate representative views and the effect of any mitigation and illustrative sections form part of the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3).</p> <p>iii) Assumptions and limitations regarding surveys and desk based analysis carried out for the Geology and Soils assessment are detailed within ES Chapter 9, Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>iv) Where relevant to ES Chapter assessments within the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) the significance of temporary possession and permanent land take is considered and identified.</p> <p>v) Application Document 3.5, HRA Stage 1 Likely Significant Effects Report considers changes in key indicators of conservation value (water quality, etc) for both construction and operation.</p>	
89		Cumbria County Council		PEI Report – Population and human health	Respondents expressing that the Project could significantly affect the tourism sector, the temporary accommodation sector, the	An assessment of the impact of the Project on local businesses, in line with DMRB LA112 guidance, is set out in ES Chapter 13 Population and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council		– business and tourism	construction employment sector and businesses	Human Health (Application Document 2.3). This assessment provides a high level narrative on the potential economic benefits of the Project at a routewide level. Potential impacts on tourism and recreation sectors are considered but in line with guidance are not monetised. The ES also considers the average and peak worker numbers at construction compounds and potential associated impacts. It is identified that any impact that temporary workers may have on the local area is unlikely to be significant and may result in a minor beneficial effect due to increased local spending.	
103	153365, 153560, 153978, 162147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153039, 153561, 153602, 153607, 153626, 154254, 162162	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Flooding / drainage	Respondents expressing concern about potential flooding and drainage issues relating to the Project. Respondents state that the proposed drainage ponds are too numerous and poorly positioned. Respondents express concern that the proposed drainage measures have not been coordinated with agricultural drainage systems; that detrunked roads would receive less future funding for drainage infrastructure; that the area already suffers from flooding and that flood risks may increase in the future due to climate change.	A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has been completed and is set out within the ES appendices (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4)). Where the Project proposes works to de-trunked road sections these areas are also considered within the assessment. Proposed drainage ponds have been designed to attenuate and treat the road runoff and climate change uplift values have been incorporated into the design. Ponds. The proposed positions of drainage ponds have been determined by capacity requirements,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>local topography, and watercourse outfall depths. Where practicable, the number of ponds has been rationalised in response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation whilst minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>The assessment identifies that the Project drainage design will manage surface water flood risk changes as a result of the increase of impermeable area of the Project and no adverse flooding impacts are identified as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that a detailed drainage design in accordance with DMRB LA113 , the Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy will be implemented at detailed design stage (which are located within ES Appendix 14.2 (Document Reference 3.4)).</p> <p>The detailed drainage design and maintenance strategies will be developed at the detailed design stage and Lead Local Flood Authorities and directly affected landowners, will be consulted through-out this development</p>	
132	154335, 154350	Durham County Council		PEI Report - Noise and vibration	Respondents expressing concern about the information in PEI Report and the impact it will have on the project relating to noise and vibration.	i) The inconsistency between the traffic modelling opening year (2031) and the opening year used throughout the PEI Report (2029) was noted within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council			<p>i) In particular, that the information has not been presented adequately especially with the acknowledged inconsistency for traffic modelling in 2031 and the opening year of 2029 mean that the noise assessment in PEI Report must be viewed conservatively.</p> <p>ii) Respondents also expressing concern that the noise and vibrations will have a negative impact on birds and fish breeding. Respondents expressing concern that the impact of vibrations on fish eggs has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>iii) Respondents also expressing concern that the PEI Report makes insufficient provision for potential damage to properties caused by vibration.</p> <p>iv) Respondents also state that more people along the route would be adversely impacted by noise than would benefit, with almost twice as many residential and non-residential properties reporting adverse rather than beneficial impacts concerning noise pollution.</p>	<p>PEI Report and was due to changes in the original construction programme. Both the traffic and noise modelling have been revised within the ES.</p> <p>An updated traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project has been carried out post Autumn 2021 Consultation. The model is a representation of the road network in the area and of where people travelled to and from in an average month. It uses an industry-recognised method of predicting future traffic flows and conditions, both with and without the A66 Project. The transport model shows the number of people choosing to travel by road and identifies the route they use now and the route they are forecast to use. This enables us to predict how many vehicles will be using each part of the road network in the future and how long it will take to complete a journey. The model considers these forecasts over a range of years, including the year of assessment, year of opening and 15 and 20 years after opening. The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and this assessment is informed by the traffic modelling carried out.</p> <p>ii) Impacts on aquatic species will be minimised through sensitive timing of works giving rise to significant noise and vibration and best practice construction, such as low impact piling methodologies. Potential impacts on fish, including migratory spawning, during construction and operation have been assessed and reported in ES as not significant once the mitigation measures outlined within the ES have been implemented (ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2)).</p> <p>iii) The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation is not required to provide a full environmental assessment of the Project. The PEI Report was prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time. The PEI Report</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>also set out the measures that were proposed to avoid or reduce any likely significant environmental effects. As part of the ES Chapter a construction vibration assessment has been carried out in accordance with DMRB LA 111 guidance within a study area of 100m from the closest construction activity, as a worst-case this is assumed to be at the edge of the DCO Order limits. These results are presented in section 12.10 of the ES Chapter. Operational vibration is scoped out of the assessment methodology as a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects</p> <p>iv) Within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) there are noise change maps which show both adverse and beneficial impacts due to the proposed Project. Table 12-27 in section 12.10 of the ES Chapter presents the number of receptors where a likely significant effect is predicted.</p> <p>Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which identifies noise barriers/earth bunds mitigation. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	
136	153560, 154350	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		PEI Report - Landscape and visual effects	Respondents expressing concern about landscape and visual effects as outlined in the PEI Report. Respondents expressing concern that insufficient information and photos have been provided, specifically mentioning mitigation, methodology, and the landscape character units. Respondents also expressing concern that visual intrusions have not been adequately assessed or reported.	The PEI Report and the landscape and visual assessment within it, published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation is not required to provide a full environmental assessment of the Project. The PEI Report was a preliminary assessment and was prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes a full assessment of visual effects. The ES assessment has further details on materials, levels and identification of topographical features.</p> <p>The Project has been assessed using prescribed guidance, LA107, incorporating aspects of GLVIA3 where it provides clarity. While the wider area and a range of viewpoints have been considered only significant effects have been assessed within the ES. The ES explains the methodology and assessment process including the definition of susceptibility, sensitivity and value and criteria for significant effects.</p> <p>A figure is provided with ES Chapter 10 (Application Document 3.3) which identifies local designations and the study area along with the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The ZTV identifies the extent of potential impact upon Landscape Character Units (LCU).</p> <p>Photomontages have been produced to illustrate representative views and the effect of any mitigation and illustrative sections form part of the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3). Representative</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>viewpoints and those that have been developed into photomontages have been agreed with each council through Technical Working Group meetings. Photography has been taken in accordance with the Landscape Institutes current guidance. The level of visual representation is selected to best illustrate the effects of the Project and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>The ES Chapter sits alongside the Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11). Together these documents, along with the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and the Mitigation Schedule (Application Document 2.9) demonstrate the Project design intent.</p>	
149		<p>Cumbria County Council</p> <p>Eden District Council</p>		<p>PEI Report – Population and human health – Public Rights of Way</p>	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the lack of information concerning Public Rights of Way (ProW) in the PEI- Report. Respondents state that the calculation provision of ProW did not use current survey data. Respondents state that the assessment fails to report on the frequency or type of use for ProW provision or whether routes marked on the PEI Report, which lay outside of the 500m study area, were included in their assessment. Respondents also</p>	<p>The PEI Report published for the Autumn 2021 Consultation is not required to provide a full environmental assessment of the Project. The PEI Report was a preliminary assessment and was prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project so that they could make an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>stated that only a single ProW diversion length was noted within the PEI Report, which they consider to be insufficient when the technical review has identified a number of other ProW that will be impacted by the project.</p>	<p>information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time.</p> <p>The Population and Human Health Chapter within the PEI Report presented the Preliminary Environmental Information in relation to the population and human health assessment and detailed the assessment assumptions and limitations identifying where further information would be used to inform the full assessment within the ES. The information provided was robust and sufficient to inform the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of impacts and effects on PRowS or WCH during construction of the Project and assumes that all permanently impacted PRowS would have appropriate diversion routes in place during the works if closures are required. The assessment is compliant with DMRB LA112 and engagement has been with key stakeholders and survey data utilised to identify the frequency of use of different routes.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Where diversions are known they have been discussed within the ES Chapter. The EMP (Document Number 2.7) provides an expanded essay plan of the Public Rights of Way Management Plan that will be further developed and implemented at construction stage. The ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 2.3) also assesses WCH routes within the 500m study area in line with the DMRB LA112 guidance. Where required an assessment of those routes outside of the 500m study area has been carried out, for example where other environmental topics such as air quality, noise or landscape identify impacts potential impacts.	
150		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England Richmond-shire District		PEI Report - Geology and soils	Respondents expressing concern that the PEI Report is inadequate in a number of respects in relation to its assessment of geology and soils. i) Concern expressed regarding inadequate characterisation of areas of contaminated land and special geo-environmental concern with a focus on desk-based rather than on-site research. ii) Concern expressed regarding the lack of detail on potential soil disturbance and damage in Table 9.21.	i) The PEI Report was informed by desk based studies. Desk studies were sufficient and robust at that preliminary stage of the assessment to identify potential impacts to inform stakeholder engagement and also to inform further assessment scope and Project design. A Soil Survey has been completed within the Order Limits and the findings and details of this are considered within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). A Phase 1 preliminary GI has been carried out along the route, to identify	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Council and North Yorkshire County Council			<p>iii) Concern expressed that there is no indication of permanent versus temporary agricultural land take required within the PEI Report;</p> <p>iv) Concern expressed that there is no summary of Agricultural Land Holdings assessment for the operational phase.</p> <p>v) Concern expressed there is an absence of soil grading to identify 'best and most versatile' land and that a soil survey and soil management plan is required.</p> <p>vi) Concern expressed that there is an insufficient indication of scope of future ground investigations.</p> <p>vii) Concern expressed regarding a lack of consideration of potential opportunities for improving contaminated land alongside construction.</p> <p>viii) Concern expressed regarding insufficient engagement plans the scope of the target ground investigation.</p>	<p>baseline ground conditions within the Order Limits.</p> <p>Post submission, further GI and Phase 2 investigation will be scoped and consulted on with the relevant authorities to inform detailed design, as is standard practice. However, the level of GI obtained to date is sufficient to inform the baseline for the purposes of the assessment.</p> <p>This is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Further ground investigation will enable consideration of risks from possible historical contamination areas and those areas where elevated chemical concentrations were identified during the Phase 1 GI. Where risks are deemed to be significant, remediation options and strategies will be developed accordingly and agreed upon with the regulatory authorities, (to include the Environment Agency and the local councils, where relevant).</p> <p>ii) This feedback is noted and ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) considers potential soil disturbance and damage.</p> <p>iii) At the Autumn 2021 Consultation stage a precautionary worst case assessment was carried out based on the information available at the time, assuming that all the land take within</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Order Limits was permanent. Further information is available, such that ES, Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land. The Project design seeks to minimise the area of land required both temporarily and permanently. Land and details of agricultural land take (both temporary and permanent) are contained within the ES Chapter.</p> <p>iv) Temporary and permanent Impacts to soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are considered within ES, Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). Impacts to temporary and permanent loss of the soils is considered to take place during construction and has been assessed as such. By the operational phase the soils have been lost and no further impact is anticipated.</p> <p>v) An assessment of agricultural and soil resource of the site has been carried out and is detailed in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). The assessment is based on desk study information and a soil survey which has taken place within the Order Limits. The soil survey has identified</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the ALC Grades. A Soil Management Plan will be produced prior to works commencing by the Principal Contractor and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment. will be produced prior to works commencing and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment. This is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>vi) Further GI shall be carried out prior to construction in order to inform the detailed design and is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The current level of GI is considered sufficient to inform the assessment.</p> <p>vii) Further ground investigation will enable further consideration of risks from possible historical contamination areas and those areas where elevated chemical concentrations were identified during the Phase 1 GI. Where risks are deemed to be significant, remediation options and strategies will be developed accordingly and agreed upon with the regulatory authorities as secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>viii) Further targeted ground investigation will inform remediation strategies and the need for any further long-term monitoring. The phase 2</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ground investigation and any remediation that may be required, should unexpected contamination be identified, will be designed in agreement with the relevant authorities(to include the Environment Agency and the local councils, where relevant) as secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
155	153560, 154350	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Natural England		PEI Report - Climate change	<p>Respondents expressing concern about the climate change aspects of the PEI Report document.</p> <p>i) Respondents note the PEI Report does not make reference to PAS 2080 when outlining emissions sources.</p> <p>ii) Respondents note there is no reference to the best practice guidance document, Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Guide to Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance.</p> <p>iii) respondents note that although the Project may have negligible emissions the Project should not be viewed in isolation and cumulatively with other government road Projects the Project impact could be major.</p> <p>iv) Respondents state that the Project is inconsistent with government aims to reduce carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in Environment Statement Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>i) The assessment follows DMRB LA 114. The principles of PAS 2080 have been used to inform and supplement the DMRB LA 114 guidance. The PAS 2080 lifecycle stages are included within the ES Chapter table 7-5 and within the “Impact of the Project on climate” (GHG assessment) sections.</p> <p>ii) The ES Chapter has followed the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 Climate (DMRB LA 114) and the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). Additional sources of guidance on the assessment of Climate are those produced by the IEMA for both GHG</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessment (IEMA, 2021c), and CCR/ICCI assessment (IEMA 2020). Both documents provide guidance on appropriate methods and standards for assessing the scale of impacts and also on determining the significance of those impacts. This IEMA guidance is largely in accordance with LA 114 with regards to GHG emissions assessment methodology and the importance of mitigation. It also notes that a spatial approach to a cumulative assessment for GHG emissions is not appropriate. The climate assessment against carbon budgets in the ES, and the mitigation we present which seeks to minimise GHGs, follows LA 114 and therefore broadly aligns with IEMA guidance. The IEMA guidance does differ from LA 114 in the assessment of significance. It is considered that LA 114 is more aligned with current policy (i.e. the NPSNN) given that it requires significance to be considered in the context of national carbon budget setting, and the likely impact of the project on the achievement of national carbon budgets. On this basis the approach adopted in this ES to the assessment of significance aligns with that specified within LA 114, rather than adopting the guidance approach proposed by IEMA. In all other aspects of both GHG and CCR/ICCI</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>assessments the approach adopted follows LA 114, which in turn aligns on most pertinent issues with the guidance developed by IEMA.”</p> <p>iii) This comment is noted. The ES Chapter assessment presents a breakdown of the emissions calculated for the Project, and a comparison against UK Government carbon budgets, to determine the significance of emissions. It is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets and no likely significant effects are predicted.</p> <p>iv) . The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out how the need for the Project and how it complies with national policy including the NPSNN. The ES Chapter assessment presents a breakdown of the emissions calculated for the Project, and a comparison against UK Government carbon budgets, to determine the significance of emissions aligning with the requirements of the NPSNN and DMRB LA 114. Following both NPSNN (paragraph 5.17) and DMRB LA 114 (paragraph 3.20), it is concluded that it is very unlikely that the GHG emissions impact of the Project will, in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						isolation, have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets (Carbon Budgets 4, 5 & 6) and therefore no likely significant effects are predicted.	
189	148611, 149689, 151520, 153316, 153557, 153559, 153560, 153562, 153567, 153974, 153976, 153983, 153984, 153988, 153990, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 154129, 154136, 154336, 154338, 154340, 154345, 154348,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Lake District National Park Authority		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Air quality	Respondents expressing concern, in general terms, about the impact the Project could have on air quality. Respondents state that the Project would decrease local air quality, particularly because of increases in traffic. Other respondents state that the Yorkshire Dales National Park could be significantly impacted by increased air pollution.	The PEI Report presented a preliminary air quality impact assessment. The air quality assessment, ES Chapter 5 (Application Document 3.2) has been updated following updates to the traffic model and Project design and considers construction and operation effects. The selection of human receptor locations takes a proportionate approach and follows the guidance given in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105. Representative sensitive human receptors have been chosen within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN) where pollutant concentrations are expected to be highest, i.e., closest to the road, junctions etc., or at locations that are anticipated to experience the highest level of change, i.e., next to roads within the ARN with the largest change in the traffic screening criteria. Air quality impacts on receptors beyond this distance are considered to be negligible. The Yorkshire Dales is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154352, 154356, 154359, 154360, 154368, 155322					outwith this distance and therefore no significant impact is identified. Proposed mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified, as a result of the Project, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105 and detailed within the ES chapter.	
191	148570, 148576, 148611, 149367, 151461, 151481, 151483, 151501, 153316, 153339, 153365, 153387, 153557, 153559, 153560, 153567, 153797, 153839, 153871, 153900, 153901, 153955, 153965, 153974, 153976, 153982,		153942, 154357	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern that the Project would have a detrimental impact on the climate. Respondents state that the carbon emissions produced, both in the construction and operational phases, would not be compatible with Net Zero goals and climate emergency strategies. Others state that carbon sinks could be lost due to the land required, and state that the sixty year appraisal figures may not be accurate.	The ES sets out, in various documents such as the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) the need for the Project and how it complies with the relevant planning policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN)) and environmental impact legislation (the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)). National Highways is required under law (the EIA Regulations) and policy (the NPSNN) to assess the effects of the Project in relation to carbon emissions and climate change. ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the climate assessment, setting out any likely significant climate effects. As well as reporting estimated emissions associated with the proposed Project, Chapter 7 of the ES sets out the carbon mitigation included within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153983, 153984, 153986, 153987, 153988, 153990, 153991, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 153999, 154125, 154126, 154128, 154129, 154130, 154131, 154150, 154329, 154332, 154335, 154336, 154338, 154340, 154344, 154345, 154346, 154348, 154349, 154350, 154352,					<p>design and identifies further mitigation measures which would reduce emissions during construction and operation.</p> <p>The assessment concludes no likely significant effect, as the DMRB LA 114 states: "assessment of projects on climate shall only report significant effects where increases in GHG emissions will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets".</p> <p>The assessment approach adopted, which is in line with DMRB guidance, has been to use traffic modelling to estimate actual vehicle numbers on the road network through the operational assessment period and to use standard vehicle emissions factors to calculate emissions for each year of the 60 year study period. The vehicle factors take account of the general decarbonisation trend and so do, indeed, reflect higher per-vehicle emissions in the earlier part of the assessment period. The adopted approach is consistent with the assessment methodology guidance set out in DMRB LA 114. The 60 year study period is based on guidance set out within RICS Whole Life Carbon Assessment for the Built Environment which is a key reference for</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154353, 154355, 154356, 154358, 154359, 154360, 154361, 154364, 154365, 155322					<p>practitioners undertaking this type of GHG assessment.</p> <p>The change in land use within each scheme is based on the assessment of habitat types (biodiversity units), following assessment by suitably qualified ecologists using the methodology outlined in Chapter 6: Biodiversity. For each scheme the net change in the area of each habitat type within the Order Limits has been quantified. The assessment approach takes a conservative approach by excluding the operational phase carbon sequestration from the evaluation of significance (i.e. excluding GHG benefits arising from new habitat creation when assessing the significance of changes in GHG emissions). However the quantification of these benefits (were all biodiversity units within the Order Limits to be delivered) are presented in the assessment results tables in Chapter 7: Climate.</p>	
216		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		PEI Report - Population and human health - community impacts	Respondents expressing concern about the impact the project could have on the health of those living nearby and how this has been assessed in the PEI Report. This includes concerns that the Applicant used the Local Authority Health Profiles without reporting on the full	The PEI Report was a preliminary assessment and was prepared to enable the local community and other stakeholders to understand the environmental effects of the proposed Project so that they could make	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>suite of indicators or providing a full list of vulnerable groups considered for inclusion.</p>	<p>an informed response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation. This included information on how the environmental assessment of the Project would be carried out and the potential environmental effects of the Project, based on the information available at the time.</p> <p>The Population and Human Health Chapter within the PEI Report presented the Preliminary Environmental Information in relation to the population and human health assessment and detailed the assessment assumptions and limitations identifying where further information would be used to inform the full assessment within the ES. The information provided was robust and sufficient to inform the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the Project on human health is provided in ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in LA 112 as the appropriate standard. The assessment identifies the impacts of the construction and operation of the Project on factors that influence health, including environmental conditions, green</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						space, traffic, severance and access. The effects on the mental and physical health of the population, including vulnerable groups, resulting from these changes have been qualitatively assessed and mitigation measures incorporated where required and practicable. Vulnerable groups are identified from data at Local Authority, Ward and LSOA level, and through consideration of the users or occupants of affected receptors.	
237	151481, 153365, 153560, 153567, 153900, 153984, 154151, 154197, 154336, 154343, 154350, 154368, 155322	Cumbria County Council Natural England		Environment - general (non PEI Report) - General / not specified	Respondents expressing concern, in general terms, about the possible environmental impact of the Project. Respondents expressing concern about environmental damage caused by the Project, stating that the Project contradicts national planning policy on environmental grounds and that the consultation materials including the Preliminary Environmental Report do not identify the volume of additional traffic that will be generated by the 'end to end' dualling of the route.	National Highways has produced an ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4), which provides a full and robust assessment of the effects of the Project on the environment and identifies how adverse effects will be mitigated. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out how the need for the Project and how it complies with national policy including the NPSNN. As part of the work carried out by National Highways, an assessment of the impact of the Project on the road network is provided the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The Transport Assessment presents the outputs of the traffic modelling and assessment carried out to date, considering both the changes to traffic on the A66 itself but also the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						changes to the local road network and the wider strategic network. The output of the traffic modelling is utilised within the environmental impact assessment of the Project and underpins the modelling used within the assessment. The traffic modelling carried out assesses the entire Project with all schemes included and therefore represents 'end to end' dualling of the route.	
267	153567, 154350	Cumbria County Council Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority	154254	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Light	Respondents expressing concerns relating to the environment and light, including concerns that there would be an increase in light pollution which would disturb wildlife and local residents. Respondents specifically mention the Yorkshire Dales, Stainmore and Lightwater cottages.	Replacement lighting will be installed at the M1 and M6 junctions and the divergence at the A67 at Bowes will be lit for safety reasons, however the rest of the Project is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. Further details on the landscape and visual assessment of the Project and proposed lighting can be found within ES Chapter 10, Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). National Highways will seek to avoid and reduce construction impacts on Biodiversity receptors and designated sites through sensitive lighting where night-time working is required Temporary construction stage lighting will be designed to be sensitive to wildlife. As part of the DCO application, National Highways has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, including wildlife, will be managed.	
268	149689, 151520, 153557, 153559, 153560, 153567, 153974, 153976, 153983, 153988, 153990, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 154129, 154132, 154136, 154329, 154338, 154340, 154345, 154348, 154352, 154356, 154359,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153627, 154254	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise	Respondents expressing concern about the potential noise pollution created by the Project. Respondents state, in general terms, that noise pollution would increase during the construction and operation phases due to increased traffic. Other respondents state that the proposed acoustic barrier mitigation measures could be ineffective.	The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). Section 12.10 of the ES Chapter presents the results of the assessment of construction and operation of the Project. The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out, baseline noise levels informed by noise monitoring carried out and traffic modelling. Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects. The Project design includes a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. National Highways has produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7) as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, which explains how the impact of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154360, 154363, 154364, 155322					<p>construction activities on the environment, such as noise, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p> <p>Monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation measures would be completed as part of National Highways Project Evaluation procedures (as set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7)), which evaluates how highway schemes are delivered and would provide an opportunity to highlight any potential issues.</p>	
300	148611, 153316, 153339, 153365, 153557, 153559, 153560, 153797, 153955, 153965, 153974, 153976, 153982, 153983, 153984, 153986, 153987,	Natural England	153603, 153627, 154254, 154357	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Wildlife / habitats	<p>Respondents expressing concerns relating to the negative impact the Project could have on the wildlife and their habitats, including in SSSI land along the River Eden, Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation and Pennine Moors Special Protection Area. Respondents also comment on the impact they feel this could have on various species of birds and ancient woodland, requesting additional buffer zones to allow for effective mitigation.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) provides a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological designated sites (including the River Eden SSSI, the Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation and the Pennine Moors Special Protection area) and receptors potentially impacted by the Project such as birds and ancient woodland. The Project has been designed to avoid adverse impacts on sensitive/protected/notable ecological receptors where practicable. Where this is not possible and potential significant impacts have been</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153988, 153990, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 153999, 154125, 154126, 154129, 154130, 154131, 154148, 154150, 154329, 154332, 154334, 154335, 154336, 154338, 154340, 154344, 154345, 154346, 154348, 154349, 154350, 154352, 154355, 154356, 154358, 154359,					<p>identified, appropriate mitigation to avoid potential adverse impacts has been included in the outline design through engagement with key stakeholders.</p> <p>This will entail application of best practice techniques and a suite of bespoke measures such as buffer zones to ensure compliance with industry standards and relevant legislation. Consequently, no significant impact on any designated site as a result of the Project is envisaged. Opportunities have also been sought to maximise environmental enhancements as part of the proposals where practicable.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154360, 154361, 154363, 154365, 155322, 162152						
365	149428, 151495, 153316, 153559, 153567, 153797, 153965, 153974, 153983, 153984, 153988, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 154129, 154148, 154332, 154335, 154345, 154352, 154359, 154360, 154363,	Historic England Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153927	Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Cultural heritage	Respondents expressing concern about the impacts of the Project on cultural heritage aspects of the environment. Respondents expressing concern that ancient settlements along the A66 could be lost during construction, and that the 'rural' cultural heritage of the region could disappear. Others specifically expressing concern about Brough Castle, Eden Valley Railway, and Rokeby Park, whilst other respondents state that heritage surveys for the Project are still outstanding.	The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project to aid the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The PEI Report identified where further surveys would be carried out. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is now reported in the ES and includes details of proposed mitigation measures. The assessment indicates that archaeological remains associated with former settlements will be removed as a result of the Project. The Mitigation Strategy indicates how this loss will be mitigated through preservation by record. Further geophysical survey, detailed setting assessments, archive research and trial trenching have been carried out to inform the ES. The impacts of the Project on the historic environment and proposed mitigation measures are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154368, 155322					<p>Brough Castle will not be impacted by the Project. The impact of the Project on the Grade II* Rokeby Park RPG and Church Plantation which forms part of the RPG have been considered throughout route development and no significant impacts are identified at Rokeby Park. No significant impacts are identified at the Temple Sowerby Station site or along the Eden Valley Branch Railway.</p> <p>The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of an Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
429	149777, 153337, 153605, 154344	Cumbria County Council		Environment – general (non PEI Report) – Water quality	<p>Respondents expressing concern relating to the environment and water quality, including concern that there would be an increase in water pollution due to surface run-off from the A66. Respondents specifically mention Thacka Beck. Respondents also expressing concern about the impact on water supply to agricultural fields.</p>	<p>The effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including surface water, have been assessed in detail and reported in detail in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Details of the outline Project drainage design and how drainage could be implemented within Order Limits, which incorporate flood and climate change mitigation are reported in the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). This has been developed to provide information on the measures designed to treat highways run-off. The water quality from the proposed highway surface water runoff, following treatment through the drainage design is assessed using HEWRAT, and displayed in Appendix 14.3 Water Quality Assessment (Application Document 3.4). No adverse impacts on water quality to Thacka Beck are predicted.</p> <p>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) outlines mitigation proposed to reduce potential impacts to the receiving water environment, including measures such as sediment traps and settlement ponds not used for the operational phase of a road. The EMP also includes ground and surface water monitoring plans and requirements for monitoring will be derived during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>Further surveys will be carried out at detailed design to collect further data on springs and abstractions that are within areas of potential impact. A plan to maintain, reinstate or compensate water supplies will be prepared, and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						implemented. This is secured through implementation of the EMP.	
666		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Environment Agency Natural England		PEI Report – Road drainage and water environment	<p>Respondents expressing concern related to road drainage and water environment as part of the Project. A number of issues are identified in relation to the PEI Report including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) failure to identify all of the main river watercourses such as the Coat Syke; ii) Thacka Beck is unlikely to be as high quality as suggested in PEI Report; iii) Light Water, while not part of an SAC, flows into one further downstream and could cause contamination to it; iv) Northumbria and Humber River Basin Management Plans have not been listed as a relevant local policy document; v) the proposed sustainable drainage system pond may be at risk of erosion; vi) contaminated waste water poses environmental risks to the River Eden, including SAC and SSSI sites; vii) no Flood Risk Assessment has been produced to accompany the PEI Report which will be required for a full DCO submission; and viii) appropriate mitigation is required at watercourse crossings and for 	<p>The effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including surface water, have been sufficiently assessed and consider potential impacts to flows and impacts on water quality. This is reported in the ES Road Drainage and the Water Environment Chapter (Application Document 3.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A naming convention has been developed for the ES to address inconsistencies where no mapped watercourse names exist, with all main rivers considered. Coat Syke is identified as a main river within the ES Chapter. ii) The comment in regards Thacka Beck is noted and considered within the assessment reported within the ES. Following DMRB guidance this watercourse is given a rating of high quality. iii) Extensive surveys of Light Water (a small tributary) have been carried out (River Corridor Survey, macrophyte/LEAFPACS surveys, fish habitat assessment, aquatic macroinvertebrate, electric fishing and riverine eDNA) and is detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					suspended works to prevent flooding and environmental damage.	<p>Reference 3.2). No significant impacts on Light Water are envisaged once the mitigation outlined in the ES has been implemented.</p> <p>iv) All River Basin Management Plans relevant to the Project such as those cited are listed within the ES chapter.</p> <p>v) A Hydromorphology Impact Assessment has been carried out and the results of this assessment have been used to propose appropriate mitigation to mitigate potential erosion risk such as bank profiling and scour protection.</p> <p>vi) The water quality from the proposed highway surface water runoff, following treatment through the drainage design is assessed using HEWRAT, and displayed in Appendix 14.3 Water Quality Assessment.. No significant adverse effects are predicted to the receiving water environment.</p> <p>vii)The flood risk assessment undertaken for the Project and an indication of how the Project drainage could be implemented within Order Limits is presented in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4). The Principal Contractor will design the drainage to ensure that runoff from the road does</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>not lead to flooding, in accordance with DMRB LA 113. This commitment is secured within the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, Table 3-2 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>viii) A Hydromorphological assessment of all infrastructure related to the Project whereby there is a potential change in the receiving water environment has been completed in accordance with DMRB LA 113 and is presented in Appendix 14.4 Hydromorphology Assessment (Application Document 3.4). Where geomorphological modelling has been considered appropriate to assess the impacts of the Project, this has been developed through engagement with the Environment Agency and other appropriate stakeholders, and is presented in Appendix 14.9 Detailed Geomorphological Modelling (Application Document 3.4). Mitigation options have been developed to reduce or eliminate these impacts and are detailed and secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).</p>	
1057		Environment Agency		PEI Report - Materials	Respondents expressing concern about the materials, assets, and waste associated with the project, these	An assessment of construction and operation waste and waste management has been carried out as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		Natural England		assets and waste	include: the need for a Site Waste Management Plan; consideration of the removal of excess material and use of licenced waste facilities; that the reuse and recycling of waste will require the treatment of demolition waste under an environmental permit or under registered waste exemption and the need for compliance with the Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) code of practice;	part of the environmental impact assessment with reference to the relevant national policy, local planning policy and legislation, as set out in ES Chapter 11, Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2). Waste generation during the construction phase of the Project will be managed through a detailed Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) meeting relevant legislative, policy and health and safety requirements. The SWMP will acknowledge the requirements of the CL:AIRE code of practice and the need for the appropriate disposal of waste off-site.	
1101		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing concern that the PEI Report doesn't contain assessments of likely permanent impacts to cultural heritage resources from the construction of compounds. Potential impacts are recommended to be fully addressed in the final ES.	Details of the indicative location and nature of use of construction compounds are provided in Chapter 2, Table 2-3 of the PEI Report document. The locations are indicative and have been refined during ongoing definition of the construction approach and are fully assessed in the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4). The potential impacts of construction compound locations are assessed within the ES and discussed within ES Chapter 8 (Application Document 3.2). The Chapter identifies that potential impacts will be mitigated by preservation by record	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1102		Historic England		PEI Report - Cultural heritage	Respondent expressing concern that the PEI Report doesn't make it clear that the potential impacts on cultural heritage resources have been assessed to help inform the location of ecological mitigation.	<p>The PEI Report contained a preliminary assessment of the effects of the Project. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is reported in the ES and includes details of proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>Potential ecological mitigation for the PEI Report identified a worst-case scenario based on the Autumn 2021 Consultation design to ensure all mitigation was accounted for when developing the Project Order Limits.</p> <p>Since the PEI Report, surveys and trial trenching have been carried out and the previous PEI Report Order Limits and extent of mitigation has been much reduced.</p> <p>Throughout this refinement, impacts have been discussed between the Design and Environment teams (including between ecology and heritage specialists) to minimise impacts and provide mitigation where appropriate. Refer to ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	No
1131	153871, 154150, 154358, 154363			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Climate impact	Respondents expressing concern over the need for the Project due to climate commitments.	The potential impact of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the Project is assessed in ES Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2). In the context of the UK carbon budget targets, it is concluded that the GHG	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						emissions of the Project will not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets.	
1354	154136			Environment - general (non PEI Report) - Noise survey technique	Respondents expressing concern about the techniques used to carry out noise assessments. Respondent mentions that the PEI Report states that a desk-based review of baseline conditions was carried out but that should not be a replacement for site-based reviews.	<p>The PEI Report noise assessment was informed by a desk-based review of the surrounding area along the existing route corridor, the draft DCO boundary for the project and the alternative alignments.</p> <p>The PEI Report noise assessment identified that noise monitoring to inform the noise baseline would be carried out to inform the ES.</p> <p>The effects of the Project in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The ES chapter sets out the methodology carried out including the noise survey methodology, identifying each monitoring location and the duration of the survey period.</p>	No
1307		Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Request for further information / Cultural Heritage	Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that the results of the Written Scheme of Investigation for trial trenching will allow refinements to the assessment of likely effects referencing Table 8.25 in the PEI Report.	<p>Substantial survey work has also been carried out to inform the ES, including geophysical survey, trial trenching and geochemical survey, the details of which are set out in the ES.</p> <p>Refer to ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) for further information.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A detailed heritage mitigation strategy forms part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and contains an Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) - which sets out the framework for the archaeological works and will be used as a reference for the Site-Specific Written Schemes of Investigation (SSWSI) which will be produced in advance of the commencement of the work.	
975	148602, 149413, 153044, 153861		149368	Environment - General	Respondents expressing support for the project on environmental grounds. In particular respondents believe that the Project will help the environmental impacts and help provide benefits to communities along the route.	National Highways acknowledge the support for the Project. The full Environmental Impact Assessment is reported in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1-3.4).	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘General Comments About the Project – Land’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
213		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153626, 154010, 154180, 152259	Land - Land - agriculture	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making suggestions relating to agricultural land:</p> <p>Respondents suggest that an agricultural liaison officer should be appointed to communicate with stakeholders.</p> <p>Others suggest that less productive land be chosen for species rich grassland and road construction.</p> <p>Others state that impact assessments should be carried out to determine the effects of the Project on agricultural land holdings.</p>	<p>The Project team has worked with an external assessor to undertake an audit of the impacts on agricultural land.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes this assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land.</p> <p>Our public liaison officers have been working with landowners since the start of the Project to understand land use and to help the Project team to minimise impacts. This liaison will continue as we move into the DCO process. An Agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed as the Project progresses. Further information can be found in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>. Some agricultural land will be needed, as described in Chapter 13 Population and Human Health of the ES (Application Document 3.2). For landtake and other affects on farms the ES (Chapter 13) identifies the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinstate any land required temporarily to a quality and value equal to that of its existing use. • To accommodate harvesting periods into the construction programme 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>where possible to avoid potential crop loss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To maintain farm access points where possible and reinstate these as soon as possible - To outline a clear communication plan with agricultural landowners to give advanced notice of planned works to ensure field rotation strategies are maximised to minimise crop loss as far as possible by giving advanced warning of works to enable farmers to plan for potential field rotations. 	
1209		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Land - Land take conditions	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that agreement to certain conditions would have to be in place before transfer of any assets can take place: establishment of the extent nature and restrictions on landownership proposed to be handed over including whether free or leasehold and mineral rights.	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council have been invited to negotiate the voluntary acquisition of their land. We will continue to work with both parties to reach a mutually acceptable agreement.	No
1211	153978			Land - Farm Owners	<p>Respondent suggesting that National Highways enter into voluntary negotiations with farm owners around all the issues that affect them;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> that the voluntary agreements offer better terms than is expected within the terms of the Development Consent Order; 	In relation to this Project, and in line with government guidance National Highways sees compulsory acquisition as a last resort. However, when seeking to deliver long linear Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, the guidance acknowledges that a request for authorisation of compulsory acquisition can be progressed alongside efforts to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. that permanent and temporary land take is kept to a minimum; 3. that a full farm impact assessment is carried out before the DCO application is submitted including detailed accommodation works considered; 4. that location of balance ponds are negotiated; 5. that Public Rights of Way arrangements and locations are discussed and agreed with landowners. 	<p>negotiate acquisition. To support this, we have dedicated public liaison officers who have been meeting with landowners throughout the Project to understand impacts. We have written to all impacted landowners to ask them to enter into negotiations in relation to land acquisition.</p> <p>To the extent that it is able to do so based on the design information available at this stage, National Highways has sought to reduce land take and we have worked with landowners towards this goal.</p> <p>The Project team has worked with an external assessor to undertake an audit of the impacts on agricultural land. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes this assessment of the effects of the Project on agricultural land.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement relating Public Rights of Way (PRoW) is detailed within the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) proposals report (Application Document 2.4). Engagement with various WCH Focus Groups will continue as the design progresses, which includes those relating to PRoW.</p>	
21				Land - Other	Respondent expressing concern about the land take and the impacts the Project could have on non-agricultural land.	The Project team has liaised closely with local authorities, our community liaison groups (which include parish council representatives) and landowners to explore any loss of space which may be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Respondent claim that local community recreational land, such as sports fields and school land, could be lost.</p> <p>Other respondents express doubt about why the red line boundary was chosen, whether the land requirements will stop at the red boundary, how this could impact land required for electricity infrastructure and over who would own the land used for the Project.</p>	<p>used by the public. For example, at Wetheriggs Country Park in Penrith we have held a dedicated consultation around replacement public open space which has informed our proposals for such replacement land.</p> <p>Our Order Limits, also known as the red line boundary, includes all the land required for the construction of the road and associated works, including environmental mitigation provision. In relation to land that is required for, among other purposes, environmental mitigation, National Highways, in suitable cases is open to entering into legal agreements with landowners that would avoid the exercise of compulsory powers to take title to land, if those powers are granted. However, given National Highways need in many cases to secure environmental mitigation for the long term not all cases will be suitable for such agreements. In any case, where National Highways requires the permanent acquisition of land it would seek to do so by agreement in the first instance.</p>	
359	153339, 153605, 153976, 153978		153561, 153607, 153625, 153627, 154010, 154180,	Land - Agricultural	Respondents expressing concern about the potential impacts of the Project on agricultural land. Respondents state that the Project would sever agricultural plots and would reduce productive agricultural land. Others express concern that the	Further information regarding the potential impact on agricultural land holdings can be found in Chapter 13 of the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) which	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
			154184, 154254		environmental mitigation measures would use too much agricultural land, and that there is limited information about whether the land take is temporary or permanent.	sets out the population and human health assessment. This chapter provides information on agricultural land holdings: the type, location, and number of agricultural holdings affected by the Project. Our public liaison officers have been working with landowners since the start of the Project to understand land use and to help the Project team to minimise impacts. This liaison will continue as we move into the DCO process.	
1202	154243			Land - Land take legal aspect	Respondents requesting further information about the legalities of taking large quantities of land for the purpose of mitigation which they believe can never be achieved.	We have refined our mitigation plans since the consultation in Autumn 2021. Several factors have influenced these changes. At the Autumn 2021 consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. More up-to-date survey data now means we don't need as much land as we previously indicated. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. The land outlined in this plan is the land required for the Project. We will seek to acquire this land through agreement with landowners in preference to using compulsory powers, should they be granted, provided that negotiations can be concluded without delaying the delivery of this nationally significant infrastructure	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Project and the wider public benefits that it will bring.	
1203		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Land - Local Authority RLB	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the Applicant, National Highways, consult further with the local authorities about changes to the red line boundary and need for additional land take as a result of the local authorities Technical Review.</p> <p>Local authorities also seeking assurance that proposals have been developed with structural forms to an appropriate level of technical detail to ensure that the schemes can be delivered within the land take and Project extents shown in the consultation information material.</p>	<p>Further targeted consultation has been undertaken with the local authorities on changes to the design following statutory consultation, although most of these changes did not involve any changes to the red line.</p> <p>While there is still detailed design to be carried out in the next phase of the Project, the work done to date is sufficient to ensure that the Project can be delivered within the Order limits.</p>	No
1204	153978, 154243			Land - Land ownership	<p>Respondents requesting further information about the ownership of land taken including land taken for environmental mitigation, and whether land taken for environmental mitigation will be offered back to landowners, stating that this is unclear from the consultation material.</p>	<p>In relation to land that is required for, among other purposes, environmental mitigation, National Highways in suitable cases, is open to entering into legal agreements with landowners that would avoid the exercise of compulsory powers to take title to land, if those powers are granted. However, given National Highways need in many cases to secure environmental mitigation for the long term not all cases will be suitable for such agreements. In any case, where National Highways requires the permanent acquisition of land it would seek to do so by agreement in the first instance.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1205	154243		154254	Land - Excessive land take	Respondents expressing concern about the amount of land taken and question the extent of the red line boundary going beyond what they perceive is needed for the carriageways themselves.	Our Order Limits represent all the land required for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Project, including the road, associated earthworks, structures, drainage, other associated works, and environmental mitigation provision.	No
1206	154136			Land - Public land take	Respondents expressing concern about the impacts from land take in from public open spaces and local community assets in general.	<p>The Project team has liaised closely with local authorities, our community liaison groups (which include parish council representatives) and landowners to explore any loss of space which may be used by the public.</p> <p>National Highways has taken an approach with respect to land take from public open space which conforms with the policies at paragraph 5.166 of the National Networks NPS, which states:</p> <p>“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be developed unless the land is surplus to requirements or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.”</p> <p>For example, at Wetheriggs Country Park in Penrith we propose to replace public open space that is lost and held a dedicated supplementary consultation around replacement public open space</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						which has informed our proposals for such replacement land.	
1207	154134			Land - NPPF Para 99	Respondent claiming there is insufficient information to demonstrate that land take of playing fields is in compliance with paragraph 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically stating that there is no evidence to demonstrate that the playing fields are surplus to requirements and that there is not information about whether the amount of playing field lost would be replaced.	<p>National policy relating to open space provision in relation to Highway DCOs is contained in paragraphs 5.162 to 5.185 of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NN NPS). In particular paragraph 5.174 which states: <i>The Secretary of State should not grant consent for development on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, unless an assessment has been undertaken either by the local authority or independently, which has shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements, or the Secretary of State determines that the benefits of the Project (including need) outweigh the potential loss of such facilities, taking into account any positive proposals made by the applicant to provide new, improved or compensatory land or facilities.</i></p> <p>In this scheme we are providing additional new open space to offset the loss of the edge of the open space at Wetheriggs Country Park. The area lost principally relates to areas of tree planting at the edge of the existing football pitch. The land required for the construction of the scheme in this location has reduced since the Autumn 2021 Consultation , as shown</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						on the brochure and material for the consultation. The area marked as a playing pitch is not included within the land required for construction.	
1208		United Utilities Group PLC		Land - Legal easements	United Utilities Group PLC stating that water and wastewater assets that will potentially be affected are subject to Legal Easements which the applicant, National Highways, must obtain copies of and ensure compliance with the provisions stated in these.	National Highways is working with all relevant utility providers in relation to the interfaces of the Project with their apparatus.	No
1217		Electricity Northwest		Land - Electricity	Electricity Northwest stating their interest in land with regards to voltage lines.	National Highways is working with all relevant utility providers in relation to the interfaces of the Project with their apparatus.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘General Comments About the Project - Need Case’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a)/ S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
364	153573, 153833, 153900, 153912, 154356			Need case	Respondents express concern over the need for the Project.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the concern expressed over the need for the Project.</p> <p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the project at section 1.7. It notes that the existing A66 is a key national and regional strategic transport corridor carrying high levels of freight traffic as well as being an important route for tourism and connecting nearby communities. If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity, due to its strategic importance as an east-west connection for freight and other vehicle movements and may threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse initiative and the achievement of the Government’s ‘Levelling Up’ agenda. Furthermore, at a local level there are issues of severance, journey delays and road safety issues, which need to be addressed.</p> <p>The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and economic benefits of the Project and it has been found that the benefits</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a)/ S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						outweigh the costs, as set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2).	
1132	152916, 154345			Need case	Respondents expressing concern over the need for the Project due to their belief that an increase in home working could lead to less traffic on the route.	The traffic modelling has taken account of forecast changes to travel due to the potential for more home working. Forecasting the impact of transport projects including option testing and appraisal involves running traffic models with different sets of assumptions. The Project will follow advice from DfT. In July 2020 DfT issued <i>'Appraisal and Modelling Strategy: A route map for updating TAG (Transport Analysis Guidance) during uncertain times'</i> . The Appraisal and Modelling Strategy Route Map sets out the DfT's approach to appraisal in a time of change. Amongst many issues, the Route Map considers both; long term Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) growth revisions issued in March 2020 at the time of the budget, and growth revisions issued in July 2020 in their Fiscal Sustainability Report in response to Covid-19 impacts in the period up to 2025. These revisions account for an element of home working. These revisions in tandem represent a significant reduction in growth compared to any previous	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a)/ S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>OBR update. An appraisal update was issued in November 2021, which provided minor updates to the appraisal parameters issued in July 2020. The November 2021 parameters have therefore been used within the modelling to inform the DCO application.</p> <p>Taking this into account there is still a demonstrable need for the Project as set out in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p>	
1133	154356			Need case	Respondent expresses concern over the need for the Project and whether rail should be preferred.	<p>The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the project at section 1.7. It notes that the existing A66 is a key national and regional strategic transport corridor carrying high levels of freight traffic as well as being an important route for tourism and connecting nearby communities. If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity, due to its strategic importance as an east-west connection for freight and other vehicle movements and may threaten the transformational growth envisaged by the Northern Powerhouse initiative and the achievement of the Government's 'Levelling Up' agenda. Furthermore, at a local level there are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a)/ S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>issues of severance, journey delays and road safety issues, which need to be addressed.</p> <p>The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and economic benefits of the Project and it has been found that the benefits outweigh the costs, as set out in the Case for the Project (Chapter 7) (Application Document: 2.2).</p> <p>In 2014, the UK Government announced that it intended to examine the case for improving the connectivity across the Pennines in the north of England. The Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Strategic Study (Highways England, 2016) concluded that there are no direct rail alternatives for passenger or freight movements along the corridor. Improvements to the rail service between Newcastle and Carlisle will improve public transport accessibility to facilities for communities along the route but will not enable the economic growth for the Northern region..</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General comments of support or opposition for the Project' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
217	149350, 150146, 151456, 151520, 152139, 152152, 152217, 152223, 152949, 153316, 153612, 153616, 153629, 153800, 153829, 153844, 153961, 154000, 154146, 154148, 154241, 154362, 154477, 162144, 162145, 162147	Cumbria County Council Durham County Council Eden District Council North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust Royal Mail Transport for the North	151490, 152153, 152485, 153138, 153626, 153959, 154001, 154007, 154184, 154185, 154254	General comments of support for the Project	Respondents express general support, without being specific, for the Project and chosen route. Respondents state that the Project is overdue, and specifically express support for the dualling aspect of the proposals and the improvements to safety and function.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project noting the dualling aspect of the proposals and Project being overdue. The A66 Project has been identified as one of the 'vital infrastructure projects' subject to the UK Government's 'Project Speed' initiative. The initiative aims to deliver public investment projects more strategically and efficiently and cut down the time it takes to design, develop and delivery infrastructure. The DCO application has been prepared in this context. The Project proposes dualling of all of the remaining single lengths of carriageway to create a continuous 70mph dual carriageway (with the exception of one short length) across the North Pennines, between the A1(M) and M6 motorways, which will contribute to improving safety, reliability and journey times.	No
51	148570, 148594, 149392,	Lake District National	154016, 154180	General opposition	Respondents express opposition to the Project, without giving further details.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the Project going ahead in principle.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	150151, 150156, 151499, 152146, 152232, 153365, 153387, 153557, 153559, 153562, 153797, 153840, 153900, 153965, 153976, 153979, 153983, 153984, 153986, 153987, 153988, 153991, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 154125, 154126, 154129, 154130, 154131, 154134, 154150,	Park Authority Northern Powergrid Holdings Company				Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the Project benefits and opportunities and sets out the findings of .	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154151, 154177, 154179, 154329, 154334, 154335, 154336, 154337, 154338, 154340, 154344, 154345, 154350, 154352, 154353, 154355, 154356, 154358, 154359, 154360, 154361, 154364, 154368, 162150, 162152						

1326 Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General Comments About the Project - Request for Further Information' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
55		Eden District Council		Traffic and transport	Eden District Council requests more information on interactions with the local highway network where the national speed limit is to be maintained with evidence that the safety of road users will not be compromised.	The Transport Assessment (TA) (Application Document 3.7) identifies where the national speed limit is maintained and how this provides for the safety of road users where it interacts with the local highway network. Specifically, section 6.4 of the TA provides local junction models and advises on available capacity, whilst section 8.3 identifies the impact of the Project on local junction performance against their operational capacity. National Highways will continue to engage with Eden District Council to discuss their requirements for the A66 Dualling where it interacts with the local road network. This is documented in a Statement of Common Ground. The safety of road users is of paramount importance to National Highways.	No
1295	154136			Air quality	Respondent recommending an air quality assessment is undertaken using traffic data.	The output of the traffic modelling is contained within The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). This traffic modelling underpins the air quality modelling and impact assessment that has been carried out for the Project. Further information on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						the air quality impact assessment can be found within Chapter 5, Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Application Document 3.2).	
1296	154136			Noise / Population & Human Health	Respondent recommends an explanation is provided for what the chosen LOAELs and SOAELs mean in health terms.	<p>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration of the ES (Application Document 3.2) identifies the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Levels (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Affect Effect Levels (SOAEL) used within the noise assessment for the Project. The LOAEL and SOAEL are determined in line with the guidance presented in DMRB LA111. The standard refers to the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and relevant guidance, in which LOAEL and SOAEL are defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOAEL: This is the level above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected. For noise levels above the LOAEL, noise starts to cause small changes in behaviour and attitude, for example, having to turn up the volume on the television or needing to speak more loudly to be heard. The noise therefore starts to have an adverse effect and consideration needs to be given to mitigating and minimising those effects 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOAEL: This is the level above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur. Above this level the noise causes a material change in behaviour such as keeping windows closed for most of the time or avoiding certain activities during periods when the noise is present. <p>Further guidance is provided in the Noise Guidance which establishes how noise could be likely to be a concern and presents the noise exposure hierarchy in policy terms.</p>	
1297		Durham County Council		Air quality	Respondent requests clarification as to why the Blue option is presented as having worse air quality impacts in the consultation document.	<p>The consultation booklet incorrectly identifies a worse outcome in regards air quality impacts for the 'Blue' route as a consequence of a modelling reporting error. However, we can confirm the information that was reported in the PEI Report in relation to air quality was correct, as is the information reported in the Air Quality Chapter of the ES (Chapter 5, Air Quality (Application Document 3.2)).</p> <p>The assessment within ES Chapter 5 Air Quality has determined that, with the application of an Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (Annex B4 of the Environmental Management Plan – Application Document 2.7) there are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						no likely significant effects arising as a result of dust during construction. The assessment concludes that no significant effects are likely as a result of traffic emissions on human health or ecological receptors are likely during construction or operation.	
1298	153566, 154136		153607	Construction / compounds	Respondent requests details of site compound locations, peak construction workforce, access tracks, haul routes and storage compounds and the potential impact of these areas and how they are incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan.	<p>Details of construction compound locations are identified in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 2 (Application Document 3.2). Storage areas will be proposed where large fill requirements are needed or where key structures are required. Information is also provided within this chapter in regards to construction haul roads, satellite compounds and the anticipated construction workforce.</p> <p>The assessments contained within the ES are based on Chapter 2 and have considered these elements of the construction phase.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (EMP), in Volume 2.7 of the DCO application incorporates construction phase management, setting out how construction stage mitigation measures would be implemented to manage risks and certain requirements for contractors. Annex B10 includes the construction worker travel and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>accommodation plan and Annex B13 includes the construction traffic management plan</p> <p>The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project, should the DCO be made, and implemented at construction stage. This will have to be developed in compliance with the EMP, which will be a certified document under the DCO.</p>	
1299	153566			Ecology / environmental impacts	<p>Respondent requests further information including GIS files to check for potential ecological constraints mentioning a specific interest in the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner sections.</p> <p>The Respondent also requests an assessment of environmental impacts of the whole Project is provided as opposed to assessments on a scheme-by-scheme basis.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (6.2 – 6.9, Application Document 3.4) details all completed surveys and the associated ecological baseline recorded, including ecological constraints such as designated sites and protected species. Appendices 6.2 to 6.9 set out survey results and the baseline for each survey on a scheme by scheme basis. ES Chapter 6 reports the ecological impact assessment on a route-wide basis and details the associated mitigation requirements relating to all ecological receptors potentially impacted by the Project. Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement reports the potential</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>cumulative and in combination effects of the project.</p> <p>The GIS system is a design and collaboration tool that National Highways use to manage the design and stakeholder interests. GIS files are not made available as part of the DCO submission. The GIS has been used to produce maps that are presented in the appendices of the ES.</p>	
1300	151520		153561	Noise	<p>Respondent requesting that the Project team go on a site visit to understand and explain the noise baseline, potential impacts on wellbeing and ecological mitigation potential on a respondent's farm.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 12.1 Baseline Noise Survey Results (Application Document 3.4) sets out the methodology, survey locations and baseline noise survey results carried out to inform the noise assessment. The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Where relevant to human health impacts such as impacts on wellbeing are considered within Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Chapter 13, Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Document Reference 3.2).</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Document Reference 2) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement submitted with the DCO application is based on all the information acquired from surveys, site visits, engagement and desktop data.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. This process will be carried out by the dedicated Agricultural liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1301	153326			PRoW	<p>Respondent requesting clarification on mapping of footpaths and bridleway diversions/stopping up. Respondent asking for clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether a definitive footpath is to be created alongside the Warcop EB slip-road or if the path alongside the slip-road is to be part of the slip-road and consequently part of the highway. • Mapping regarding FP 317016 requires clarification as it seems it is being extinguished and pedestrian traffic is to be directed along via a new underpass to the diverted BW 317012. • Whether the proposed diversion routes that are superimposed on the following the routes B6259, C3963, C3030 and U 3119 are mapping errors, whether there are definitive footpaths to be created alongside the routes? 	<p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Information on proposals for PRoW can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19). Further summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	No
1302	153978			Materials & Waste	<p>Respondent requesting details of how subsoil and topsoil will be stored and kept clean during construction, details of how soils will be reinstated and how aftercare will be carried out.</p>	<p>The Principal Contractor(s) are required to produce a Soil Resource Plan (SRP) as part of the Soil Management Plan (Annex B9 of the EMP – Application Document 2.7). The Soil Survey and ground investigation findings will be used to inform the SRP. Topsoil stripped during the construction of the Project will be re-</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>used as soon as is practicable and stored in such a way as to minimise structural damage from weathering, construction traffic movements, and multiple handling. This will also minimise the potential for leaching of nutrients from soils.</p> <p>Further information on the soil survey completed can be found in Chapter 9 Geology and Soils of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
1303			154180	Bio security	Respondent requesting details on bio security issues and the opportunity to review and comment on these measures.	Annex B15 Invasive Non-Native Species of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out an essay plan in this regard. The essay plan includes specific information on species including Japanese Knotweed, Giant Hogweed and Aquatic Invasive species alongside general biosecurity recommendations. The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project.	No
1304	153978			Mitigation calculations	Respondent requesting information in regards mitigation calculations used for the Project.	A Biodiversity net gain assessment is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects therefore is not included as part of the Application documents. However National Highways does	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>intend to submit such a document prior to the commencement of examination of the Application</p> <p>National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
1305	151520			Noise	Respondent requesting information in regards mitigation of impacts for Coupland Beck and requesting clarification if noise modelling has been undertaken at this location.	Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration of the ES (Application Document 3.2) provides details of the noise modelling that was carried out and presents an assessment of the potential noise impacts of the scheme including consideration of receptors at Coupland Beck. Noise modelling has been carried out in the vicinity and the noise assessment did not identify a residual significant adverse effect during	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						construction or operation of the Project at The Barn, Coupland Beck.	
1306		Eden District Council		LVIA / Geology and Soils / Heritage / Climate /	<p>Respondent requesting more information on the PEI Report and supplementary documents including: i) Further detail on why certain aspects have been scoped out within the landscape and visual assessment particularly regarding farmland.</p> <p>ii) Respondent also requesting that photos and viewpoint be annotated more clearly.</p> <p>iii) Respondents note no geophysical information is available or figures defining what has and has not been surveyed. Requests are made for further details of how the Scheme will be designed close to heritage assets.</p> <p>iv) Respondents note decommission of the proposed scheme is not included in the climate section. It is requested that the process of decommissioning and resulting greenhouse gas emissions should be provided for clarity and potential mitigation measures identified.</p> <p>v) Respondents also request confirmation that the assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidance.</p>	<p>The points are addressed as follows.</p> <p>i) and ii) Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) provides details in regards the scope and methodology of the assessment. The scope of the assessment is in accordance with the Scoping Opinion adopted by the Planning Inspectorate in July 2021. Photomontages and viewpoints are presented in line with Landscape Institute guidance.</p> <p>iii) Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) sets out the details of the cultural heritage assessment. Substantial survey work has been carried out to inform the ES, including geophysical survey, trial trenching and geochemical survey, the details of which are set out in the ES. The Project Design Principles (Document 5.11) set out the principles to be incorporated during detailed design of the Project including that the detailed design must respond in an appropriate and sympathetic manner as far as possible in scale and materials to maintain historic form, fabric,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>vi) Respondents state that the Environmental Management Plan has limited information regarding the type, quantity and location of mitigation measure for all forms of environmental impact. Respondents stating that there is no means of comparing historic data against the plan or the council held recorded mapping. Requesting that plans could include details on landscape, air quality and noise impacts.</p>	<p>significance and the qualifying features of historic assets.</p> <p>iv) DMRB LA114 requires that: decommissioning associated with a proposed project shall be excluded from assessment of climate (for both impacts on climate and vulnerability of projects to climate change) due to the length of the asset operational phase. Therefore, decommissioning has been excluded from the Climate assessment. Furthermore, this approach accords with the Scoping Report as submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 14 June 2021 and the information received in the Scoping Opinion issued in July 2021.</p> <p>v)The IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions and evaluating their significance is noted and has been considered as part of this environmental assessment. This IEMA guidance is largely in accordance with LA 114 with regards to GHG emissions assessment methodology and the importance of mitigation. It also notes that a spatial approach to a cumulative assessment for GHG emissions is not appropriate. The IEMA guidance does differ from LA 114 in the assessment of significance. It is considered that LA 114 is more aligned with current policy</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						(i.e., the NPSNN) given that it requires significance to be considered in the context of national carbon budget setting, and the likely impact of the Project on the achievement of national carbon budgets. On this basis the approach taken to the assessment of significance aligns with that specified within LA 114, rather than adopting the guidance approach proposed by IEMA. vi) ES Figures (Application Document 3.3) present both the environmental baseline and where appropriate the modelled and qualitative impacts. How the physical mitigation arising from the assessments within the ES could be implemented are presented on the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The mitigation is secured through the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Table 3-2 of the EMP, Application Document 2.7) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).	
1307		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire		Trial trenching	Respondents suggesting that the results of the Written Scheme of Investigation for trial trenching will allow refinements to the assessment of likely effects referencing Table 8.25 in the PEI Report.	ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) determines the cultural heritage baseline and assessment. This assessment includes the preliminary trial trenching carried out. The EMP includes Annex B3 Detailed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council				heritage mitigation strategy (Application Document 2.7). This sets out the further archaeological survey required.	
1308	153978			Agricultural land / development land / businesses	Respondent requests to understand what beneficial operational effects the project could have on agricultural land holdings, development land and businesses.	The Environmental Statement (ES) identifies environmental benefits during construction and operation of the Project. Chapter 13, Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) identifies that the Project is envisaged to provide beneficial impacts to improve journey time reliability and safety, both of which will typically provide operational benefits on agricultural land holdings, development land and businesses in the surrounding area.	No
1309	154136			Environmental Management Plan	Respondent requests a draft Environmental Management Plan be circulated early.	The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document 2.7) sets out control measures to be employed during planning and construction of the Project. The EMP will be further developed by the Principal Contractors into a second iteration prior to the construction phase of the Project should the DCO be made and implemented at construction stage. We have been discussing the process of preparing an EMP with local authorities and the strategic environmental bodies and the EMP document is submitted as part of our	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						DCO application (Document Reference 2.7).	
1310	154136			Residential market	<p>Respondent requests assessment of the impact of the project on local accommodation supply and affordability particularly in relation to the rented sector and housing supply. Respondent also request the cumulative assessment considers housing demand dependent on the number of developments. Respondents also request an assessment of how construction would impact local services.</p>	<p>The size of the construction workforce on site will vary over the course of the construction phase and over the geographical extent of the Project. The maximum monthly workforce has been assumed to be around 540 staff based on the indicative phasing and staffing estimates for each scheme (i.e., this is the highest staff number estimated in any single month based on the phasing of the Project). Each scheme has a peak workforce at a different time due to the varying programmes. Environmental Statement Chapter 2 The Project (Application Document 3.2) has further information on construction workforce.</p> <p>Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (of the Environmental Statement) also details the potential impact of the scheme on local businesses and local housing/accommodation during construction and operation.</p> <p>EMP Annex B10 sets out a Construction worker travel and accommodation essay plan. The PC is required to develop this during detailed design in consultation with the relevant local authorities.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>This will ensure that additional demand created by non-home-based workers does not place excessive pressure on the local housing market and visitor accommodation supply. This will be based on a forecast of the number of people employed throughout the construction programme and the likely proportion requiring accommodation. Impacts on the local housing and tourism sectors will be evaluated and the strategy will set out proposals for the provision of high-quality accommodation for construction workers as required, either within construction compounds or off-site.</p> <p>The strategy will outline how the selected sites will be accessed by public transport, both for ease of access during construction and to promote future use of the sites should they be repurposed. It will also provide an assessment of impacts on local healthcare infrastructure and set out measures to equip services to cope with any increase in demand.</p>	
1311		Durham County Council		Assessment	Respondent requests clarification if the Blue option in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby Scheme has been assessed in accordance with the test set out in the NNNPS.	The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out the need for the Project and how it complies with the National Policy Statement for National Networks and other relevant national and local policy.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						More information on the specifics of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby Blue route assessment can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). The PDOR explains the context and rationale for the decision taken including in respect of policy including the National Networks National Policy Statement.	
1312		Durham County Council		Principal aggregates	Respondent requests details of the quantity of the principal aggregates and details of the expected amount of inert and non-hazardous waste which is likely to be generated and require management and disposal over the life of the project and on an annual basis at a scheme level.	ES Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2) provides an estimate of the material requirements for each scheme and for the whole Project (including aggregates). The ES Chapter also provides an estimate of the inert, non-hazardous and hazardous waste generated by each scheme and for the whole Project.	No
1313		Cumbria County Council		De-trunking	Respondent requests further detail on the extent of de-trunking prior to establishing de-trunking agreements.	National Highways have been working with local authorities to agree the approach to de-trunking of the existing A66 section and we will prepare plans together with local authorities which outlines the extent of the section to be de-trunked and will agree a scope for surveys on the existing carriageway to agree the standard prior to the work. Conversations regarding de-trunking and standards will continue post DCO approval.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1314		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Biodiversity net gain	Respondent requests further information on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) noting that the Project should seek to achieve a 10% BNG.	<p>A Biodiversity net gain assessment is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects therefore is not included as part of the Application documents. However National Highways does intend to submit such a document prior to the commencement of examination of the DCO Application.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project.</p> <p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. The design has been informed by the principles of habitat replacement (i.e., replacement rations) set out in Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1315	148697			WCH	Respondent would like to understand what impact the Project will have on cycleways.	<p>Chapter 13 Population and Human Health, of the ES (application document 3.2) details the potential impact of the scheme on non-motorised users including cyclists during construction and operation. Paragraphs 13.10.32 to 13.10.39 set out the likely effects on cycleways during the construction and operation of the Project. This notes that during construction the Project may result in some adverse effects on cyclists using the PRow network, in particular the 85 PRow which intersect with the Order Limits of the DCO. In respect of all routes either temporarily or permanently effected by the scheme, the most appropriate diversion the most appropriate diversion will be put in place.</p> <p>The Project's proposals in regard to Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-rider routes has been produced in consultation with local authorities and stakeholders to ensure a collaborative approach that meets the demands of the local population.</p> <p>The Project design has identified opportunities to enhance local connectivity which includes an active travel link travelling eastwards from Penrith and utilises sections of the de-trunked A66.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. An overview of the proposals is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and full details are available in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	
1316		Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents noting limited references between the Design Report and PEI Report.	This feedback on the PEI Report is noted and where relevant cross references have been provided throughout the DCO documentation. The key aspects of the design that are relevant to the assessment of environmental effects that are not otherwise secured through parameters of the project contained in its limits of deviation, are secured through the means of the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11).	Yes
1317	153852			Air / noise / light pollution	Respondents request a full assessment of impact of air, noise and light pollution.	A full environmental assessment of the Project has been carried out and is detailed within the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) this considers the potential impacts of the Project on air quality in Chapter 5, noise in Chapter 12 and light pollution in Chapter 10.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1318		Durham County Council		Ecology impacts	Respondents request clarification of the impacts of the Black and Blue options in the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme on bats, otters and Tutta Beck and why the Blue option has a greater impact.	The Blue option alignment results in additional potential impacts associated with severance to potential bat crossings, loss of potential habitat for otters and additional discharges to Tutta Beck in comparison to the black option alignment. Principally this is due to the larger physical extent of the blue option and the relocation of the junction at the western end of the scheme, in comparison with the black option. All impacts relating to the preferred junction option are contained within the ES (Chapter 6 Biodiversity, Application Document 3.2).	No
1319	152243			Project timeline	Respondents request confirmation on when schemes will be completed.	Subject to securing a DCO, preliminary works are planned to commence in 2024, with all schemes to be completed by 2029 or earlier.	No
1320		Durham County Council		Mineral impacts	Respondents request effects on mineral sites are provided by scheme.	A preliminary assessment based on the information available at the time was presented in the PEI Report and identified preliminary effects on a Project-wide basis. In the ES the assessment which includes mineral sites is presented at an individual scheme and Project wide level (refer to Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste Application Document 3.2).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1321		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Landscape	Respondents request further information on the landscape strategy and mitigation.	Landscape mitigation for the Project has sought to replace lost features where practicable and to ameliorate or offset impacts on landscape character. The landscape and visual assessment carried out for the Project and proposed mitigation measures are detailed within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2). An indication of how landscape planting could be implemented within Order Limits is set out within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8.) The outline monitoring, maintenance and management measures for up to 30 years following completion of ecological and landscape mitigation measures are set out within the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (an Annex to the EMP, Application Document 2.7).	No
1322	153566			Request for further information	Respondents request that the ES includes a full assessment of the whole Project alongside other projects or plans in the area. Noting, projects and plans in the area should include those that are being, have been or will be carried out and should include those that have been granted planning permission, currently being considered	ES Chapter 15, Cumulative Effects (Application Document 3.2) presents the findings of the combined and cumulative effects assessments (CEA). It follows Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Seventeen including consideration of permitted application(s), whether under the Planning Act 2008 or other regimes,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					for planning permission or for applications which have not yet been submitted for planning permission, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development.	but not yet implemented and submitted application(s) whether under the Planning Act 2008 or other regimes but not yet determined. Chapter 15 identifies that the less information that is available for the future projects (i.e., environmental impacts predicted, project definition), the less likely that the cumulative effects assessment will be able to make robust assessment in relation to these other proposed developments. Where 'other developments' are expected to be completed before construction of the A66 improvement Project and the effects of those 'other developments' are understood, effects arising from them are considered within the ES as part of the future baseline within environmental topics and are therefore included as part of both the construction and operational assessment.	
1323		Natural England	153627	Request for further information	Respondents requesting clarification on specific details of keys within PEI Report materials: what the green star shown on the plans means and what the orange horizontal cross hatching means.	Comments in regards keys/diagrams within the PEI Report are noted and where necessary updates have been made within the ES to assist with improved understanding.	No
1324		Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting confirmation on how connectivity for communities will be maintained during construction.	Maintaining connectivity between communities during construction has been a key consideration in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						buildability and phasing element of the design process. The Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) sets out and secures a number of Management Plans. These include the Construction Traffic Management Plan in Annex B13 and Annex B6 Public Rights of Way Management Plan.	
1325		Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting detail on measures to prevent ecological severance.	The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity includes a full impact assessment and details of associated mitigation requirements relating to all receptors potentially impacted by the Project. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) has been developed to avoid or reduce the potential construction impacts on habitats and species and would seek to employ best-practice methods for dealing with habitat loss, habitat severance, disturbance and species mortality. Species specific crossing points, planting/additional habitat and associated fencing have been included in the design to mitigate potential fragmentation impacts. These include, but are not limited to, suitable fencing, planting and crossing points for bats, badgers, birds, otter, red squirrels, reptile species and aquatic species. Further details can be found in ES Chapter 6.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1326	153850, 154182, 154248	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	154254	Request for further information	<p>Respondents requesting further clarification on ecological mitigation measures and maintenance:</p> <p>how much mitigation is required?</p> <p>whether land belonging to Fox Tower View earmarked for species rich grassland will be taken on a permanent basis;</p> <p>what powers National Highways possess to compulsorily acquire land;</p> <p>if land take is distributed fairly among landowners;</p> <p>what maintenance requirements there are for species rich grassland and ecological mitigation.</p>	<p>The environmental mitigation design has been developed to ensure mitigation is provided for impacts on protected species and permanent replacement habitats are provided for those lost, achieving a minimum of no net loss. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>We have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At the time of the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we had not completed all our surveys and were assuming we needed to mitigate for every habitat and species. The completed surveys have been used to inform the ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Document Reference 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Document Reference 2.8) demonstrate how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>(Document Reference 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>Section 122 of the Planning Act 2002 confirms that an order granting development consent can include provision authorising the compulsory acquisition of land if the land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) is required for the development 2) is required to facilitate or is incidental to that development, or 3) is replacement land which is to be given in exchange <p>The proposed land take is based on whether it is required in relation to the three points set out above and not in relation to a process of distribution among different landowners.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
1327		Cumbria County Council Eden		Request for further information	Respondents requesting further detail in regard to what surveys will not be available within the ES and the approach to address any deficiencies/limitations in knowledge.	Each chapter within the ES and the survey work on which the EIA is based, has been carried out in line with the requirements of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and the EIA Regulations and other applicable	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		District Council				law and policy. Each ES chapter identifies assessment assumptions, survey details and includes any limitations where present.	
1328			154184	Request for further information	Respondent requesting that further details on mitigation measures are shared with a farming business.	<p>The environmental mitigation shared at statutory consultation was discussed with impacted landowners. The public liaison officers also detailed how the proposed mitigation measures would be refined once further information became known – for example additional survey data. As the details of mitigation have emerged we have held meetings with all impacted landowners to explain them further. The management regimes associated with these various mitigations is included in the outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Application document 2.7, Annex B1). The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outline how the planting and ecological mitigation could be applied.</p> <p>The ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) identifies required mitigation measures in line with the requirements of DMRB LA 104. Mitigation is based upon the mitigation hierarchy with an intention for no net loss of biodiversity across the Project with an intention for reinstatement wherever possible. Mitigation measures have been</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						developed in response to the findings of surveys, assessments and consultation. These mitigation measures are designed principally to address impacts the occurrence, timing and location of which can be predicted in advance and are intrinsic to the design of the Project.	
1329	148581			Request for further information	Respondent requesting detailed plans of cycle, pedestrian and horse-rider facilities along the whole length of the A66	An overview of the plans for walking, cycling and horse-riders proposals are contained in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) the full details contained in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	No
1330		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondent requesting further information in regards the performance of the road network and clarification of data which can be used to monitor performance.	Information in regard to the performance of the road network and data which can be used to monitor performance is included within the Transport Assessment (Document 3.7). National Highways have included the following additional analysis within the Transport Assessment: • Operational modelling representing the changeover day and specific peak hours at the proposed Center Parcs access.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational assessment of additional traffic at Eamont Bridge, Kirby Stephen, Appleby and Kirkby Thore. A detailed analysis of route reliability and route resilience. This considers the frequency of closures due to accidents or disruption of the A66 in both with and without the scheme, and the performance of the local road network when closures occur. <p>In addition, it is confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 2019 VISSIM model of M6 J40 and Kemplay Bank has been developed to provide the basis from which the assessment work to test the performance of the junction within 2044, the scheme design year. This will be shared with CCC. An assessment has been made to understand where additional traffic attracted to the upgraded route comes from. It is made up of both reassigned traffic (i.e., from other routes) however the majority of additional traffic is due to traffic being redistributed within the demand model (i.e., people choosing to change the destination of their trip due to the scheme). 	
1331			151465	Request for further information	Respondent requesting further information on what will happen to the old station building fabric.	The station building is outside the scope of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1332	151520			Appleby bypass	Respondent requests an update on the commencement date for the Appleby bypass resurfacing.	The re-surfacing of the Appleby bypass is not part of the A66 Project. The work was carried out in autumn-winter 2021.	No
1333	153939			Bus network	Respondent requests further information of how public transport use is considered by the Project. Respondent asking for information on the location of bus stops, how pedestrian access to bus stops will be enhanced for residents and visitors, how the planning fit with the overall transport appraisal of personal and public transport policies in light of increased visitor presence, increases in local industry and farming practices.	<p>It is accepted that modal shift towards public transport and active travel should be encouraged, however users in rural locations, such as those served by the A66 are more dependent upon the private car than those in urban areas. This is because public transport is more difficult to provide cost effectively within areas of low population density, and residents within rural locations are less able to make use of active travel options as they need to travel longer distances to access jobs and services.</p> <p>The Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1) offers insight into the process of considering alternative transport solutions and how the A66 might support other forms of transport. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) provides further details on the need for this Scheme and our assessment of alternatives. In respect of public transport, there is no existing rail line near to the A66 corridor between Darlington and Penrith, including the partial route coverage of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Wensleydale heritage railway which could be upgraded as an alternative, and the corridor has low bus service provision (partial coverage and infrequent services).</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (TA) (Application Document 3.7) assesses the Projects in relation to public transport. Section 10.5 of the TA assessed impacts on bus routes and bus stops. It concludes A small number of rarely used stops would be removed as a consequence of the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the case of those at Bowes and Cross Lanes to Rokeby there are alternative bus stops that would remain open that are closer to the resident population. • In the case of the bus stop on A66 at Whinfell Park, discussions are ongoing with Cumbria County Council to consider whether any re-provision is necessary, particularly given the very low reported usage of the stop. <p>It is concluded overall in terms of bus routes and stops, that the Project does not lead to significant impacts on the identified bus routes. Section 10.5 of the TA considers bus provision for local communities and visitors. Discussions with both local authority</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and bus operator representatives have helped determine suitable bus provision.	
1334	153907			Request for further information	Respondent noting that they would welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the detailed design of the provision for cyclists, including on who will be responsible for maintenance of facilities over the longer term.	Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. An overview of the proposals is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the full details in Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	No
1335		Durham County Council		Request for further information	Respondent requesting clarification on decrease of traffic through Barnard Castle and whether this is a result of the proposed options for Rokeby.	Traffic flows on the A67 through Barnard Castle will drop with the Project. This is because the improved (faster) A66 attracts more longer distance east west traffic from the A67 between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington. This reduction in flow on the A67 would be expected to be a beneficial aspect of the Project to Barnard Castle, forecasted to remove around 400 daily vehicles from the 16th Century Bridge in comparison to the Do Minimum (to estimate the impacts of a transport scheme it is necessary to forecast two future versions of the world, one with the Project and one without. We refer to the Do Minimum	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						forecast as the version of the world without the Project). Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
1336	153978			Request for further information	Respondent requests further information on additional environmental or wider works funded by National Highways 'designated funds'.	Further information on the Designated Funds applications that have been submitted can be found in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
1337		Health and Safety Executive, NSIP Consultations		Request for further information	Respondent requests further information on whether the development is within HSE consultation distances.	The Order Limits fall within the consultation zones of Hulands Quarry and the pipeline route between the A66/B6262 junction and Whinfell Park.	No
1338		Durham County Council		Request for further information	Respondent requests Select Link Analysis plots to show why there is a change to the HGV routing with the Black option for the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme compared to the Do Minimum and the Blue option when there are weight restrictions on Bridgegate.	Select Link Analysis Plots have been shared with Durham CC. In terms of the reasoning for the change in HGV routing: we can confirm that the traffic model does include the HGV ban to represent the weight restriction on Barnard Castle Bridge. The rerouting within the model is caused by the following issue: The Black Option causes a modelled reassignment of HGV traffic from Barnard Castle Road to Moorhouse Lane / The Sills in a northbound direction, due to the additional distance needed to travel to the compact grade separated junction	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						to exit the A66. This impacts HGV movements between the A66 east and destinations on the B6277 and B6278 north of Barnard Castle, such as Alston and Stanhope. With the Black option there is an increase of 32 daily HGV trips on B6277 Moorhouse Lane and the Sills, which continue travelling on the south Side of the River Tees up the B6277. Within the Do Minimum this traffic would turn off the A66 at Rokeby and travel up Barnard Castle Road to continue northwards on the North side of the Tees on the B6278. As the route via the B6278 will remain the signed route then not all of this modelled reassignment may occur. It should be noted that these 32 modelled HGVs have local destinations along the length of Teesdale, and over to Alston and, as such would likely be associated with local businesses, such as agriculture within the area.	
1339	154363			Request for further information	Respondent requests: The full options analysis undertaken to date: i. both at present and leading up to the 2020 Preferred Route Announcement and 2021 consultation including in particular any analysis carried out regarding a "do nothing" option, upgrading the existing route and/or a tunnel.	The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems on the existing A66 and to deliver the Project objectives taking into account various factors including environmental impacts, policy conformity, engineering considerations, the views of stakeholders and regard to consultation responses	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>Any analysis carried out regarding why other alternative routes to the north of Kirkby Thore were ruled out.</p> <p>Any internal documents analysing or summarising the results of the consultation leading to the 2020 Preferred Route Announcement.</p> <p>The overall budget for the Project.</p> <p>The cost of each of the options currently under consideration.</p> <p>Clarification of what (if any) environmental/ecological reports and surveys have been carried out in relation to all of the suggested routes (Options E and F in the Preferred Route Announcement, as well as the previous preferred route (shown as black in the current consultation documents), Blue Route, Red Route and Orange Route in the most recent consultation leaflet).</p> <p>Copies of those environmental/ecological reports and surveys, both final and in draft, provided to National Highways.</p> <p>Any further updates of the appraisal summary table for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine improvement Project.</p>	<p>. The cost is justified by the economic, environmental, heritage and social benefits that the Project will bring, including journey time reliability from east to west (accommodating traffic now and in the future) and relieving communities of rat running traffic.</p> <p>Project Control Framework (PCF) Stage 0 feasibility studies showed that the dualling is best able to meet the Project objectives by providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion and speeding up journey times and providing journey time reliability. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity. Department of Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's strategic road network. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future; this information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>capacity to accommodate the forecast growth.</p> <p>Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the Case for the Project sets out details of the costs and economic assessment work.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6 Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Application Document 3.2) for information on ecology surveys and refer to the relevant chapters within the ES for more information on surveys undertaken for each discipline.</p>	
1340		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council		Request for further information	Respondent would like to understand de-trunking issues and accesses/ adoption.	We have been working with local authorities to agree the approach to de-trunking of the existing A66 section and we will agree a scope for surveys on the existing carriageway to agree the standard prior to the work.	No
1341		Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire		Request for further information	Respondent would like to understand who will have responsibility for undertaking winter maintenance on the A66.	National Highways will continue to undertake winter maintenance on the A66 strategic road network. The relevant host local authority will undertake winter maintenance on the de-trunked sections of the A66.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		County Council					
1342		Durham County Council		WCH	<p>Respondents request clarification if an assessment of the impacts to walkers and cyclists from each option has been undertaken and note a grade-separated crossing of the new dualled section, on or in the near vicinity of the current footpath alignment, is recommended.</p>	<p>If a PRow is severed by the new dualling scheme, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. Each access was assessed on its own merits and if closing a PMA will result in greater than 0.5km diversion for the existing landowner or tenants it was considered reasonably convenient.</p> <p>Chapter 10 Sustainable Transport of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) provides an overview of the provision for travel in the vicinity of the Project by sustainable modes of transport. It also seeks to identify the current type and quality of provision as well as improvements delivered as part of the Project. A Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR) has also been carried out for the Project.</p> <p>The purpose of the WCHAR is to ensure that walking cycling and horse-riding facilities are considered within the Project. An overview is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						and full details are provided in Rights of Way and Access Plans (5.19).	
1344		Eden District Council		Request for further information	Impact on land in the Councils ownership. The council expects to see further information on the detailed impacts on individual parcels of land in its ownership as early as possible so that the council can understand the impacts and any arrangements that will need to be made.	The Book of Reference (Application Document 5.7) provides details of all land parcels, and a description of the extent, description and situation of the land, including whether the possession sought is permanent or temporary. We have been in ongoing dialogue with the impacted host local authorities as the plans have developed to date and we will continue this dialogue as we move through the DCO process and, should that be successful, into construction. We recognise the constructive work carried out by the Council in this regard.	No
1345	154363			Request for further information	<p>Respondents request to understand if an assessment of what sections will achieve the greatest benefit in terms of reducing delays has been conducted and whether there is a plan to sequence works.</p> <p>Request for further information as to if it is proportionate for a DCO to be progressed on the Kirkby Thore section without full information on how an upgrade to the existing road (combined with the completion of work between Penrith and Temple Sowerby) would reduce journey time. Stating the</p>	<p>For details of what sections will achieve the greatest benefit in terms of reducing delays; please refer to the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Information on the proposed construction work timescales and sequencing is explained within the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					existing route provides the shortest journey time over dualling options.		
1346		Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority		Request for further information	<p>Respondents request to understand if design or operational solution which improve resilience have been considered as part of this Project. Including - Restrictions to vehicles during periods of high wind, poor visibility or reduced traction A second weather camera perhaps at the summit or the eastern approaches to Stainmore for travel planning Planting of evergreen trees or shrubs to improve contrast (visibility in fog, rain or blowing snow), increase shelter, reduce spindrift and speed up storm recovery work. As well as shelter for a new cycling and pedestrian route and provide a carbon offset. Additional planting to mitigate distant landscape impacts and create a new wildlife corridor.</p>	<p>Holding areas to facilitate management of closures due to poor weather are not within the scope of the Project. However, the proposed Project includes provision of grade-separated all movement junctions which will allow for vehicles to turn around in the event of a closure to enable drivers to re-route. The Project will also provide additional variable messaging signs to inform drivers of closures and diversions. Therefore, whilst no holding areas are planned as part of the Project, the proposals will improve the management of traffic when the route needs to be closed.</p> <p>The Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (Table 3-2 of the EMP, Application Document 2.7) includes measures which require the detailed design of the project to incorporate measure related to climate resilience including high winds.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of visual effects. The scheme has been assessed using prescribed guidance, LA107, incorporating aspects of GLVIA3 where it provides clarity and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>with reference to the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates the scheme intent with regard to proposed planting, and provides an indication of how landscape mitigation could be implemented.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p>	
1347		Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting clarification of speed flow curves used to reflect HGV and other class vehicle speed limits.	<p>The traffic modelling that has been carried out has accounted for the difference between HGV speed limits and speed limits for cars on the different standards of road.</p> <p>Full details of the traffic modelling that have been carried out are presented in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7)</p>	No
1348		Durham County Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting confirmation if there are any negative distributional impacts resulting from the increase in traffic flows on B6277 and whether additional traffic flows on the B6277 in	The modelled flow on Moorhouse Lane is low within the base model validation, however it is not expected that this will lead to us underestimating the reassignment of trips from Barnard	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>the Do Minimum would impact on the switch in routing from Barnard Castle Road to B6277 with the Black and Blue options in place.</p>	<p>Castle Road to Moorhouse Lane within the Do Something Scenario (i.e. with the Project in place) for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current route for traffic between the A66 East to Barnard Castle was via Barnard Castle Road and Rokeby Junction. Total modelled trips on this route are currently more than observed. • The missing trips on Moorhouse Lane were local trips between Barnard Castle and the settlements to the south. • The modelling exercise has shown that impact of the Project is to reassign trips from the route they currently use, namely via Rokeby junction and Barnard Castle Road to Cross Lanes Junction and Moorhouse Lane, due to the relocation of Rokeby junction to the east meaning this route is less direct than at present. Therefore, the total number of trips that will transfer to Moorhouse Lane will not be underestimated as all of these trips are represented within the base model. 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1349		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting confirmation on the planned active modes on the de-trunked sections of the A66 and the suitability of this area for active travel. Noting traffic modelling outputs show traffic levels remaining.	Between Kirkby Thore and Crackenthorpe, without the Project in place the daily flow on the de-trunked A66 alignment would be 26,000 vehicles per day in the design year of 2044. In the 2044 do something scenario assuming the route at the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the daily flow would be 700vpd on this route. In the 2044 do something scenario assuming the route that was subject to the targeted consultation, i.e., with the removal of the westbound Appleby junction, and the new junction at Long Marton, the daily flow would be 2,900vpd on this route. In other words, the flow on this section of road will be reduced to 1/10th of what it would otherwise be. It is suggested that this provides scope to provide measures to encourage active travel.	No
1350		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondent suggesting that further design development detail will need to be presented to the Councils to provide assurances that the Project proposals remain acceptable to the Councils prior to the DCO application being submitted.	Further engagement was carried out with statutory environmental bodies, the local planning authorities and other organisations throughout the design development up to the DCO submission. Local Authorities are a Section 42 consultee and both members and officers were formally consulted, including officers who were responsible for co-ordinating the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						response from the Council and were dedicated to the A66 Project. In addition, officers from planning, environmental health and technical services were consulted and will continue to be involved throughout the next stage of the Project, including throughout DCO and construction.	
1351		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting further details on electric vehicle charging provisions.	In terms of electric vehicle charging, the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) is fully integrated into government efforts to decarbonise road transport including efforts to deliver a network of electric vehicle charge points along the Strategic Route Network and National Highways will also publish a blueprint for EV charging services and energy storage by 2023. As part of the RIS2 National Highways are committed to improving public transport where it can, such as by working with local authorities and service providers to make sure that public transport journeys on the Strategic Road Network works for everyone. National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. National Highways are exploring opportunities to incorporate EV charging in the community.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
1352		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Request for further information	Respondents requesting further information on occupancy levels of laybys noting safety concerns resulting from full laybys which may prevent other vehicles from parking in an emergency.	All existing laybys affected by the schemes will be retained where practicable. New laybys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards. Our Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.	No
1353		Durham County Council		Request for further information	Durham County Council request that clarification is provided of the differences between 'Do Something' traffic flows and shapefile data.	National Highways provided two different model runs as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation material in error, with a different model run presented in the Route Development Report (RDR) to the Local Traffic Report (LTR). Whilst the data in the LTR was from a later version of the junction design this had omitted the Rokeby eastbound merge in error. We apologise for the confusion this has caused, and we have now provided the corrected data for analysis. We would refer the respondent to the Technical Note included with the Durham County Council Statement of Common Grounds for the latest position on traffic modelling in this	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						location. We continue to engage with Durham County Council as reported in the Statement of Common Ground.	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to ‘General Comments About the Project - Traffic, transport, and junctions’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
109	148596, 151484, 151499, 151503, 152217, 152949, 153316, 153829, 153975, 154148, 154207, 162157	Cumbria County Council Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council Royal Mail	154010, 162158	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Cumbria Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, Eden District Council and Royal Mail expressing support for the Project on the grounds that dualling and upgrading the A66 would improve the safety of the road and reduce serious accidents.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. The A66 currently has a higher-than-average accident rate with a number of accident cluster sites. A number of these sites are either located in single carriageway sections or in dual sections adjacent to single carriageway sections. To reduce risk, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reserve, removing right turns. We have included junctions, connected to the local road network, that enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network. Every junction has been tailored to meet the individual needs of local communities. By dualling the remaining single carriageway sections, we will reduce the overall number of accidents and resulting casualties predicted to happen on the route. For more information, please refer to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						Transport Assessment Report (Application Document 3.7).	
110	151484, 152217, 153844, 153975, 154210, 162147	Carlisle City Council Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Historic England Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Royal Mail Transport for the North	154010	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents including Carlisle City Council, Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Historic England, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council, Royal Mail and Transport for the North expressing support for the Project on the grounds that dualling and upgrading the A66 would improve access between the East and West of the country. Respondents state that as well as being beneficial for local residents who would have better access to services, improved access would boost the local economy.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Core Project objectives are to improve safety and connectivity, reduce congestion and improve the reliability of people's journeys. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).	No
178	148596, 151484,	Cumbria Office of	154354, 162158	Traffic, transport, and	Respondents including the Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	152949, 154241, 154363	the Police & Crime Commissioner Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Royal Mail		junctions - Congestion	Commissioner, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Royal Mail expressing support for the Project on the grounds that dualling and upgrading the A66 would relieve existing congestion and improve journey times. Respondents state that at present vehicles may be delayed behind slow-moving traffic on single carriageway sections.	Project Control Framework (PCF) Stage 0 feasibility studies showed that dualling is best able to meet the Project objectives by providing drivers with a consistent road standard that provides the best connectivity for those using the route, either end to end or to the many destinations along the corridor. This will improve commuting, visiting the area on holiday, or transporting freight and will bring huge benefits to the area by cutting congestion, speeding up journey times and providing journey time reliability. The planned upgrade will shape the future of a critical link in the Nation's road infrastructure and redefine local connectivity. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2)	
367	148616			Traffic, transport, and junctions - Increased traffic	Respondent expressing opposition to the Project due to a potential increase in traffic and expressing concern that the traffic predictions will be out of date when the road is completed.	National Highways acknowledges the responses received which object to the Project going ahead in principle. Please refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2), which sets out the need for the Project. Department for Transport projections indicate continued growth in traffic on the country's SRN. A traffic model has been prepared for the Project which projects traffic growth into the future;	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						this information is used to ensure that the design has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast growth. Further information can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).	
105	154132, 154148, 162161	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Infrastructure	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making suggestions relating to traffic and infrastructure that National Highways should coordinate the Project with including utility providers and police control systems. Respondents state that existing junctions should be improved, and communications infrastructure should be improved to provide 4G/5G readiness along the route.	New 4/5G digital infrastructure is not within the Project scope. However, a desktop study has been carried out using Ofcom's 'Mobile Availability Checker' to identify areas with reduced mobile network coverage. From this assessment, the majority of the proposed upgrade works are deemed to have good network availability. The installation of longitudinal fibre is not within the Project scope. Following discussions with National Roads Telecommunications Services (NRTS) the Project strategy is to provide longitudinal network ducting in priority areas through new structures only in order to facilitate installations at a later date if a future technology enhancement project was commissioned. The Project will not be installing longitudinal fibre along the whole route. The link to the Police Command and Control System is not within the scope of the Project but National Highways will continue to work with key	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						stakeholders to facilitate such arrangements where possible. The longitudinal network ducting could be used in future for data sharing and we have liaised with network providers to coordinate provision within new structures.	
164	148570, 152939, 153036, 153559, 153560, 153567, 153955, 153976, 153995, 154148, 154215, 154335, 154362, 154363	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	154354	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council suggesting that further traffic control measures should be included in the proposals, such as a 50mph or 40mph speed limit along the entire route. Respondents also state that lowering the speed limit would mean that dualling the road is not necessary. Other suggestions include providing more effective signage, using smart technology, and better provision of CCTV and variable message signs (VMS), specifically mentioning the importance of this during bad weather. Respondents also state that there needs to be appropriate signage for the junction leading to Mainsgill Farm Shop, Foxhall Inn, Ravensworth and Browson Bank junction.	Reducing the speed limit of the road would increase the journey time along the route and would therefore hinder the achievement of the Project objectives such as economic growth, strategic connectivity and particularly improving journey time reliability for road users. It is anticipated that the Project will deliver journey time savings of between 10 and 13 minutes (19-22%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years (compared to a scenario without the Project). Existing dualled sections of the A66 generally show speeds approximately 5mph slower than the speed limit. Single carriageway sections of the A66, however, consistently show higher levels of relative delay, with average speeds across most single sections around 45-50mph. This represents a speed 10-15mph below the speed limit of a standard single carriageway trunk road (60mph) and 15-20mph below that observed on the dual sections. Please refer to The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) for further details of how the current proposals meet the Project objectives.</p> <p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs including variable messages signs and signs for local services and places of interest, within the Project extents, will be upgraded as part of the works and will be considered in detail in future Project stages.</p> <p>There will be no provision of CCTV, though there will be opportunities to further develop the approach to technology, including for route resilience in bad weather, as part of the detailed design which would continue after the submission and approval of the DCO.</p> <p>In terms of resilience more generally, the Climate Chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) follows the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 114 Climate (DMRB LA 114) which states "the environmental assessment shall identify how the Project can be adapted to protect it from future climate scenarios." The ES climate chapter contains the Climate Change Resilience Assessment and identifies embedded mitigation, including design standards which are aligned to future</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>climate projections, and any additional mitigation measures required in light of the assessment.</p> <p>With regards to safety, the single carriageway sections of the A66 have been shown to have a 73% higher accident rate than the dualled sections. All fatalities between 2012-2019 along scheme sections were a result of drivers drifting into oncoming traffic or poor overtaking manoeuvres on single carriageway sections, with a significant proportion of non-fatal collisions also a result of poor overtaking manoeuvres on single carriageway sections. The Transport Assessment includes a detailed description of the COBALT analysis. COBALT (Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch) is the DfT's recommended computer program for undertaking the analysis of the impact of a road scheme on accidents. This shows how the provision of a safer road design for the sections of the A66 upgraded as part of the Project translates into a reduction in accident levels over a 60-year period. When considering both improved scheme sections and existing dual sections, a net saving of 9 fatalities and 83 serious injuries is forecast to occur.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
165	148581, 148587, 149350, 149689, 149777, 151487, 152931, 153078, 153316, 153365, 153559, 153562, 153797, 153833, 153839, 153900, 153965, 153984, 153987, 153991, 153995, 154128, 154151, 154335, 154345	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Transport for the North		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Sustainable transport	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and Transport for the North suggesting that more needs to be done in terms of encouraging, and investing in, sustainable transport specifically mentioning: walking, cycling, electrical vehicle infrastructure and public transport. Some respondents suggest that sustainable transport should be the Government's priority, rather than facilitating low-occupancy vehicle usage. Respondents believe that this approach would align with climate change goals and help to reduce the overall carbon footprint of transport. Respondents suggest improving the existing public transport network; transporting freight via rail instead of road; and improving infrastructure for sustainable transport (e.g., additional charging points for electric vehicles).	National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. The plan states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads remain an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network. The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p> <p>To improve the strategic east west links within the north there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). The east coast and west coast lines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% due to the Project, which illustrates the main strategic benefits of the Project, which is its ability to provide more reliable, safer, and efficient strategic and local connectivity in the north of England, supporting economic growth and the Northern Powerhouse commitments and aspirations, as well as strengthening Union connectivity between English regions, Scotland, and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>Significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riders Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
236		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggesting that the Project needs to place more emphasis on easing congestion. Respondents mention the need for strategic diversion routes for the A6 and A685, which fall outside the project boundary,	Traffic modelling has been carried out to determine capacity requirements in future years. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the Project on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner, within a modelled Affected Road	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>in order to alleviate heavy volumes of traffic.</p>	<p>Network (ARN) which includes the A6 and A685. The report shows that there will be an increase in journey time of approximately 5 minutes (9%) along the A66 corridor by 2051 if the Project is not delivered. This is because the single carriageway sections are near their capacity throughout the assessment period. The Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) of a Single Carriageway Road is typically between 22,000 to 23,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), and all single carriageway sections of the route exceed 22,000 AADT by 2046. The CRF of a Dual Carriageway Road is much greater (68,000 to 70,000 AADT) than a Single Carriageway Road and therefore the delivery of the Project will provide significantly more capacity. It is anticipated that users will save between 11 and 13 minutes (20-23%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. Additional lanes on approaches to M6 Junction 40 for example address this.</p> <p>Traffic modelling work has also been carried out to understand the impacts of temporary diversions during construction. In terms of temporary diversion routes, the Project will minimise the use of these and when required they are more than likely to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>be implemented overnight. Construction plans, diversions and closures will be finalised during detailed design and shared with local councils.</p> <p>The introduction of a full-length dual carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner will help our ability to manage incidents and reduce the number and duration of closures associated with road traffic collisions, reducing the need for the use of diversions.</p>	
275	149689, 153829	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making suggestions relating to traffic safety. Respondents suggest that junction strategies should be put in place, and that Project proposals should aim to remove crossover junctions and sharp bends along the route. Others suggest that illegal parking by travellers and HGVs at the edges of the road be mitigated to protect drivers.</p>	<p>In relation to removing sharp bends, the route will be designed to the latest standards within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) which includes design standards for horizontal and vertical alignments. Junction locations have been positioned to optimise connections into the local road network where gaps in the central reserve have been removed. 'Crossover' at-grade junction crossing points have been removed along the proposed A66 scheme sections. New lay-bys are proposed in accordance with current DMRB standards but they have been designed so as to minimise their size, to specifically discourage longer staying and overnight</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>parking. Existing lay-bys will be retained where possible. Illegal parking away from this lay-by provision is a police enforcement issue.</p> <p>In relation to road safety, the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the accident analysis carried out. The observed accident rate (i.e. personal injury accidents per million km travelled) of a dual carriageway road is around half that on a single carriageway road. In addition, accidents on dual carriageway roads tend to be less severe (on average) than on single carriageway roads. The results shown within The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) outlines a saving of 281 accidents over the appraisal period, saving 14 fatalities, 148 serious and 368 slight casualties.</p>	
284	154148	Cumbria County Council Transport for the North	153626	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Transport for the North suggesting that measures must be taken to ensure that there is no loss of connectivity along the route. Respondents mention the need for improved access for local residents and ensuring that new roads are accessible for all vehicles specifically mentioning HGVs.</p>	<p>The upgraded A66 will be designed to the latest standards as identified in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The route includes junctions, to connect to the local road network, that enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, slip roads will be provided that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						ties into the local road network. Every junction has been tailored to meet the individual needs of local communities. Sections of de-trunked A66 will also provide access for local residents so that connectivity along the route is not detrimentally impacted.	
376	148570, 148587, 149367, 151481, 152906, 152931, 153365, 153560, 153562, 153567, 153797, 153839, 153871, 153900, 153976, 153982, 153984, 153987, 153991, 153995, 154151, 154329, 154335, 154345, 154363		154457	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Reduce demand	Respondents suggesting that, in the context of the current climate crisis, traffic reduction should be the priority rather than upgrading the transport network to accommodate the growing demand. Respondents also suggest investing in public transport and in active travel infrastructure, to reduce the demand and reliance on cars and lorries.	National Highways have published a 'Net Zero Highways: our 2030 / 2040 / 2050 plan' which sets out how we will support making every journey on our network emission free. With 79% of freight goods moved by road, Britain's roads remain an integral part of our economy and wider transport system. It states that we have set an ambition for all of our customers to be travelling using net zero transport by 2050 in line with the UK Climate Change Act. Our priorities are to help roll out solutions to decarbonise HGVs and support the uptake of electric cars and vans. We will also continue our work integrating the SRN with other transport modes, whilst working to improve the efficiency of the network. The A66 is a key national and regional strategic route, linking the east and west of northern England across the Pennines, and is the best available option for traffic travelling between the southeast of England and the west of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Scotland. It also provides a key link to Northern Ireland and onwards to the Republic of Ireland via the Port of Cairnryan.</p> <p>The Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (2016) identified the critical importance of improving connectivity across the North and the Northern Trans-Pennine Routes Study identified the A66 as the priority for investment. Upgrading the route is a UK National priority which forms a key part of the 'levelling-up' and Northern Powerhouse agendas enabling better connectivity between North and South and increasing economic performance in the North.</p> <p>In terms of reducing demand and reliance on cars, there is no existing rail line alternative to the A66 between Darlington and Penrith. The east coast and west coast mainlines provide strategic north-south rail links however the only east-west rail link in the north of England north of the Leeds to Carlisle rail line, is the one between Newcastle and Carlisle. Bus service provision along the A66 corridor will continue to link the rural villages along the route. Moreover, significant Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) provision is included in the proposed A66 upgrade work, to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						facilitate and encourage sustainable transport and active travel. Full details are provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riders Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
420	149689, 151458, 153384, 153560, 153976, 154128, 154132, 162144		153626	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Alternative project	Respondents suggesting alternative road projects that could be undertaken instead of or alongside the proposed schemes: upgrading and maintaining existing infrastructure; improving the safety of existing routes; re-opening previous rail routes and re-designing certain elements of the existing Project: a new junction at Powis House and creating free flowing links between Junction 53 and Junction 40, .	In advance of confirmation that the A66 would be taken forward as a priority Project, a series of Northern Trans-Pennine strategic studies took place to further assess the proposals and identify any feasible alternatives. Following statutory consultation, the design of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme has been updated to include an improved junction at Long Marton (Powis House). The capacity improvement from dualling the route and new grade separated junctions on scheme sections between A1(M) Junction 53 and M6 Junction 40 will enable the majority of links to become free flowing, particularly sections that currently experience congestion. The northern Trans-Pennine routes strategic study further assesses and offers the strategic case for intervention along the A66/A685 corridor, specifically given if improvements are not made, delays and levels of congestion on the M62, as the only existing east-west strategic Trans-Pennine route, will continue to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>increase. For some journeys the A66 and A69 can serve as an alternative and more direct east-west crossing to the M62.</p> <p>The study concluded that full dualling options were expected to deliver the greatest level of strategic benefits, with the A66 full dualling option delivering particularly strong benefits in terms of strategic connectivity and journey time reliability, as well as making a significant contribution to the Northern Powerhouse economic growth agenda and supporting access to key tourist sites.</p> <p>Other options which represented a lower level of intervention, such as the junction improvement and bypass options, would provide some localised journey time reliability and environmental benefits; however, the scale of these benefits would understandably be much smaller than more extensive interventions, and the contribution made towards achieving the intervention-specific objectives around economic growth and strategic connectivity would be much less significant.</p> <p>The study also found a much clearer strategic case for the proposed improvements on the A66 compared to the A69 which better meets the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>intervention specific objectives set out for the study.</p> <p>The outcome of the study was then published in the Northern Trans-Pennine routes strategic study stage 3 report, which informed the 2016 HM Treasury Autumn Statement announcement of plans to dual the A66 and the start of the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project.</p> <p>The route proposed has emerged from studies of alternative options as the best solution to address the problems of traffic congestion on the A66 and to deliver the Project objectives. Further information on the alternative options appraisal and route selection can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).</p>	
17	148548, 151495, 152152, 152939, 153365, 153559, 153562, 153809, 154132, 154136, 154198,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Yorkshire Dales National	154184	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority expressing concern about traffic, transport, and junction safety. Respondents believe that the A66 could become more dangerous with higher speed limits, especially if the practice of unsafe overtaking were to continue, and a potential for increased collisions with wildlife.	<p>Since 2017, we have been working hard to deliver a safer, more connected A66 for local people, businesses, tourists and other road users between Penrith and Scotch Corner. Feedback from individuals and organisations has helped us to deliver on this ambition.</p> <p>We will remove potentially hazardous turnings as part of the Project, providing new links – via the local road</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	154350, 154365, 162144	Park Authority				<p>network – to safe junctions to provide safer journeys on the newly-dualled sections of the A66.</p> <p>To reduce risk, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reserve, removing right turns. We have included junctions, connected to the local road network, that enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network.</p> <p>National Highways are committed to maintaining an ongoing conversation about construction with local people, businesses, and organisations. We regularly monitor the safety of our network and work throughout the year to ensure our motorways and A-roads meet all required safety standards. Our Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) and Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) set out the safety case for the scheme, including proposed speed limits, junction types and locations.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment shows that with regards to safety, the existing single carriageway sections of the A66 have been shown to have a 73%</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						higher accident rate than the existing dual carriageway sections. All fatalities between 2012-2019 along scheme sections were a result of drivers drifting into oncoming traffic and poor overtaking manoeuvres on single carriageway sections, with a significant proportion of non-fatal collisions also a result of poor overtaking manoeuvres on single carriageway sections. The Transport Assessment also includes a detailed description of the COBALT (Cost and Benefit to Accidents – Light Touch) analysis. This shows how the provision of a safer dual carriageway road design for the sections of the A66 upgraded as part of the Project translates into a reduction in accident levels over a 60-year period. When considering both improved scheme sections and existing dual sections, a net saving of 9 fatalities and 83 serious injuries is forecast to occur.	
106		Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Yorkshire Dales		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Traffic control	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern relating to traffic control and that there would be insufficient provision of CCTV and VMS along the route.	The installation of longitudinal fibre is not within the Project scope. Following discussions with National Roads Telecommunications Services the Project strategy is to provide longitudinal network ducting in priority areas through new structures only in order to facilitate installation at a later date if a future technology enhancement project was	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
		National Park Authority				<p>commissioned. The Project will not be installing longitudinal fibre along the whole route.</p> <p>Traffic signals, road markings, traffic signs including variable messages signs, within the Project extents, will be upgraded as part of the works. There will be no provision of CCTV, though there will be opportunities to further develop the approach to technology as part of the detailed design which would continue after the submission and approval of the DCO.</p>	
175	153339, 154365, 162147	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council	153376	Traffic, transport, and junctions - HGVs	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concerns that increasing the road capacity would mean an increase traffic using the route, in particular the number of HGVs. Respondents say that an increase in HGVs would be a nuisance and lead to illegal parking. Respondents also express concern that there is insufficient provision of rest facilities for HGVs.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling carried out has accounted for HGV speed limits and speed limits for cars and also traffic growth. Full details are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). The Transport Assessment shows that HGV traffic will grow by around 8% due to the Project. Whilst HGVs will benefit from reduced congestion and the increased capacity of the dual carriageway along the full route length, the majority of growth due to the Project is attributed to LGV and car growth. In comparison, average growth across the locations shown in the Transport Assessment (Section 7.2) for all vehicles is 30% due to the Project by 2044</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						A new service area for HGVs is not within the scope of the Project, however National Highways Users and Communities Designated Fund supports making improvements to the UK's freight and road haulage sector. In this context, National Highways is working to explore the feasibility of installing new facilities along the A66 route and this will be a separate initiative from the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. All existing lay-bys affected by the Project will be retained where possible. New lay-bys will be provided in accordance with current DMRB standards to increase provision for HGVs.	
182	149777, 151458, 152998, 153078, 153081, 153326, 153605, 153978, 154015, 154136, 154182	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153603, 153627, 154254	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern about transport and access, in particular the potential severance of communities and services due to the removal of all at grade right turns along the road; the impact on bus services which connect settlements. Respondents, in particular farmers, also express concern that: land will no longer be accessible; land may be severed by the A66, and the new underpasses will be unsuitable for agricultural vehicles. Respondents	To improve safety, we have designed the improvements so there are no gaps in the central reserve, removing right turns. We have included junctions, located in positions which optimise connections into the local road network, that enable drivers to safely join and leave the route in the direction of travel only. To enable drivers to travel in both directions, we will provide slip roads that connect to a bridge or underpass that crosses the dual carriageway and ties into the local road network.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>express concern that the current proposals offer no suitable escape or diversion routes for HGVs and that the route may prove unsuitable for electric HGVs in particular due to gradient. Respondents' express concerns about Clint Lane Bridge potentially being removed for road traffic due to its regular use for local daily traffic.</p>	<p>The route will be designed to the latest standards within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which allows for appropriate gradients and HGV escape lanes where required.</p> <p>Sections of de-trunked A66 will provide access for local residents so that connectivity along the route is maintained and severance avoided.</p> <p>Discussions with landowners and farmers have been carried out so that the A66 improvements take account of operational farming requirements. Underpasses have been sized to accommodate agricultural vehicles.</p> <p>A new Clint Lane Bridge will be constructed as part of the works, in its current location (see General Arrangement drawings which are provided as Application Document 2.5).</p>	
188	148548, 149689, 149777, 150152, 152916, 153365, 153557, 153559, 153560,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Lake	153626	Traffic, transport, and junctions - Congestion	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Lake District National Park Authority and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust expressing concern regarding congestion, in particular that the Project will increase traffic on the route as a consequence of additional capacity, and that this would</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) report shows the impact of the Project on reducing congestion on the route and improving journey time for traffic between Penrith and Scotch Corner. The report shows that there will be an increase in journey time of approximately 5 minutes (9%) along</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153562, 153604, 153809, 153909, 153965, 154132	District National Park Authority North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust			exacerbate existing issues with congestion. Respondents also express concern that additional congestion could have a knock-on effect on congestion elsewhere: the M6 and various locations off the main A66 such as Barnard Castle. These respondents believe that the additional delays would offset any potential positive impacts.	the A66 corridor if the Project is not delivered. This is because the single carriageway sections are near their capacity throughout the assessment period. The Congestion Reference Flow (CRF) of a Single Carriageway Road is typically between 22,000 to 23,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and all single carriageway sections of the route exceed 22,000 AADT by 2046. The CRF of a Dual Carriageway Road is much greater (68,000 to 70,000 AADT) than a Single Carriageway Road and therefore the delivery of the Project will provide significantly more capacity. In terms of journey time savings between M6 J40 and A1(M) Scotch Corner with the delivery of the Project, it is anticipated that users will save between 11 and 13 minutes (20-23%) when travelling along the A66 corridor in future years. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) shows the impact of the Project on the local highway network.	
1145		Dacre Parish Council		Traffic, transport, and junctions - Safety	Dacre Parish Council expressing concern over the use of rat runs by all types of vehicles trying to avoid congestion at the A66 eastbound at Junction 40 resulting in rural roads	The introduction of a full-length dual carriageway between Penrith and Scotch Corner will increase capacity on the A66, improve route reliability and reduce the use of rat runs. We are introducing additional lanes on approaches to M6 Junction 40 to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					experiencing increased and dangerous traffic.	<p>reduce congestion and associated rat running in this location.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) provides details of the congestion relief the Project provides.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation in relation to 'General Comments About the Project - Walking, cycling and horse-riders' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
31	151487, 154136, 162147	Durham County Council		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	Respondents including Durham County Council express support for the Project on the grounds of improved safe access that has been included for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders on routes on and adjacent to the A66.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project in regard to safe access including from Durham County Council. We are committed to working closely with local communities to provide safe crossing points for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.	No
95	148567, 148570, 148581, 148697, 148701, 149350, 150159, 150175, 151469, 151470, 151482, 152131, 152211, 152248, 152906, 152931, 152938, 152969, 152972, 153036, 153326,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Transport for the North	154180	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Cyclepath / footpath / bridleway	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Transport for the North suggest the creation of a cycle path, footpath, or bridleway alongside the route. These respondents state that creating an active transport route would help mitigate the potential loss of public rights of way, improve the health of local people using the route, and improve connectivity. Various similar suggestions are made for a dedicated active travel path parallel to the route, these include repurposing older infrastructure for active travel, such as de-trunked parts of the existing A66 and disused rail tracks.	With regards to the comments made, the following relevant objectives for walking, cycling and horse riding (refer to Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals) have informed the design of the Project: 1. A low-speed, low-traffic route parallel to the A66 for pedestrians and cyclists should be created where possible, in order to replace and connect existing routes affected by the A66 improvements. This could mean utilising the de-trunked sections of single carriageway, where they remain open to traffic; 2. All facilities for WCH users should be a betterment, where practicable,	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153362, 153835, 153839, 153860, 153874, 154128, 154147, 154148, 154210, 162147, 162148, 162157				Respondents also request that any new active travel routes be adequately designed and maintained, for example by making them wide enough to be used by all walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders.	<p>to those available prior to the improvement project;</p> <p>3. Re-establish any WCH routes severed by the proposed works; and</p> <p>The Project has achieved the objectives as follows.</p> <p>Objective no.1: In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation process, east-west WCH provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes. This is typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway, or in the verge along the de-trunked A66, where sections of the old A66 remain. A summary of this provision is shown in Table 1, and Figures 2-7 of Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals. Specific scheme features are detailed in Chapter 4 of the same document.</p> <p>Objective no.2: the proposed WCH provisions are a betterment of the current provision, particularly the improvement in east-west connectivity which not only creates longer east-west active travel routes but also connect existing north-south PRoW to enhance available recreation routes in the area. The grade separation of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>crossing facilities also provides enhancements in safety for users.</p> <p>Objective no.3: All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. Where a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. Safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders (WCH) is of paramount importance. WCH provision will be of adequate width and design for users. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed to applicable design standards current at the time of detailed design, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project, should the DCO be made This design process will involve engagement with the relevant stakeholders including local authorities.</p> <p>The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed new east-west PRoW will be with either National Highways or the local authority although there may be some instances where legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	
177	151462, 151482, 153326, 153559, 153816, 153844, 153976, 153984, 153987, 153995, 154130, 154146, 162148	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmond- shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council Transport for the North		Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Active travel	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Transport for the North suggested that an active travel corridor for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders be included in proposals. Respondents state that the Project would be an opportunity to encourage a shift towards active travel which would align with climate change commitments and encourage sustainability.	A low-speed, low-traffic route parallel to the A66 for pedestrians and cyclists is part of the proposals, where it has been possible to accommodate this in order to provide an active travel corridor for these groups. As well as providing new routes this provision also replaces and connects existing routes affected by the A66 improvements. This has been achieved through utilising the verge of the de-trunked sections of single carriageway, where they remain open to traffic or providing a route parallel to the new dual carriageway. All facilities for WCH users would be a betterment, where practicable, to those available prior to the improvement Project and will provide further opportunity to encourage a shift towards active travel for communities along the route.	Yes
670	148619, 154128, 154344			Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Don't prioritise motorised transport	Respondents making suggestions relating to not prioritising motorised transport: that the health, safety, and wellbeing of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders should instead be given priority, that non-motorised users should be given priority at crossing points and that the routes they use	The core objective of the project is to dual the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 between the M6 J40 and A1(M) Scotch Corner. On the resulting high speed road this creates, motorised users need to be prioritised for the safety of those travelling on the A66 and the non-motorised users which need to cross the A66.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>should be at least as direct as those used by motorised transport users.</p>	<p>The health, safety and wellbeing of walkers, cyclists and horse riders also forms a key objective of the Project as set out in Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposals.</p> <p>In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation process, east-west WCH provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes. This is typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway, or in the verge along the de-trunked A66, where sections of the old A66 remain. A summary of this provision is shown in Table 1, and Figures 2-7 of Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals. Specific scheme features are detailed in Chapter 4 of the same document.</p> <p>The proposed WCH provisions are a betterment of the current provision, particularly the improvement in east-west connectivity which not only creates longer east-west active travel routes but also connects existing north-south PRow to enhance available recreation routes in the area. The grade separation of crossing</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>facilities also provides enhancements in safety for users.</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. Where a PRoW is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>Crossing facilities for non-motorised users will be designed in accordance with relevant design standards current at the time of design. It is acknowledged that these design standards generally prioritise motorised users over non-motorised users in the case of a new road scheme. Signalised crossing points are however proposed on the larger terminal junctions at the M6 and A1(M) to allow safe negotiation of the junctions by non-motorised users.</p> <p>Regarding the comment around WCH routes being as direct as motorised routes; the Project needs to balance this consideration alongside a range of other considerations including engineering, environmental, cost and feedback received through engagement with affected</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>stakeholders (including WCH focus groups).</p> <p>Proposed structures, under and over the new A66, are provided to enable safe crossing of the dual carriageway for a variety of modes of transport. Where possible we have ensured that structures serve multiple purposes and collect PRow together, to minimise the number of new structures. This has however been balanced with keeping lengths of diverted PRow to a minimum to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions.</p>	
61	148697, 149350, 150159, 151484, 152131, 152211, 152938, 152969, 153326, 153559, 153604, 153835, 153844, 153974, 153983, 153984, 153988,	Cumbria County Council Eden District Council Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council	153376, 153607	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Access	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council express concern as follows.</p> <p>i) the Project's potential severance of cycle paths, footpaths, and bridleways; and the detours or access issues that could arise.</p> <p>ii) the lack of a safe and continuous active travel network, stating that this could deter people from travelling by foot, bicycle, or horse; and would therefore have a negative impact on residents' health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>National Highways address each of these issues in turn below.</p> <p>i) All existing Public Rights of Way (PRow) will remain. If a PRow is severed by the new dualling Project, it will be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing. This may be at a proposed grade separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. Safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders (WCH) is of paramount importance. WCH provision will be of adequate width and design for users. Where possible we have ensured that proposed structures, under and over</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153990, 153992, 153993, 153994, 153995, 153996, 153997, 154128, 154129, 154136, 154332, 154335, 154340, 154343, 154344, 154345, 154352, 154359, 155322, 162157					<p>the new A66, serve multiple purposes and collect PRoW together, to minimise the number of new structures. This has however been balanced with the need to keep lengths of diverted PRoW to a minimum to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions.</p> <p>ii) In response to stakeholder engagement throughout the preliminary design process, and to feedback provided during the Autumn 2021 Consultation process, east-west provision has now been provided on the majority of schemes. This is typically either parallel to the new dual carriageway, or in the verge along the de-trunked A66, where sections remain. A summary of this provision is shown in Table 1, and Figures 2-7 on Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse riding Proposals. Specific scheme features are detailed in Chapter 4 of the same document. The issue is also the subject of further supplementary consultation.</p>	
338	152906, 152974, 153559, 153569,	Cumbria County Council Eden	154180	Walking, cycling and horse-riders - Safety	Respondents including Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Richmondshire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council expressing concern relating to the	The safety of WCH users is of paramount importance. The detailed design of WCH facilities will be in accordance with relevant design standards current at the time of	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
	153835, 153979	District Council Richmond-shire District Council and North Yorkshire County Council			<p>safety of walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders and that the Project plans do not sufficiently improve safety.</p> <p>Respondents express concern about the use of verges (particularly de-trunked sections of the old A66), narrow footpaths, and that people, livestock, and horses are required to cross a proposed accommodation bridge near Cross Fell House that respondents state is unsuitable.</p>	<p>design. This will include adequate width provision for the intended users, as well as suitable segregation from adjacent roads where WCH routes are proposed in the verge (for example de-trunked sections of the old A66). The design will be subject to the road safety audit process which will provide independent review of the Project from a safety perspective. National Highways confirm that we will look at WCH facilities on all de-trunked lengths on a case-by-case basis and will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development as part of the wider de-trunking processes.</p> <p>A summary of proposed WCH provision is shown in Table 1, and Figures 2-7 on Application Document 2.4 Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposals. Specific scheme features are detailed in Chapter 4 of the same document.</p> <p>Regarding the specific comment about the shared use of the proposed accommodation bridge near Cross Fell House; this proposal has since changed and is no longer a bridleway. The bridge will be designed for the safe passage of pedestrians, farm traffic and livestock and will meet the relevant design standards.. Specific</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	S47	S42(1)(a) / S42(1)(b)	S42(1)(d)				
						detail such as parapets and any on-bridge segregation will be considered at the next stage of design development, should the DCO be made and will include engagement with relevant Stakeholders as appropriate.	