

**A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
TR010062**

**4.4 Consultation Report
Annex P Tables evidencing regard to
supplementary 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 P TABLES EVIDENCING REGARD TO
SUPPLEMENTARY 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

Public open space at Kemplay Bank

Temple Sowerby to Appleby

Appleby to Brough

Walking, cycling and horse-riding provision, landform and compounds

Brough Hill Fair

Hulands Quarry access and Bowes Cross Farm access

Kemplay Bank - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
56	TR0200048			Access	Respondents express support provided that the boundary between Wetheriggs Country Park and A66 is safe.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including boundary treatment. Boundary treatment including fencing and planting will be developed further during the detailed design stage to ensure the area between the park and the A66 is secure and safe. Further information on proposed planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	No
63	TR0200055			Access - Pedestrian	Respondents suggest pedestrian access needed from the dual carriageway to existing lane beside the school playing fields.	Pedestrian access will be provided from the shared cycle footpath running parallel to the A66 to Wetheriggs Country Park and linkage to the Park can be developed in conjunction with Eden Council during the detailed design stage. Further information on the public access can be viewed in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
65	TR0200055			Access	Respondents support the new pedestrian access yellow area [proposed open space as shown in the supplementary consultation brochure] allowing access to Clifford Road /Ullswater Road from Wetheriggs Country Park.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the new pedestrian access.	No
101			TR0200070	Connectivity	Respondents support the acquisition of a field to the east of Wetheriggs Country Park as proposed new public open space presented at Supplementary Consultation, as it provides greater connectivity to the Country Park.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the proposed open space which will be enhanced with landscaping, planting and habitat creation.	No
28	ANON-6V39-79C3-X, TR0200056			Consultation Meeting - lack of quality	Respondents express concern relating to the effectiveness of the consultation meeting due to a lack of facts and definitive information. Respondent states that most residents who attended the consultation meeting believe the plans for the A66 are set in stone. This led residents of Clifford Road to hold their own meeting in regard to the A66 upgrade.	These meetings were part of a supplementary consultation process, which followed the previous public consultations on the Project. The focus of the supplementary consultation was on proposed changes to the Project design in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. The supplementary consultations were discussed with the Community Liaison Groups, for those where drop in events were being held. Information was provided on the scope of the consultation in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>form of a consultation brochure, which was available in hard copy at the events and deposit points, and an online version on the website. Consultation feedback forms asked specific questions relating to the proposed design changes. This information made clear that the Project is not 'set in stone' and the specific areas where National Highways were seeking feedback to influence the design. For example, National Highways were seeking views on the new proposed public open space at Kemplay Bank, which would be connected through the Wetheriggs Country Park and available for community use.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of this Consultation Report sets out the approach to the supplementary consultation. The feedback to the supplementary consultation has been recorded and taken into account as is demonstrated by this report.</p>	
109	TR0200027			Design - flooding	Respondents express support for the flood relief efforts and expresses concern on how drainage will occur from the underpass at Kemplay Bank	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the flood relief efforts. A comprehensive drainage system is proposed with outfall to a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					junction that will be below ground level.	watercourse via an attenuation pond. The drainage system will be designed in accordance with the appropriate standards to ensure the pipework has sufficient capacity to provide the level of flood protection mandated in the standards. Please refer to ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) for further detail on the proposed drainage system. The Flood Risk Assessment is set out in Appendix 14.2 of ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.4).	
2		The Ramblers		Engagement - further local engagement	The Ramblers suggest that the Kemplay Bank proposals are put on hold and suggesting that a local consultation should be carried out and that there will be a lot of different ideas from a local consultation and that these should be handled locally.	The supplementary consultation was required to inform and seek the views of local communities and relevant key Stakeholders. The consultation for specific durations within the period from January 2022 to April 2022, focused on proposed changes within six of the schemes within the Project. Section 7.9 of the Consultation Report provides a summary of the matters raised through the supplementary consultations and this Annex	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						explains how the Project has responded to this feedback. With respect to Kemplay Bank the supplementary consultations were conducted in line with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the Statement of Community Consultation prepared for the Project.	
84	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - limited consultation	Respondents including Eden District Council expressed concern that there has been limited consultation, given their view that the changes are significant. The Respondent would like more detailed information on impacts and proposed mitigation.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are of relevance to. Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>PEI Report at the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report. As such, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary Consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
82	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - poor engagement	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern about the size and detail of the public notices and the accessibility for some locals due to the use of a QR code.	<p>When considering the need for and approach to additional consultation, as a result of the proposed design changes, National Highways considered the changes against three key points. These points are:</p> <p>The scale of the proposed change; the likely public interest; and the potential for changes to environmental impacts and effects.</p> <p>It was concluded that additional consultation was required and should be non-statutory and focused to those effected by and/or interested in the changes. The publicity for the consultations followed this approach.</p> <p>The signs used at Wetheriggs Park (A5 with QR and National Highways website address) were intended as an additional measure used in this location only to recognise that some users of the park are tourists to the area and not residents that received leaflets to their address. These measures complemented a local awareness-raising campaign which included A4 posters in local shops and public buildings, materials in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						deposit points and a leaflet which was distributed to local homes and businesses. Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report provides more information on this approach.	
80	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - wider programme	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern around the consultation process. They would have preferred to see wider exercise which involved several stakeholders, as well as more detail and time.	Following the statutory consultation process and ongoing engagement with Stakeholders, landowners and those with an interest in the land, potential design changes were identified to several of the schemes. These include geographic areas (M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank, Temple Sowerby to Appleby, Appleby to Brough, and Bowes Bypass) and two topic areas: changes to walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions, and the location of construction compounds. When determining the need for and approach to additional consultation the proposed changes were reviewed in regard to Government guidance (DCLG 2015, Guidance on the Pre-Application Process) and in particular, three key points that can be summarised as: the scale of the changes, potential for a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>change in environmental impacts and effects; and the likely level of public interest. On this basis, it is considered appropriate, that the additional consultation took the form of focused supplementary consultations on each of the schemes and overarching topics.</p> <p>The supplementary consultations were conducted in line with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the Statement of Community Consultation prepared for the Project (as relevant).</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultations including the duration, the level of publicity of the consultation and the consultation material and events is considered proportionate to the proposals and was in accordance with the Guidance. Furthermore, the approach was tailored for each set of scheme and topic changes. For example, the consultation on the public open space at Kemplay Bank included the distribution of a leaflet to 387 nearby homes in the local community, as well as local</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>posters and a letter sent directly to nine land interests impacted by the changes.</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders that National Highways consulted directly include: directly impacted persons with an interest in the land; relevant host local authorities; statutory environmental bodies; the AONB Partnership; the Gypsy and Traveller community representatives (where relevant to the scheme) and local residents where relevant to the scheme. Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report sets out why the supplementary consultation was necessary and reasons for the approach taken, which are summarised as followed.</p>	
41	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Engagement process - lack of information	Respondents express concern for a lack of information provided at consultation. The consultation material lacked sufficient detail, leaving some consultees having to make interpretations of what they heard/saw. This left them unable to provide a meaningful response.	The approach to the supplementary consultations including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals which included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary.	
110	TR0200091			Engagement process - poor quality	Respondents expressed concern that staff at the Consultation event (at Penrith Cricket Club) were unable to answer questions on the proposed land take at Wetheriggs Country Park.	It is understood that the respondent is referring to the consultation event at Penrith Cricket Club, held by the project team on Wednesday 9th February 2022. The event was held to listen to and speak with local people about the re-provision of land for the public open space which was to be lost from the edge of Wetheriggs Country Park for the Project. The event was hosted by seven members of the Project team who were available to engage and answer any questions about the Project including the space suggested for the re-provision. Information was also made available online on the consultation webpage. The land take was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation and the focus of this supplementary consultation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						was on the proposed reprovision of open space. The comments on the ability of staff to respond to questions is duly noted, although it is considered the members of the Project team hosting the event had suitable knowledge with respect to the changes being consulted upon.	
81	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - longer engagement	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern in regards to the consultation process. They state that a genuine local input will be key in ensuring that negative impacts are minimised and that mitigation measures are comprehensive and a longer engagement would have ensured this.	National Highways recognise the value of local input to the supplementary consultations, especially given the local nature of the proposed changes. As such, the consultations were focussed on landowners in the vicinity of the proposed changes (in most cases) and people with an interest in the land affected, in addition to relevant stakeholder organisations. The consultations were well publicised (by letter, email, leaflets, posters, online) and a period followed for consultees to provide feedback, which in most cases was 28 days. The Project team remained open to ongoing engagement with local people and stakeholders following these consultations, through the established channels of communications (i.e. Community	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Liaison Groups, project email and phonenumber).	
83	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - wider programme	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern over the radius methodology used as part of the leaflet distribution to 300 houses in Kemplay Bank area. A wider programme of consultation would be better.	The supplementary consultation on the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank scheme was focused on the proposal to provide replacement open space for that lost at Kemplay Bank. This non-statutory consultation focused on the proposed change and those likely to be affected and/or interested in the change. The autumn 2021 consultation proposed widening of the lanes between J40 and Kemplay Bank. This means that National Highways would need to acquire land on the north side of the A66 – some of which is used by local people for recreation and is designated as public open space. The Supplementary Consultation proposed to reduce the amount of land needed and also to seek feedback on the proposal to replace lost open space. As part of this consultation, National Highways posted leaflets, to provide a notification of the consultation, to 387 nearby homes. These households were identified because the residents live nearby the public open space	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and National Highways were seeking feedback on the use of the existing open space and suggestions for the replacement open space. In addition, National Highways displayed two posters in and around the Wetheriggs Country Park to raise awareness to people using the open space that may not live in the area that received the leaflet. Further posters were displayed in local shops and community facilities.</p> <p>National Highways also consulted stakeholder organisations, which are considered to represent the interests of the local area including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council.</p> <p>The Supplementary Consultation is considered proportionate and adequate in regard to the changes proposed and in accordance with the relevant Guidance.</p>	
42	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Engagement process - predetermined	Respondents express concern that residents believe the proposals to be a 'done deal'	The purpose of the Supplementary Consultation was to seek feedback on the proposed changes, which could be used in the finalisation of the Project for the DCO application. The Supplementary Consultations included specific questions on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>design changes in the feedback forms provided.</p> <p>All feedback submitted during the consultation feedback was collated, reviewed and taken into account.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the Consultation Report, including Chapter 7 and our responses within this Annex (Annex P) where we have aimed to respond to as many comments and questions raised during the consultation process. In addition, table 7.13 of the Report describes the outcomes of the supplementary consultation.</p>	
93	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Engagement process - lack of information	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern that the consultation provided does not give clear enough information, nor information on mitigation. They are therefore unable to reach a judgement.	National Highways provided Consultation Brochures to provide consultees with information to inform their response to the Supplementary Consultations. The Brochures provided consultees with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in the autumn 2021 statutory consultation and set out detailed information on the revised proposals we put forward. It showed land required for the scheme (as presented at the autumn 2021 consultation, the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>reduced land we now require and the field we are proposing to acquire to compensate for the loss of open space as a result of the proposed work. The Brochures referred back the PEI Report that was published at the autumn 2021 consultation and provided information on environmental effects and potential mitigation approaches.</p> <p>Each proposed change, as set out in the supplementary consultations, was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI Report. It was concluded that none of these changes would and therefore information was provided within each brochure confirming that the information including mitigation presented in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The Brochures provided details of how consultees could ask questions and seek further information by phone and email and also provided details of locations of hard copy documents.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
51	TR0200048			Drainage and flooding	Respondents express concern about failing drainage system which floods Wetheriggs Country Park in existing conditions	This existing drainage issue is not currently part of the scope of the Project, however National Highways will continue to work closely with United Utilities during the next phase of the Project as part of the diversionary works required to facilitate the Project. A description of the Project is provided in the first chapter of this Consultation Report.	No
48	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Environmental – noise and air quality	Respondents express concern about the effect of noise and pollution from the Project at their property (approximately 150m from the road) during and after construction	This supplementary consultation was about the proposed re-provision of public open space and therefore focussed on the field that could be potentially provided. It was not a consultation about potential noise or pollution impacts of the Project construction and operation. These impacts were subjects of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. Further details on the consultation undertaken and responses can be found within the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) and Annex N. 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 study area for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>construction noise extends to 300m and for operation noise extends to at least 600m from the Project.</p> <p>A property within 150m will be assessed for both construction and operation noise and vibration effects. Across the entirety of the Project, with the implementation of embedded design mitigation including lower noise road surface and the use of cuttings and landscape earth bunds, only three locations have been assessed as requiring additional noise barriers to mitigate an increased noise level.</p> <p>In terms of construction noise 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, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The air quality assessment, is set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2). This assesses all sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant air quality effects on human or ecological receptors.</p> <p>During construction with the application of the control measures set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) the assessment has concluded that there will be no significant effects from dust or construction traffic emissions.</p>	
30	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Environmental - amenity	<p>Respondents express concern for the need to purchase the field which the respondent states no one is using. The respondent states that the Wetheriggs section is overgrown and neglected and that the area alongside the playing field is not for general public access other than to travel along the footpath and cycleway.</p>	<p>This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space." As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space".</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						replacement land interacts with existing public spaces.	
9	TR0200030			Environmental - drainage	Respondents express concern that the existing foul water leakage imposing potential health risks from the park drains on Kemplay Bank.	National Highways notes the concern in regards existing leakage of foul water. This is a matter for the local authority and is not in the scope of the Project proposals. However, National Highways will relay these concerns to the local authorities and will seek to work with them during the next phase of the Project to determine if improvements can be made.	No
92	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Environmental - amenity	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern regarding the impact on the area, both in terms of the overall impact on Wetheriggs Country Park, on its users, and on the ability of the residual area to support formal sports pitches as it does at present.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public spaces.	Yes
10	TR0200035			Environmental – noise and air quality	Respondents express concern related to disruption, noise and dust pollution on Kemplay Bank, as respondent is local to the potential construction works.	National Highways notes the concerns relating to disruption, noise and dust pollution during construction at Kemplay Bank.. In terms of traffic disruption during construction, the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>developed further in the detailed design stage ahead of the construction phase.</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.</p> <p>In terms of noise during construction, ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) assesses the impacts of noise occurring as a result of the construction of the Project, including construction activities and construction traffic. Construction noise mitigation measures set out in that chapter and brought forward into the Mitigation Schedule (Application Document 2.9) and EMP (Application Document 2.7) are intended to minimise and control the impacts of construction noise on local residents.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The assessment set out in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of construction dust. Construction dust mitigation measures set out in that chapter and brought forward into the Mitigation Schedule (Application Document 2.9) and EMP (Application Document 2.7) are intended to minimise and control the impacts of construction on dust on local residents such that the effects are not significant.	
11	TR0200035			Environmental – amenity - land	Respondents express concern related to loss of existing green space at Kemplay Bank.	All areas of semi-natural habitats and green space have been avoided and retained where practicable. Where this has not been the case, replacement planting and additional habitats (including areas of species-rich grassland, woodlands, wetlands, ponds and hedgerow) has been developed and set out within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). ES Chapter 14 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) assesses the effects on Community Land and Assets. The assessments confirm a minor adverse effect during	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>construction on green space (including Wetheriggs Country Park and Skirsgill Park) which with mitigation is considered not significant when the scheme is completed.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts on protected species as a result of the Project have been fully assessed and mitigated for, where required, and are detailed in full within the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
111	TR0200091			Environmental – noise and pollution	<p>Respondent express concern relating to traffic and noise pollution increases as a direct consequence of the proximity of residents living near Wetheriggs Country Park to the A66 proposed improvement route/s. Respondent is concerned that the potential change in landscape, increased traffic noise and emissions will reduce the enjoyment of outside space impacting health and well being.</p>	<p>The results of the noise and vibration impact assessment are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), The assessment concludes that no additional noise mitigation measures, beyond the embedded design mitigation such as low noise road surfacing, are required within this area.</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 air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>effects on sensitive human receptors, within 200m of the ARN at Kemplay Bank.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). A photomontage at Wetheriggs Country Park is included within the ES.</p> <p>At Wetheriggs Country Park the Project will minimise impacts on mature tree canopy and enhancement of the Park through woodland management and sensitive replanting.</p>	
8	TR0200030			Environmental – landscape and visual	Respondents express concern that trees will be lost on the southern edge of the park on Kemplay Bank.	The feedback in regards tree retention at the south side of the park is noted. Environmental Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8) identify the removal of these trees due to construction works and proposals include for replacement trees to be planted in this area. An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). A photomontage at Wetheriggs	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Country Park is included within the ES.</p> <p>At Wetheriggs Country Park the Project will minimise impacts on mature tree canopy and enhancement of the Park through woodland management and sensitive replanting, these measures are secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The ES identifies that during construction and Year 1 recreational users on Wetheriggs Country Park would be subject to a significant visual effect. However during Year 15, the visibility of the scheme would reduce due to the combination of the existing vegetation being in leaf and the establishment of the proposed planting, which would also be in leaf. This increased integration of the scheme within the landscape and its reduced perception due to the underpass construction and the establishment of the proposed planting would result in no significant effects on visual receptors.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
27	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Design	Respondents suggest amending the current design by removing the lay-by as its believed to encourage environmental issues such as littering. Respondent suggest that the lay-by at Crow Wood is suitable, already constructed to a higher standard thus making it safer and also has the potential to be enlarged should further vehicle provision be considered necessary.	Lay-bys have been located/spaced in accordance with National Highways latest design standards. Measures will be incorporated to discourage littering and other anti-social behaviour.	No
33	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Environmental - amenity	Respondents suggest controls introduced for the benefit of the residents if the field is opened to the public to ensure the field does not fall into disrepair.	An appropriate maintenance regime will be implemented to minimise the risk of the new area of public open space falling into disrepair. Measures such as new fencing and litter bins will be introduced to help mitigate against some of the issues raised regarding litter and dog waste. Details for the proposals on open space land would be developed with the relevant local authorities and would consider aspects such as maintenance, boundary treatments etc. National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree maintenance responsibilities.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
64	TR0200055			Environmental - landscape	Respondents suggest planting/landscaping will be required at Wetherby Country Park.	At Wetheriggs Country Park the Project will minimise impacts on mature tree canopy and enhancement of Wetheriggs Country Park through woodland management and sensitive replanting. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) provide an indication of how planting could be implemented in this area. The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures the implementation of proposed planting mitigation measures.	Yes
49	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Environmental - landscape	Respondents suggest the number of trees in the park be increased and include deciduous and not just replacement trees.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting. Further detail on proposed planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Annex B1 of EMP – Application Document 2.7) sets out the proposed native woodland species including deciduous trees to be planted.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
5	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Environmental - noise	Respondents suggest trees are planted to mitigate noise and emissions at Kemplay Bank.	The use of trees to act as acoustic screening to minimise noise is not effective in providing substantive noise mitigation. The results of the noise and vibration impact 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. The assessment considers potential noise impacts in this location and concludes that no additional noise mitigation measures, beyond the embedded design mitigation such as low noise road surfacing, are required within this area.	No
46	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Environmental -amenity/ landscaping	Respondents suggest the space to the north of the A66 where there are currently swings could be turned into a football pitch. Adding there is speculation that the current football pitch may be in the way of replacement tree planting. However the respondent does encourage the replacement of trees from the M6 to Kemplay.	The suggestion around turning the existing open space with swings into a football pitch is noted. We will continue to engage with relevant stakeholders to in determining the layout and intended use of the area, including planting. Current proposals include for public open space with amenity tree and shrub planting.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Further detail on how planting could be implemented in this area is contained within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures the requirement for planting proposals and sets out the species to be planted and how they will be managed.	
120	TR0200071			Consultation	Respondent express concern regarding the potential environmental impact of the road on Kemplay Bank. The respondent states they have received conflicting information about whether and how the road will expand (it was suggested it would only expand to the south, which is not correct), about whether and how many trees will be removed.	The widening of the road to the north and south was presented at statutory consultation in autumn 2021. The plans showed environmental mitigation to reinstate the woodland edge to the north around Wetheriggs Country Park. The road is to be widened mostly to the south, but with some landtake to the north (as shown on the supplementary consultation maps). The proposals which form part of the supplementary consultation only relate to the re-provision of the new open space and reduction of landtake to the north. The 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						landscape character of the area. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. Where possible mature trees are retained. Where this is not possible mitigation measures include restoring and enhancing landscape features such as hedgerows, trees, woodland and grassland planting.	
119	TR0200071			Environmental - ecology	Respondents express concern regarding the potential environmental impact of Kemplay Bank scheme stating the road eats into a wild area that is well used by the people of Penrith and contains animals, insects, plants and trees. The large trees are many decades old and provide a screen between the road and the houses. You propose to increase the traffic on the road while removing the natural screen.	<p>Potential adverse impacts on protected species as a result of the Project have been fully assessed and mitigated for, where required, and are detailed in full within the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The impact on trees and woodland within Wetheriggs Country Park will be minimised as far as possible and any trees lost will be replaced to maintain screening. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outline how the ecological and landscape mitigation planting can be applied and the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Annex B1 of the EMP Application Document 2.7) sets out the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						species to be planted and how the areas are to be managed.	
29	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Evaluation/consultation	Respondent has collated local residents' views on the consultation activities. Residents stated that the response questionnaire was too generic, and that more information on the Project design is needed in order for them to be able to provide definitive responses.	This was a supplementary consultation, focused on specific design changes proposed since the autumn 2021 consultation. Consultation Brochures were provided that set out details of the proposed changes, including maps, reasons for the proposed changes and reference to the likely environmental impacts of the change. The Feedback Form included questions specific to the changes proposed and an opportunity to provide general comments.	No
53	TR0200048			Existing drainage problems	Respondents express concern for ongoing sewerage problems already existing in Wetheriggs Country Park.	This existing drainage issue is not currently part of the scope of the Project, however National Highways will continue to work closely with United Utilities during the next phase of the Project to determine if improvements can be made as part of the diversionary works required to facilitate the Project.	Yes
95	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Existing drainage problems	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern regarding existing drainage issues from pipes beneath existing A66	National Highways will continue to work closely with United Utilities during the next phase of the Project to determine if	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					adding that the proposals provide the chance to rectify these issues.	improvements can be made as part of the diversionary works required to facilitate the Project.	
18	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Financial and security	Respondents express concern for the financial and security impacts to the properties which currently privately own the field given the proposal for it to become a public area.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders including consideration of security and privacy. The Project will incorporate suitable planting and fencing to screen and secure boundaries of the proposed public open space field in the vicinity of Kemplay Bank as appropriate.	Yes
32	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Financial - land	Respondents express concern for the financial impact on the residential properties which currently enjoy private and secure field to their rear, if the field is opened to the public.	National Highways recognises the concerns raised around the provision of the field for replacement public open space and the perceived impacts on local houses. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders regarding this matter. The field in question is currently in private ownership and could be sold at any time. The DCO intends to secure possession of the land and provide it as replacement public open space, to be maintained and managed in the same way as the park is currently. Boundary treatment including fencing and planting will be developed further	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						during the detailed design stage to ensure the area between the park and the A66 is secure and safe	
102			TR0200070	Environment - flooding	Respondents suggest that as part of the scheme design consideration is given to provide a solution to the problem of waste-water and sewage that collects and floods the Wetheriggs Country Park area.	Upgrading of the existing drainage issue is not part of the scope of the Project. However National Highways will continue to work closely with United Utilities during the next phase of the Project to determine if improvements can be made as part of the diversionary works required to facilitate the Project.	Yes
45	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Access - footpath access	Respondents suggest that access from Wetheriggs Country Park to the path behind KFC be considered. Adding a surfaced path would be ideal.	The suggested improvement does not fall within the direct scope of the A66 Project. However, National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public open space.	Yes
19	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			General - amenity	Respondents express concern related to the opening of the private field and its potential deterioration as a result, using the deterioration that has been seen in the neighbouring Wetheriggs Country Park as an example.	An appropriate maintenance regime will be implemented to minimise the risk of the new area of public open space falling into disrepair. Measures such as new fencing and litter bins will be introduced to help mitigate against some of the issues raised	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						regarding litter and dog waste. Details for the proposals on open space land would be developed with the relevant local authorities and would consider aspects such as maintenance, boundary treatments etc. National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree maintenance responsibilities.	
13	ANON-6V39-79CX-3			General – land	Respondents express concern that extra land taken could impact on the provision of the full size football pitch (known as the crescent). Respondent stresses the importance of this football pitch as it is in high demand.	The football pitch (known as the Crescent) to the north east of the M6 J40 is not impacted by the Project and will remain useable throughout the duration of the works and after the Project has been completed.	Yes
52	TR0200048			General - flooding	Respondents express support for linking the field to Wetheriggs Country Park on the condition that the park is expanded safely for flooding stating that the lower pathway is currently prone to flooding.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders regarding the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths. National Highways note the respondents' concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.2). The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 will be implemented at detailed design stage.</p>	
22	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Land - amenity	Respondents oppose proposal of new open space stating that the current land being replaced is not used and neglected.	<p>This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space." As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with a with a equivalent, suitable area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space".</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public spaces.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
106	TR0200026			Land - amenity	Respondents oppose the idea that the plans will improve the boundary between the park and the A66.	National Highways consider that additional amenity planting measures will offer overall improvements to this area including the boundary between the park and the A66. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the planting could be delivered within the Order Limits and the EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures planting mitigation proposals.	No
116			TR0200100	General - Oppose	Respondent formally objects to the scheme to protect their assets and ensure that electrical supplies are not put at risk or compromised. Respondent states that it is standard procedure to object until the Development Consent Order has been submitted.	National Highways has carried out a preliminary consultation with all Statutory Undertakers and will continue to do this through the formal statutory processes during subsequent stages of the Project development.	No
14	ANON-6V39-79CX-3			General - land	Respondent suggest that there could be sufficient space to allow extra land to be taken by the A66 upgrade, and retain a full size football pitch, but that this might require adequate fencing between the A66 upgrade and the football pitch.	The football pitch north east of M6 J40 is not directly impacted by the Project. and will remain useable throughout the duration of the works and after the Project has been completed.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
117			TR0200100	Further engagement	Respondents suggest National Highways engage with Northern Power engineers and the Design Team Manager if not already done so and there may be a re-charge for the engineers time reviewing the proposals.	National Highways has carried out a preliminary consultation with all Statutory Undertakers (including Northern Power) and will continue to do this through the formal statutory processes during subsequent stages of Project development.	No
103			TR0200070	General - Amenity	Respondents suggest that seating, interpretation boards, measures to enhance biodiversity, and the provision for informal recreation such as a children's play park will add value to the area. Respondent suggests lighting is included for the designated footpaths in Wetheriggs Country Park to allow for them to be used throughout the year.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders regarding the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths, planting and seating where appropriate. Current proposals in this area include for public open space with amenity tree and shrub planting. An indication of how planting could be implemented within this area is shown within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and proposed planting mitigation measures are secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	Yes
47	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			General - land	Respondents support that the land highlighted yellow (referring the proposed reprovided open space shown in yellow in the consultation brochure) is suitable to replace the open space that would be lost.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the proposed replacement public open space land.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
115			TR0200100	Land / DCO (PPs) /	Respondents support the Kemplay Bank scheme stating Northern Powergrid welcome engagement with National Highways on the proposal, however due to the level of detail available at this stage continue to object to the proposals until such time their engineers are satisfied that their statutory duty is not compromised	National Highways have carried out a preliminary engagement with all utility companies commensurate with the stage of the Project. Further engagement will take place at the next phase of the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary works.	No
16		Historic England		General - support	Historic England express support for the Kemplay Bank scheme.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme.	No
4		The Ramblers		General - support	The Ramblers express support for the Kemplay Bank scheme and extension of the Country Park.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme.	No
12	TR0200035			General - oppose	Respondent express general opposition to the proposals for Kemplay Bank.	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 feasibility and preliminary design stages.. 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 in 2019.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The proposals and plans have been through a detailed and robust design and assessment process during the current stage including extensive consultation and engagement with stakeholders. It is National Highways view following the rigorous evaluation undertaken that the proposed scheme at Kemplay is the most suitable scheme to take forward for inclusion in a Development Consent Order.	
7	TR0200030			General - footpaths	Respondent suggest footpaths, trees and seats are included in the Kemplay Bank proposals without providing more detail.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths, planting and seating where appropriate.	Yes
118			TR0200100	DCO / PPs	Respondent express opposition to the scheme until they receive confirmation that National Highways will be responsible for all of associated costs of diversion of apparatus, plant and or equipment that may be required as a result of the Project.	National Highways has carried out preliminary consultation with all Statutory Undertakers and will continue to do this through the formal statutory processes during subsequent stages of Project development.	No
66	TR0200056			Land take- Oppose	Respondents express concern for replacement of the blue area on the key map within the	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					consultation materials due to its lack of use and neglect question if the land take is needed.	of "Public Open Space". As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space".	
67	TR0200056			Land take-Public Access	Respondents express concern for the impact of opening the private field to their privacy, security and financial implications of their properties.	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space". As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders including consideration of security and privacy. The Project will incorporate suitable planting and fencing where appropriate to screen and secure boundaries.	Yes
38	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Land take	Respondents express concerns for opening the field in question as they deem it unnecessary due to the land proposed for replacement being unused and neglected.	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space". As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". National Highways	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public open space.	
89	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Land take - loss of public space	Respondents including Eden District Council oppose any plans which would involve the loss of public space.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the importance of retaining Public Open Space and will ensure there is no loss in the overall quantity of Public Open Space as a result of the Project. The Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". The feedback received to the autumn 2021 consultation as helped inform our proposals for the replacement of open space, as presented in the supplementary consultation.</p> <p>Special Category Land Plans (Application Document 5.15) indicate the Special Category Land being acquired or repurposed as part of the Project.</p> <p>At Wetheriggs Country Park National Highways need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acquire a strip of special category (open space) land 	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>(i.e. pink land with purple hatching);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acquire rights over another strip of open space land (i.e. blue land with purple hatching); and - take temporary possession of an area of open space (i.e. green land with purple hatching). <p>The land shaded grey is replacement land intended to re-provide the open space land which will be affected permanently by the scheme, where a length of the A66, to the south of Wetheriggs Country Park, is proposed to be widened.</p>	
76	TR0200056			Land take	Respondents oppose opening the field as they deem land loss as not requiring replacement.	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space." As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						replacement land interacts with existing public open space.	
17	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Land take	Respondents oppose the acquisition of the field as the area highlighted blue (it is understood that this is referring to the blue area identified on the on the key map within the consultation material) is not accessed by or used by people and is neglected and full of debris and therefore should not be replaced.	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space." As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public open space.	No
74	TR0200056			Land take - public access	Respondent expressing concern that of a footpath linking the area to Wetheriggs Park stating that no residents would be comfortable with a footpath passing through the field, particularly close to their properties.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths and consideration of security and privacy. The Project will incorporate suitable planting and fencing where appropriate to screen and secure boundaries.	Yes
69	TR0200056			Land take	Respondents oppose the land take adding the land to be acquired far outweighs the lost land.	This area highlighted blue on the key map within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space". As such	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space".	
99			TR0200070	Land take - support	Respondents support the new proposal should it mean the retention of more public open space for local residents.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the public open space proposal.	No
61	TR0200048			Amenity -safety and maintenance	Respondents express concern for the safety and flooding of Wetheriggs Country Park and the long term maintenance.	<p>An appropriate maintenance regime will be implemented to prevent the risk of the new area of public open space falling into disrepair. Measures such as new fencing and litter bins will be introduced to help mitigate against some of the issues raised regarding litter and dog waste. National Highways will continue to engage will affected stakeholders to agree maintenance responsibilities and ensure appropriate agreements are in place.</p> <p>In terms of flooding, the Flood Risk Assessment for the Project is set out in Appendix 14.2 of ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.4).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
91	TR0200069	Eden District Council and		Mitigation of Open Space	Respondents including Eden District Council express support for dualling the remaining single carriageway. However, the impacts of the Scheme on areas of Open Space at Kemplay Bank will require substantial mitigation.	National Highways acknowledges the importance of retaining Public Open Space, which is why we carried out this consultation on replacing that which would be lost through the proposed work. This will ensure there is no loss in the overall quantity of Public Open Space as a result of the Project. National Highways will continue to engage will affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths, planting and seating where appropriate. Further detail on proposed mitigation can be viewed in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	No
36	ANON-6V39-79C3-X TR0200056			Land - alternative	Respondents suggest an alternative for providing the new open space being a field to the rear of 21 to 37 Clifford Road becoming low maintenance wild flower meadow, which would provide an improved level of security.	The Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss of Public Open Space with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". The suggestion around creation of a flower meadow is noted however this suggestion would not be suitable in providing an equivalent public open space	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>area. National Highways are committed to ensuring the final arrangement of the new public open space brings the greatest benefit to the local community.</p> <p>The field is to be acquired with its use changed to public open space would provide a continuation of Wetheriggs Country Park. We will continue to engage with affected stakeholders including consideration of security and privacy.</p>	
34	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Mitigation /amenity /landscape and noise	<p>Respondents suggest a better alternative for how the new public open space at Wetheriggs Country Park could be improved: Removal of trees on south side of the field and replaced with a roadside barrier and lower growing vegetation which would mitigate noise/traffic.</p>	<p>The suggestion around lower growing planting and noise barrier is noted. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting.</p> <p>Environmental mitigation is determined on the basis of minimising likely significant effects. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has not identified the need for any additional noise mitigation (acoustic barrier) in this location. Further detail on the mitigation required and an outline of how it may be applied is provided within the Environmental Mitigation Maps</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 2.8) with mitigation secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
75	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Mitigation - footpath	Respondents suggest mitigation for residents if a footpath is included in the new public open space. They suggest screening, running footpath along school playing field or accommodation of path within vegetation barrier.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths and consideration of security and privacy. The works will incorporate suitable planting and fencing where appropriate to screen and secure boundaries.	Yes
98		Environment Agency		Mitigation - water abstraction	The Environment Agency suggest mitigation of impacts of development on abstraction, such as dewatering, are assessed and any detrimental effects identified are mitigated through appropriate measures (e.g. replacement supplies) and agreed with the relevant parties.	The effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water, have been assessed in detail. This is reported in detail in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). 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 implemented. This is secured	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
68	TR0200056			Mitigation - public access	Respondents suggest positive controls introduced for opening of the private field to mitigate the potential of deterioration as seen in Wetheriggs Country Park.	An appropriate maintenance regime will be implemented to minimise the risk of the new area of public open space falling into disrepair. Measures such as new fencing and litter bins will be introduced to help mitigate against some of the issues raised regarding litter and dog waste. Details for the proposals on open space land would be developed with the relevant local authorities and would consider aspects such as maintenance, boundary treatments etc. National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree maintenance responsibilities.	No
23	ANON-6V39-79C3-X TR0200056			Mitigation – biodiversity, noise	Respondents suggest replacing neglected trees on the south side of the field with low growing vegetation, close spaced adding this would provide a barrier to noise and traffic pollution and reduce risk of falling trees to new road.	The feedback in regards to replacement planting t the south side of the field is noted. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outline how the ecological and landscape mitigation planting may be applied. Annex B1 (the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out proposed tree	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>species to be planted and how the planting will be managed.</p> <p>Comments in regards the installation of low growing vegetation adjacent to the carriageway to mitigate noise and traffic pollution are noted.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has not identified the need for any additional noise mitigation (acoustic barrier) in this location.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 Air Quality has not identified any likely significant effects.</p>	
35	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Mitigation - amenity	Respondents suggest the removal of hedgerow (up to 19 and 21 Clifford Road) and incorporating a larger playground (retaining the existing equipment).	<p>The suggestion around removal of the existing hedgerow is noted.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting and recreational requirements.</p> <p>Further detail on proposed planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p>	No
71	TR0200056			Mitigation - amenity	Respondents suggest the removal of the hedgerow dividing the existing playing field and playground with the replacement	<p>The suggestion around removal of the existing hedgerow is noted.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					land being incorporated into an enlarged playground.	stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting and recreational requirements. Further detail on proposed planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	
37	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Mitigation - noise	Respondents suggests the removal of trees on south side of the field and replaced with a roadside barrier and lower growing vegetation which would mitigate noise/traffic.	The suggestion around low planting and noise barrier is noted. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting. Environmental mitigation is determined on the basis of minimising significant effects. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has not identified the need for any additional noise mitigation (acoustic barrier) in this location. Further detail on the mitigation required and an outline of how it may be applied can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Annex B1 Landscape And Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the species to be	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						planted and how they will be managed.	
107	TR0200027			Modified design	Respondent express support for this Scheme and the design connecting Wetheriggs Country Park to Kemplay roundabout.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for this Scheme.	No
94	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Modified design	Respondents including Eden District Council suggest a full study of the redesign of the Kemplay area (between the junction with the M6 and the Kemplay roundabout) to mitigate the proposals and facilitate an agreement on an acceptable way forward. Respondents suggest that this should be funded by National Highways and include discussions with the local football association, current users of the pitches and other relevant bodies (without specifying which ones).	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public open space. The works planned for the Kemplay Bank roundabout have only a small incursion on the public open space at Wetheriggs Park and do not take any of the existing football pitches in this location. There is a small impact on the area used for supporters but this will be largely during the construction period with land being returned to the park post-construction. We will continue to work with park users throughout this process.	No
78	TR0200056			Modified design - alternative lay-by	Respondents suggest alternative lay-by already in place at Crow Wood has the potential to be	National Highways is aware of some anti social behaviour associated with the lay-by at Wetheriggs. However lay-bys	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					increased in size, reducing land take requirement from the park.	have been located in accordance with National Highways latest design standards as well as trying to maintain existing provision where practicable so it is unlikely that this lay-by can close. However we can look at measures to discourage littering and other anti-social behaviour in the detailed design stage of the project.	
21	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Modified design - alternative footpath	<p>Respondents suggest alternatives for the new footpath linking the area and Wetheriggs Country Park:</p> <p>For the footpath to be wholly screened from the houses;</p> <p>For the footpath to run along the school field boundary fence and turning left to join the new A66 cycle/pathway;</p> <p>Entering the Wetheriggs Country Park adjacent to the current footpath. Or the path be wholly accommodated within the new boundary vegetation barrier preserving wildlife habitats, it would address the security/privacy concerns of residents.</p>	<p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths, planting, boundary treatments and security measures where appropriate.</p> <p>More information on the Public Rights of Way (ProW) identified or affected as part of the Project are contained 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
77	TR0200056			Modified design - boundary treatment	Respondents suggest boundary to the park be improved if proposed lay-by were removed from plans.	Lay-bys have been located in accordance with National Highways latest design standards as well as trying to maintain existing provision where practicable. Boundary treatment will be developed further during detailed design stage to ensure the Park is secure, safe and is screened appropriately. Measures will be incorporated to discourage littering and other anti-social behaviour.	No
39	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Modified design – lay-by	Respondents suggest that the lay-by adjacent to the Wetheriggs Country Park be removed from the Project plans, as the present lay-by has waste and littering issues.	<p>Lay-bys have been located in accordance with National Highways latest design standards as well as trying to maintain existing provision. Measures will be incorporated to discourage littering and other anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Lay-bys have been designed so as to minimise their size, to specifically discourage longer staying and overnight parking by HGV drivers which will minimise litter. The responsibility for litter collection for this section of the A66 sits with Cumbria County Council.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
40	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Modified design – lay-by	Respondents suggest that there is already a suitable alternative lay-by, already constructed and capacity to be improved at Crow Wood.	Lay-bys have been located in accordance with National Highways latest design standards as well as trying to maintain existing provision or re-use existing lay-bys where practicable.	No
87	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Noise - revise PEI Report receptors	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern that the approach carried out is contrary to the Good Acoustic Design process and does not allow for a full understanding of the impact of the amended Scheme on residential properties. Previously the PEI Report set out the numbers of residential and non-residential receptors that would have significant adverse effects and those which would benefit from the scheme. It would have been helpful if these numbers had been revised to reflect the changes and included in the consultation documents.	<p>The methodology for the noise and vibration assessment follows the guidance set out within National Highways Standard Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and government policy defined within Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). Good Acoustic Design relies on the same policy documents as used for this assessment. LA 111 has been developed specifically for assessing noise impacts and their significance for highway schemes and describes the procedures used in the assessment.</p> <p>The proposed changes were reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI Report, which was published at the autumn 2021 consultation. It was concluded that none of these changes would, and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirmed that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable. Since the PEI Report the Project design has undergone refinement. An updated traffic modelling exercise has also been undertaken to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project has been assessed out following Autumn 2021 Consultation. The ES, Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) assessment is informed by the traffic modelling carried out. The ES chapter identifies the likely effects on residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures.	
50	ANON-6V39-79CM-R			Noise, Air Quality – lack of information	Respondents express concern that they would like to know more about the noise mitigation and atmospheric pollution which would impact during and after the works.	The design proposals consulted on at supplementary consultation relate to the proposed replacement open space and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Had requested more information. Original plans were not clear and changes suggest now could make it worse.	would not impact on road noise or atmospheric pollution. The material published for statutory consultation was based on the information available at that time. It was developed with the purpose of gaining feedback on the Project proposals and for that feedback to be taken into consideration as part of the continuing scheme development up to the time of submitting the DCO application. 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 includes embedded mitigation such as a lower noise road surface, the use of cuttings, earth embankments and other physical features to reduce noise impacts during operation. The assessment determined that additional noise mitigation (noise barrier) was required at one location (Skirsgill Lodge) on the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank Scheme. Elsewhere on the Scheme no additional mitigation is	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>recommended. The location of noise barrier is presented on the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</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, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	
15	TR0200036			Noise and air pollution	Respondents suggest mitigation for noise and air pollution on Kemplay Bank.	<p>The results of the noise and vibration impact assessment are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2), Our noise assessment indicates that no additional noise mitigation measures beyond embedded mitigation (which includes low noise surfacing) are required within this area.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that the low noise surfacing and other measures embedded into the design are sufficient to mitigate</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>impacts and ensure no likely significant effects and no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, is set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2). This assesses all sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant air quality effects on human or ecological receptors and no mitigation is therefore proposed.</p> <p>During construction with the application of the control measures set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) the assessment has concluded that there will be no significant effects from dust or construction traffic emissions.</p>	
113	TR0200091			Privacy - local residents	Respondents oppose proposed plan for the Country Park and believes if it goes ahead it will cause privacy and security issues for local residents.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including footpaths and consideration of security and privacy. The works will incorporate suitable planting and fencing where appropriate to screen and secure boundaries. An indication	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						of how planting could be implemented in this area is shown within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) indicating that the park will be screened using woodland planting. Planting proposals are secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Boundary treatment will be developed further during the detailed design stage.	
90	TR0200069	Eden District Council		Public open space - loss of space	Respondents including Eden District oppose the loss of public open space and refer to the National Planning Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN) to highlight the importance of Public Open Space as they believe is such at Wetheriggs Country Park	National Highways acknowledges the importance of retaining Public Open Space, which is why this consultation was carried out giving details of replacing that which would be lost. National Highways will ensure there is no loss in the overall quantity of Public Open Space as a result of the Project. The Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "Public Open Space". Special Category Land Plans (Application Document 5.15) indicate the Special Category Land being acquired or repurposed as 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>At Wetheriggs Country Park National Highways need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acquire a strip of special category (open space) land (i.e. pink land with purple hatching); - acquire rights over another strip of open space land (i.e. blue land with purple hatching); and - take temporary possession of an area of open space (i.e. green land with purple hatching). <p>The land shaded grey is replacement land intended to re-provide the open space land which will be affected permanently by the scheme, where a length of the A66, to the south of Wetheriggs Country Park, is proposed to be widened.</p>	
112	TR0200091			Land / Public Open Space - request further information	<p>Respondents express concern raising queries in relation to the loss of land due to the scheme at Wetheriggs Country Park as outlined in the Supplementary Consultation brochure 2021/22. The respondents are not in agreement with the proposed loss of land from the Wetheriggs Country Park directly behind their property and disagree with the</p>	<p>This area at Wetheriggs Country Park highlighted within the consultation materials falls under the definition of "Public Open Space". As such the Project is legally obligated to mitigate this loss with an equivalent, suitable compensatory area to be reclassified as "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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>proposed purchase of the adjoining field since this would lead to increased footfall, loss of privacy and possible security issues for all the residents of Clifford Road bordering the park.</p>	<p>Special Category Land Plans (Application Document 5.15) indicate the Special Category Land being acquired or repurposed as part of the Project. At Wetheriggs Country Park National Highways need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - acquire a strip of special category (open space) land (i.e. pink land with purple hatching); - acquire rights over another strip of open space land (i.e. blue land with purple hatching); and - take temporary possession of an area of open space (i.e. green land with purple hatching). <p>The land shaded grey is replacement land intended to re-provide the open space land which will be affected permanently by the scheme, where a length of the A66, to the south of Wetheriggs Country Park, is proposed to be widened.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						replacement land interacts with existing public open space.	
114	TR0200091			Request further information – plans and drawings	Respondents suggest more detailed information required on plans and drawings to provide further comments.	<p>The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback on the change. The materials included a mini brochure providing further information which was supported by the technical documents which were made available at local deposit points and online. Should the DCO application be accepted, there will then be an opportunity for the public to register with the Planning Inspectorate to become an Interested Party by making a Relevant Representation, expressing their views on the Project. As an Interested Party you will be invited to submit your views and attend meetings at appropriate points in the examination process.</p> <p>The purpose of the consultation on the replacement public open space was to understand stakeholders' views on the land proposed and how they might like to see it designed. We will</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>continue to engage as we move into the detailed design phase of the project.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders to maximise the benefit to the local community including consideration of how the replacement land interacts with existing public open space.</p>	
43	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Consultation - questionnaire	Respondents express concern for Kemplay Bank. The respondents considered the response questionnaire was bland and felt to be a generic document. Greater discussion and more detailed information need.	The response questionnaire asked questions which allowed respondents to draft an open response. The intention was not to limit the response and to allow respondents to raise the issues and concerns that they consider important to them and their communities. The feedback form also sat alongside a mini brochure providing further information and was supported by the technical documents which were made available at local deposit points and online.	No
44	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Requests further information - more detailed information	Respondents express concern that a lack of firm design proposals affects their ability to give a definitive response. Further consultation required when more	The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback on the change.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					detailed design is available to be discussed.	The purpose of the consultation on the replacement public open space was to understand stakeholders' views on the land proposed and how they might like to see it designed. We will continue to engage as we move into the detailed design phase of the project. Should the DCO application be accepted, there will then be an opportunity for the public to register with the Planning Inspectorate to become an Interested Party by making a Relevant Representation, expressing their views on the Project. As an Interested Party you will be invited to submit your views and attend meetings at appropriate points in the examination process.	
108	TR0200027			Safety - WCH	Respondents express concern about the safety of pedestrians and their ability to cross both the existing and proposed A66 roads.	The Project will upgrade and provide new crossing facilities where required to re-route pedestrians to Kemplay bank. Traffic signals will be provided at Kemplay Bank Roundabout to ensure safe crossing facilities are provided around the junction and adequate linkage is provided with existing facilities.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
31	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Safety - property	Respondents express concern for the security of the residential properties due to potential loss of privacy which is currently provided by the existing adjacent field being enclosed and shielded by the road screening.	National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders regarding the layout and intended use of the new public open space area, including footpaths, planting, boundary treatments and security measures where appropriate.	Yes
100			TR0200070	Safety / noise	<p>Respondents suggest:</p> <p>i) acoustic barriers to reduce noise impact on residents and users of Wetheriggs Country Park</p> <p>ii) with the pavement on the eastbound side of the A66 becoming a public right of way, adding segregation of a hedge to the pavement would increase safety.</p>	<p>i) A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration. With the application of embedded design mitigation, including low noise road surface, earth bunds and cuttings, it has been concluded that a noise barrier is not required at this location.</p> <p>Further illustrative detail on how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>ii) Additional planting/ and screening and boundary treatment will be provided which will demark</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the walking area for safety purposes along the northern side of the carriageway. Final fencing specification will be considered further at the next stage of design development.	
6		The Ramblers		Separation	The Ramblers suggest green barrier along the north side and fencing for separation on Kemplay Bank.	Additional planting/screening and boundary treatment will be provided which will demark the walking area for safety purposes along the northern side of the carriageway. Final fencing specification will be considered further at the next stage of design development.	Yes
3		The Ramblers		Safety - WCH	The Ramblers suggest segregated footpath for Kemplay Bank between junction 40 and Kemplay.	It is recognised that this is an important walking route and measures to improve this facility have been incorporated in the design . We are proposing to widen the existing shared footway/cycleway facility to facilitate segregation. However, the exact layout will be developed further during the detailed design stage.	Yes
70	ANON-6V39-79C3-X, TR0200056			Security - public access	Respondents express concern that opening the public open space field will impact on residents privacy and security.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders including consideration of security and privacy. The Scheme will	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						incorporate suitable planting and fencing where appropriate to screen and secure boundaries.	
25	ANON-6V39-79C3-X			Social - amenity	Respondent suggest expanding current play area by removing the neglected hedgerow which separates the field from the playing area.	The suggestion around removal of the existing hedgerow is noted. National Highways will continue to engage will all affected stakeholders to agree the layout and intended use of the area, including planting. Further detail on proposed planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	No
104			TR0200070	Social - land	Respondents express concern for the future management and maintenance plans of new field and would welcome the opportunity for the asset to be transferred into their ownership and management. This POS would replace other green space lost by the respondent as part of the A66 project.	We are planning to implement an appropriate maintenance regime to minimise the risk of the new area of public open space falling into disrepair. Measures such as new fencing and litter bins will be introduced to help mitigate against some of the issues raised regarding litter and dog waste. National Highways will continue to engage with affected stakeholders and the local authority to in relation to maintenance responsibilities.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to ‘Temple Sowerby to Appleby’ and National Highways regard to the comments

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
539	163963, 164712, 164725, 164726	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council, Cumbria County Council	164332, 164723	Alternative route - design	Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions for alternative route designs, including: (1) moving the Long Marton junction to Appleby; (2) consider keeping Long Marton Road on the same alignment and taking it over the proposed A66 (3) Realign Long Marton Road so it is more sympathetic to the field boundaries (4) Move the realigned Long Marton East to avoid Roman Vale Farm (5) Introduce a junction on the existing section of A66 for the Cross Croft Industrial Estate (6) Reduce footprint of Long Marton Road and address safety issues associated with short link to existing A66	(1) National Highways carried out a comprehensive optioneering exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) (Application Document 4.1). 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. Since the Statutory Consultation in Autumn the proposed eastbound entry slip road near the fair field and the proposed westbound left in / left out junction close to Crackenthorpe have been removed from the Scheme. Traffic would be able to leave the A66	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and travel past the Appleby Fair field before passing under the A66 and travelling into Appleby as it does currently. Traffic wishing to travel west from Appleby would leave Appleby as it does now and then proceed along the existing A66. It is then able to join the new A66 at the Long Marton Junction, or it can continue along the existing A66 and re-join the A66 at the Temple Sowerby.</p> <p>The westbound slip road out of Appleby will become two-way rather than one-way as it is currently. This would allow local traffic to use the existing A66 to access Appleby at this point if required. The traffic flows on the existing A66 would be much lower than current levels as the majority of the traffic that currently uses it would be on the new dual carriageway.</p> <p>(2) There is a need to have a junction on Long Marton Road, and because accident rates are typically higher at junctions, compliance with the design standards is important. It has not been possible to achieve the design standards when trying to keep Long Marton Road on its</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>current alignment, and the associated risks with user safety are not acceptable. An online solution would have impacted on the Roman Camp, scheduled monument due to the earthworks and structures required.</p> <p>(3) The current proposed alignment of Long Marton Road is the most economical design that can achieve the design standards. As with point 3 above, the road must have a junction and that junction must comply with the design standards. The design involves the minimum amount of excavation to reduce the impact on the environment and the landscape.</p> <p>(4) Running the realigned Long Marton Road through the narrow and straight fields to the east of Roman Vale Farm was considered but this option was discounted for the same safety reasons given in points 2 and 3 above.</p> <p>(5) Providing additional junctions on existing dualled sections is outside of the scope of the Project.</p> <p>(6) The design of Long Marton Road has been designed to run around the hill to the north to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						reduce the amount of excavation and so reduce the impact on the landscape/environment.. The visibility requirements of the junction restricts options for minimising the depth of excavation. The distance between the southern link and the existing A66 is approximately 250m. It has been designed to accord to standards and was reviewed as part of the Road Safety Audit undertaken on the scheme.	
549	164295	Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Alternative route - design	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council making suggestions for alternative routes and road designs, including: moving the road further north-east to avoid the need for a cut in a drumlin; making the junction of Main Street and Fell Lane the main route; making slip roads longer and straight, rather than curved; and making the southern part of the new junction by Sandersons Croft a motorway-style junction.	National Highways carried out a comprehensive optioneering exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1). 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	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>designated areas including AONBs and cultural heritage.</p> <p>The junction has been moved from Main Street to Fell Lane, making Fell Lane the main route in/out of Kirkby Thore. The main factor in this decision was based around road safety, and the concerns surrounding the existing width and alignment of Main Street beyond its junction with Fell Lane.</p> <p>A number of layouts were considered for this junction including a motorway style junction (diamond) with slip roads parallel to the A66. The comparison assessment concluded that a compact grade separated junction as shown on the current plans represented the best solution.</p> <p>One of the main issues associated with a motorway style junction (diamond) at this location relates to the amount of land that would be required to accommodate it. A very long westbound entry slip road (approximately twice the length of an average slip road) would be required to provide sufficient visibility due to the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>curvature of the new A66 at this location.</p> <p>Additionally at this location the route is constrained by the Gypsum mineworking's so it is not possible to move the junction any further to the north to avoid affecting the drumlin.</p>	
627	163960, 163986, 164037, 164053, 164151, 164158, 164338, 164712	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council	164150	Alternative route - design	<p>Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council suggesting that alternative routes be adopted instead, including a return to the statutory consultation proposals for Appleby junction and westbound exit road, on the grounds that these involved shorter distances into Appleby, allowed eastbound access to Fair Hill, facilitated HGV access; an on-junction for eastbound traffic by the Appleby industrial estate, which could exist alongside the Long Marton junction; alternative designs for a westbound slip road; an eastbound junction from Long Marton Road; and widening Long Marton Road (as it was never designed to carry A road traffic).</p>	<p>National Highways carried out a comprehensive optioneering exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1). 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 comparison assessment concluded that a junction at Long Marton be included to provide</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>access to and from the new A66 in all directions. This is a short distance from Appleby. The proposals will not impact current access arrangements of HGV's.</p> <p>It is not necessary to have a junction at Long Marton Lane end and at Appleby, as they are just 3km apart and have relatively low levels of traffic. Traffic travelling west will use the existing A66 and join at the Long Marton Junction (with a minimal delay compared with having a junction at Appleby), and for traffic travelling east there will be no change from the current situation. There is minimal effect on distances travelled.</p> <p>Eastbound access to the A66 dual carriageway from Fair Hill (modifying the existing junction) cannot be safely achieved because of the existing junction with Roman Road.</p> <p>By including the junction at Long Marton, National Highways have removed the need to include a new junction at Appleby. The existing arrangements would remain to allow traffic to exit the eastbound carriageway at this point to go into Appleby. The current westbound on slip would</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>be changed to allow two-way traffic so that traffic using the existing A66 would be able to enter and exit Appleby by using the old road. The removal of the eastbound junction at Appleby means that we no longer need to take land away from the Appleby fair field.</p> <p>The Project has no plans to widen Long Marton Road and is a matter for Cumbria County Council.</p> <p>Proposals to create a westbound junction using the existing slip road (B6542) or the existing A66 have been discounted due to engineering difficulties. On the west side of the railway bridge the proposed A66 dual carriageway turns north and cuts through the existing embankment to avoid Roger Head Farm and Crackenthorpe. It climbs as it turns to reduce the depth of excavation and so to minimise the effect on the landscape/environment. At the point where a connection between the existing B6542/A66 and the proposed dual carriageway can be made the level difference is significant, resulting in a substandard alignment. The</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						connection would also involve significant excavation which would have a negative effect on the landscape/environment. The only place where the level difference is not a problem is near the railway bridge. At this location the roads are too close to each other to achieve a suitable link between them for an all movement junction, and the proposed curve of the dual carriageway (turning it north) combined with the restricted visibility (caused by the railway bridge) presents safety issues when introducing a junction.	
151	164052, 164295, 164716, 164717	Eden District Council	164714	Communication - consultation	<p>Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern about the approach taken to consult for the supplementary consultation phase, including lack of notification letters.</p> <p>Respondents also expressing concern that the consultation could have involved engagement with a wider range of stakeholders rather than targeted at landowners especially to receive feedback on negative impacts and suitable mitigation measures.</p>	The supplementary consultation on the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme was related to proposed design changes to Kirkby Thore junction, Long Marton Lane End junction and Appleby junction. These changes were proposed in response to concerns raised to the statutory consultation in autumn 2021, in particular with regard to congestion, light pollution, HGV/LGV access and safety and the connectivity and proximity to the Roman Camp Scheduled Ancient Monument.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>All of the persons with an interest in the land and directly impacted by the changes were notified of the consultation by letter and/or email and meetings were also held. The Consultation Brochure, published as part of the supplementary consultation, provided details of the proposals including maps illustrating the proposed land take.</p> <p>A range of stakeholders were engaged in the consultation process (including host local authorities, statutory environmental bodies and the AONB Partnership). In addition, this included discussions with the Community Liaison Groups (CLG), including the Temple Sowerby to Appleby CLG scheme on 27 January 2022.</p> <p>Local communities, the general public and stakeholders are able to respond to the DCO application to the Examining Authority through the Examination process.</p>	
63	165005			Community compensation	A respondent suggesting compensation for those whose land would be affected by the proposals, without providing further detail.	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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						compensated in accordance with the statutory compensation code.	
583	164295	Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Community compensation	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council making suggestions regarding the local community, in particular that local residents should be compensated for the impact of the scheme through land allocation, which could be used for parking provision and the creation of playgrounds.</p>	<p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>In developing the scheme we consider the views of those who do not own or occupy land required for the proposed scheme but are nevertheless potentially affected by it. Development of scheme design drives our proposals for land acquisition, and our design considers your views, and those of the people living nearby.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
3	164726			Community impact - Appleby Horse fair	A respondent expressing concern over potential adverse impacts on the local community arising from the Project, stating that proposed stopped-up road from the A66 to Brougham could be used for anti-social behaviour during the Appleby Horse Fair.	<p>The design team has sought to minimise areas where stopped up carriageway creates an area with potential for inappropriate parking and anti-social behaviour while maintaining access to properties. National Highways will work with landowners during detailed design on how this access track is managed.</p> <p>On the southern side of the A66 we stop the Long Marton Road up from a short distance after Powis Cottages to the new A66 dual carriageway and there would be no access from the dual carriageway. Here, the majority of the old road is returned to agricultural use, north of the turning area adjacent to Powis Cottages. To the north however the old Long Marton Road needs to be retained for access to properties.</p> <p>An over/underpass on the existing alignment of Long Marton Road cannot be economically justified when Long Marton Road is being relocated 400m away and will provide a means for farm traffic to cross the proposed A66 dual carriageway.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
7	164717	Eden District Council		Community impact	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern over the impact that the Project could have on local communities, and that the scheme submitted for the DCO should minimise any adverse impacts on local residents and community amenities before these impacts be made permanent.	In accordance with the approach adopted throughout the design process, the design has sought to minimise adverse impacts on residential and local amenity, for example, ensuring continuity of rights of way. This process has been augmented by a thorough and open consultation process to allow the local community, including residents, to comment at more specific level of detail, and concerns arising have been noted. Throughout this stage of the Project we have worked with community liaison groups to understand and mitigate local issues and we will continue this process as we move through to construction should our application be successful. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the impact of the Project on amenity and identifies potential significant impacts and required mitigation measures. Mitigation measures are secured through implementation of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
52	164721			Community impact - infrastructure	A respondent raising concerns over the impact that the Kirkby Thore junction could have on infrastructure in the local area, with specific reference to the impact on British Gypsum. They express concern that the new route could reduce maintenance access to water supply boreholes and potentially damage water pipes, sewage pipes, gas mains, telecommunication links, and electrical lines to the plant.	The intention is to maintain access, connection to services and access to facilities required by local businesses as part of the works. Specifically, where boreholes would be impacted by the new route we will liaise closely during detailed design and construction phase to maintain access and supply. ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) assesses the potential impacts on water supply, including access to boreholes. There is no significant effect identified at the Kirkby Thore location.	No
83	163856, 163857, 163966, 163974, 163977, 164725	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council, Crackenthorpe Parish Council		Community impact - Appleby Horse Fair	Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council and Crackenthorpe Parish Council expressing concern on (1) the potential negative impact to the local community and their road access due to the Appleby Horse Fair. This includes concerns that (2) the proposed changes would benefit the Gypsy and Travelling community at the expense of local residents, who say they would be negatively impacted throughout the year. Respondents also (3) voicing concerns that parking for	(1) (2) While the removal of the planned works on the Appleby junction does remove the proposed east bound slip road from the design, the general access and egress for Appleby residents remains the same as it is currently. The removal of the proposed slip road from the design is primarily on safety grounds due to the close proximity of junctions in this area.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>the horse fair makes local roads difficult to access, and (4) therefore highway verges should be narrow to discourage parking, and (5) that the proposals could encourage camping on private land. One respondent expresses further concern (6) that the residents of Appleby should also be listened to in the same way the residents of Warcop were regarding their need for a junction.</p>	<p>The relocation of the new A66 was unpopular with local residents at options consultation. The proposals at this consultation do not change the location of the new A66. In addition the plans allow for a new east bound access into Appleby from Crackenthorpe as well as the existing westbound slip onto the existing A66.</p> <p>(3) (4) (5) The issue of parking on private land is outside of the scope of the Project however National Highways are liaising with the local authority and Multi-Agency Strategic Co-ordinating Group (MASCg) about safe stopping places to avoid caravans parking on verges which could present issues such as potentially obscuring visibility.</p> <p>(6) Following the statutory consultation process and ongoing engagement with stakeholders, landowners and those with an interest in the land, potential design changes were identified to several of the schemes. The supplementary consultation was required to inform and seek the views of local communities and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>relevant key stakeholders. Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report provides a summary of the matters raised through the supplementary consultations and this Annex explains how the Project has responded to this feedback.</p> <p>It is not necessary to have a junction at Long Marton Lane end and at Appleby, as they are just 3km apart and have relatively low levels of traffic. Traffic travelling west will use the existing A66 and join at the Long Marton Junction (with a minimal delay compared with having a junction at Appleby), and for traffic travelling east there will be no change from the current situation. There is minimal effect on distances travelled.</p> <p>By including the junction at Long Marton, National Highways have removed the need to include a new junction at Appleby. The existing arrangements would remain to allow traffic to exit the eastbound carriageway at this point to go into Appleby. The current westbound on slip would be changed to allow two-way traffic so that traffic using the existing A66 would be able to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						enter and exit Appleby by using the old road. The removal of the eastbound junction at Appleby means that we no longer need to take land away from the Appleby fair field.	
122	163743, 163852, 163856, 164051, 164153, 164295, 165005, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Eden District Council		Community impact - Sandersons Croft	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Eden District Council expressing concern over the (1) potential impact of the proposed Kirkby Thore junction on Sandersons Croft housing estate and that these proposed changes prioritise a smaller number of residents on Main Street. This includes concerns (2) about the impact on residents' parking especially for disabled badge holders; the (3) impact of moving the access for the Caravan Park creating greater light pollution from caravan movements; and (4) congestion should caravans have to be parked on local roads instead. Other (5) respondents state that the proposed changes could negatively impact the housing market in this area and (6) concern that compensation would not be provided until after completion of the Project. Respondents suggest the need for	(1)(3) The new proposed junction is closer to the properties at Sandersons Croft, but we are confident that this is a better location (compared to alternatives) to allow for mitigation of the issues raised at the autumn 2021 consultation event. Such mitigation includes increased planting to reduce headlight glare. There would be little change in the glare from vehicles exiting the caravan park. It should be noted that the current road alignment also faces the houses at Sandersons Croft. It is acknowledged that there will be an impact on the landscape in vicinity of Sandersons Croft, however it has been minimised as far as possible and opportunity to continue to reduce this will be sought in detailed design. An indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented in the Environmental Mitigation Maps	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					mitigation measures to work seamlessly to reduce potential impacts.	<p>(Application Document 2.8) and mitigation measures are secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The assessment of landscape and visual impacts is covered in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>In addition, the location of the proposed grade separated junction would intercept HGV movements to and from the Gypsum plant, which would result in markedly reduced traffic passing Sanderson's Croft.</p> <p>The primary reason for relocating the junction concerned the existing alignments of Fell Lane compared with Main Street (from its junction with Fell Lane in a northerly direction). Main street has an inconsistent and narrow carriageway width (making it difficult for larger vehicles to pass), poor horizontal alignment leading to poor visibility (which is associated with increased accident rates) and does not have footways (making it difficult for non-motorised users to travel along the road). For these reasons Main Street was not considered to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>be a suitable route to the junction, or to be suitable as the primary means of users crossing the A66 dual carriageway.</p> <p>(2) During the consultation we visited and reviewed the layby in question with local residents and can confirm the layby is not affected by the proposed design. Therefore, the existing parking provision will be similar to existing with minimal impact to the residents of Sandersons Croft.</p> <p>(4) The access to the industrial estate and caravan storage is to be improved, however this will not affect the space available for caravan storage and should not affect the number of caravans parking on the road. We will continue to work with local people on the detailed design.</p> <p>(5)(6) 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>scheme would not differ significantly from the baseline situation with only minor impact arising from a discernible change in amenity. 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.</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>	
133	163970, 163972, 163981, 163988, 163992, 163995, 163996, 163997, 163998, 164037,	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council		Community impact - economy	Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council expressing concern over the impact that the scheme could have on the local economy and economic growth of the town, as lengthening the route into Appleby would discourage passing trade, visitors and tourism. Respondents commenting that the proposals	For eastbound and westbound vehicles (including HGVs) requiring access/egress with Appleby, the scheme proposed does not have a significant impact on the routes or journey times. The junction at the east of Appleby is unaffected; at the west of Appleby, an additional junction would be implemented near Powis	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	164040, 164296				<p>would generally have a negative impact on local businesses, reduce HGV access to the Appleby Industrial estate, and would prioritise the business of the horse fair over local businesses. Respondents also note that the scheme could come at a substantial cost to the taxpayer.</p>	<p>House, and this would offer access / egress in both directions with the proposed A66. This junction would be accessed via the existing A66 - with markedly reduced traffic on this route.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are costs associated with the Project (both financial and environmental impact related costs). There also major benefits and opportunities associated with the Project including benefits to local communities and businesses. The Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) sets out these benefits and opportunities at a Project wide level and at a local (scheme) level. Section 6.4 of the Case for the Projects sets out the case including the benefits of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme and demonstrates how issues of severance, journey delays and road safety issues are addressed at a local level.</p> <p>In addition to the local benefits of the project there are major economic and transport benefits route wide. If the existing A66 route is not improved, it will constrain national and regional connectivity, due to its strategic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against these public, transport 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>.</p>	
158	163991, 164043, 164151, 164335, 164716			Community impact - property	Respondents expressing concern over the potential community impact of the Project, with particular mention of the inconvenience that the new layout could have on properties and residents in Appleby, Long Marton, and Crackenthorpe.	With regard to alternatives, National Highways carried out an optioneering exercise to compare the route options, details of which can be found within the PDOR (Reference Document 4.1). 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,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>carbon and conformity with the National Networks National Policy Statement including key policy tests and impacts on nationally designated areas.</p> <p>The proposed alignment of the new route is a significant distance from Crackenthorpe and Long Marton villages and no specific effects are identified.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed junction amendments do not change any of the existing access and egress at Appleby but do add in an additional east bound route to the west.</p> <p>An indication of how much time the scheme could save for Residents of Appleby, Crakenthorpe and Long Marton is provided by the traffic model. This shows that journey time savings for trips from Appleby, Crakenthorpe and Long Marton to Penrith could be between 3 and 4 minutes, with the scheme in place compared to the situation without the scheme.</p> <p>Compared to the previously consulted option, the westbound journey time from Appleby to Penrith is only 90 seconds longer using the Long Marton Junction,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compared to using the previously proposed westbound road at Appleby. Journeys from Appleby eastbound on the A66 will be unaffected.</p> <p>Compared to the previously consulted option journey times from Crakenthorpe and Long Marton to destinations on the A66 to the east will be largely unaffected, although residents travelling to destinations in the west would be expected to save between 30 seconds to a minute. The scheme will significantly reduce the flow on the existing A66 between Appleby, Crackenthorpe and the proposed junction at Long Marton. The modelled flow for 2019 (reflecting the current situation) is 19,000 vehicles per day. Without the scheme in place, this flow would rise to 22,000 vehicles per day by the opening year of 2029 due to traffic growth. However, with the scheme in place the flow on the road would drop to 2,700 vehicles per day in 2029. A drop in traffic flow of this volume would result in positive impact upon air quality and noise, will allow easier access to properties on the route and will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						be more amenable to those using active modes.	
167	164045, 164050, 164717	Eden District Council		Community impact - property	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern over the potential impact that the Project could have on the community, with particular reference to a loss of parking outside residential properties, potential adverse impact on the village school, and disturbance from an increase in traffic past residential properties.	<p>The alignment of the scheme around Kirkby Thore would mean significantly less Gypsum traffic through the village, and along the road near Sanderson's Croft. It would also mean that the industrial estate can be accessed directly from the A66 without the need for traffic to pass through the village.</p> <p>Works local to Kirkby Thore Primary School consist an improvement to the junction outside the main entrance where visibility will be substantially improved to make the junction safer, widened footways and improved crossing points for pedestrians, better access to, and safer use of Priest Lane for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians, and works will involve the realignment of Cross Street to take it over the proposed A66 dual carriageway. These works will not encroach into the school grounds. During the Supplementary Consultation we visited and reviewed the parking layby in question with local residents. Subsequently, we have been able</p>	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						to amend the plans to avoid this impact and retain the layby. We will continue to work with local people on the detailed design through liaison with the public liaison officers.	
172	164152			Community impact - design	Respondents expressing concern over the proposals severing Kirkby Thore residents from Fellside visually and physically.	<p>The northern bypass option was preferred by local residents at the Statutory consultation undertaken in autumn 2021.</p> <p>There will be a change to existing landscape and visual amenity, however we have minimised as the road in this location is largely in cutting at around 10m deep. The slopes of the road will be graded into the existing landscape to reduce visual impact of 'artificial' embankments. Physical connection would be retained with Public Rights of Way being maintained where possible and realigned over bridges to span the new road where this isn't possible. The Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity (Application Document 3.2) assesses the impact of the new route including viewpoints at various points across the Project. Proposed bunding would also help minimise visual impacts.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
230	163965, 164725, 164726	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council	164723	Community impact - property	<p>Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council expressing concern that moving the junction to Long Marton would negatively impact local businesses, on the grounds that construction could lead to a decline in property values, that the proposed design would have a negative impact on farming businesses including at Roman Vale and could lead to a reduction in visitors to Appleby.</p>	<p>The adoption of junction location at Long Marton is more optimal in terms of the impact of land resource required, and in turn is a more compact arrangement than a junction at Appleby. Motorists travelling eastbound will still be able to utilise the existing Appleby loop diverge, so there will likely be little inconvenience in that regard; further, the new junction location is of the order 3km to the west of the original proposed: making use of the existing A66 with its derestricted speed limit and markedly reduced traffic flow, should present little hindrance to the motorist needing to access the new line of the mainline.</p> <p>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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>but in line with guidance are not monetised.</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. 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.</p>	
249	163461, 163502, 163960, 163962, 163965, 163966, 163967, 163969,	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council		Community impact - design	<p>Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council expressing concern that</p> <p>1) the Project has prioritised the views of the travelling community, who use Fair Hill for up to a week of the year, over those of landowners</p>	1&2The design development around the Appleby access arrangements considered a number of factors, as set out in the supplementary consultation brochure for this part of the scheme. This includes potential safety and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	163970, 163972, 163973, 163981, 163986, 163987, 163988, 163989, 163991, 163993, 163994, 163995, 163996, 163997, 163998, 164034, 164036, 164038, 164039, 164040, 164042, 164151, 164152, 164155, 164157, 164158, 164296, 164338, 164713				<p>whose land would be acquired for the scheme,</p> <p>2) permanent local residents who would no longer have the year-round benefits of the previously proposed direct access to Appleby.</p> <p>3) respondents state that the land at Fair Hill is not owned by the travelling community but by Appleby Town, who rent the land to the horse fair, and that the original scheme would not significantly impact the Appleby Horse Fair as it would only take a small amount of land owned by local landowners rather than land from the original Fair Hill Showground.</p> <p>4) concern expressed that the proposals could encourage an expansion of the horse fair.</p>	<p>design risks as well as relatively low anticipated traffic volumes associated with the inclusion of an on-slip at the proposed eastbound junction and the impact on the Fair Hill showground. The proposed westbound junction also required a deep cutting and widening of the existing A66 in an area with known geotechnical issues. In addition, changes were influenced by consultation feedback around these matters, including relatively low anticipated traffic volumes for the westbound off-slip and the means to provide a wider solution that serviced Kirkby Thore, the B6262 and other local communities.</p> <p>The design of the access arrangement at Appleby also needed to be considered alongside the proposals at Long Marton, as this junction would be just 3km from the proposed Appleby junction, each serving low volumes of traffic.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The impact on Fair Hill was therefore not the only consideration which influenced the proposed design changes in this location including the need to change the designated park to highway making other accesses to Fair Hill undesirable.</p> <p>3) National Highways acknowledge that the proposed east-bound addition to the loop diverge would not have required a large amount of land from the fair site. However, its removal was primarily on road safety grounds, anticipated traffic volumes, and compliance with design standards rather than land take. The safety grounds were specifically associated with the junction of Roman Road, the access to the fair ground and the limited visibility of the loop road when leaving the A66. Accident rates are known to be higher at junctions and so the design standards rarely allow departures, and the inclusion of the junction/access on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>loop/slip road (forming the basis of the departures) when combined with an additional movement at the junction (eastbound on-slip), poor visibility, and potentially increased traffic flows were deemed to increase risks to a level that would be unacceptable. Initial consultation made it clear that an application for these departures would be declined.</p> <p>4) With regards to the proposals encouraging an expansion of the fair, the proposals would retain the Fair Hill site in its current situation, and no proposals for growth are considered as part of the Project.</p>	
437		Cumbria County Council		Community impact - Sandersons Croft	Cumbria County Council expressing support for Kirkby Thore junction location subject to the impacts on Sandersons Croft being mitigated appropriately.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the junction location and commits to continuing work to minimise impacts throughout detailed design should our application be successful. Mitigation measures that are to be built into the design are set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						5.11) and mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7). The ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) identifies that at Sandersons Croft, with the implementation of mitigation, there are significant adverse noise effects during operation at receptors at Residential dwellings to the north of Kirkby Thore by Sandersons Croft and significant landscape and visual temporary adverse effects during construction at residences at Sandersons Croft. Refer to ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) for further information.	
12	164717	Eden District Council		Environment – LVIA and Ecology / Cultural Heritage and Land (loss of sports fields)	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern over the potential for adverse impacts on the environment and importance of minimising these, including that: i) light pollution and the removal of ecological corridors could undermine wildlife movements, ii) the proposals would lead to a loss of sports fields and open spaces, and	National Highways have carried out a detailed and robust assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on the environment, the results of which are set out in the Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4). This sets out the assessment of likely significant effects and where require proposed mitigation measures.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					iii) the scheme is in close proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	i) The Project seeks to avoid and reduce impacts on wildlife. The Project includes ecological design features such as creating new habitat and wildlife crossings, maintaining wildlife corridors where possible and linking and restoring locally important habitats, as well as providing new habitats for notable and protected local wildlife. 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 provides for replacement lighting at the M1 and M6 junctions and lighting at the divergence at the A67 at Bowes for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. National Highways will also introduce woodland in the junction itself to provide additional screening. Temporary construction stage lighting will be designed to be sensitive to wildlife. As part of the DCO application, we have produced an EMP (Application Document 2.7)	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, including wildlife, will be managed. With mitigation in place a significant effect is identified in regard to barn owls, however it is anticipated that further work can be undertaken in detailed design to minimise this impact. Further details on lighting at potential impacts can be found within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>ii) The scheme would result in the temporary loss of a small area of the Kirkby Thore Primary School playing field during construction as a result of utility works. Works would be undertaken outwith school hours.. Following these works this area would be restored. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on community assets such as sport fields and open space.</p> <p>iii) The design process has focused on how best to conserve</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the area and minimise impact on the AONB. 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. In indication of how mitigation measures could be implanted within Order Limits is set out in Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) The landscape design response is also illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) The assessment within the landscape and visual ES chapter 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>The new arrangement of the junction moves the works and the new road away from the Scheduled Monument, removing</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						direct impacts to the monument and associated archaeology in the surrounding area. The location of the new junction to the east remains within the setting of the Scheduled Monument but the effects are substantially reduced compared to the previous design. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. With mitigation it is anticipated that there are no significant effects on the Scheduled Monuments, either Kirkby Thore Roman Camp or Redlands Bank Roman Camp	
22	164153			Environment / air quality / carbon	A respondent expressing concern that the proposals could have a negative impact on air quality in Sandersons Croft from the proximity of slip roads to residential homes, and that designing the route near Sandersons Croft has a larger carbon footprint than the previous proposal.	The relocation of the junction would bring it closer to Sandersons Croft. 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 at this location. Mitigation measures, where required, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105. A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has also been carried out, using the assessment	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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> <p>The Air Quality assessment has concluded that there are no significant effects to any human receptor across the Project in construction or operation, including at Sandersons Croft</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate factors in accordance with the relevant statutory and policy requirements such as the Climate Change Act 2008, the National Policy</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme and carbon footprints during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Minimising GHG emissions through design is a core principle of our standards. This includes delivering measures such as material recovery and using recycled materials; reducing construction traffic; and using renewable energy within compounds where feasible – and these measures are set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7) for the Project. It is concluded no significant effects.	
23	164335			Environment - air quality	A respondent expressing concern that the proposals would have a negative impact on air quality in Crackenthorpe due to greater traffic passing the town to access Appleby.	National Highways have carried out a traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project. 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>predicting future traffic flows and conditions, both with and without the A66 Project. The modelled flow for 2019 (reflecting the current situation) is 19,000 vehicles per day. Without the scheme in place, this flow would rise to 22,000 vehicles per day by the opening year of 2029 due to traffic growth. However, with the scheme in place the flow on the road would drop to 2,700 vehicles per day in 2029. A drop in traffic flow of this volume would result in positive impact upon air quality.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the closure of the junction would lead to vehicles approaching from the west or leaving Appleby-in-Westmorland via Crackenthorpe, the number of vehicles using this route would be substantially reduced when compared to predicted 'without Project' daily flows.</p> <p>The current alignment of the A66 runs along the south-west edge of the village of Crackenthorpe. The proposed realignment would move the road, and the associated traffic flows, over 600m away to the north-east. The air quality assessment, as set out in ES</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential impact of the proposed alignment and traffic flows. This assessment concludes that there are no significant effects to any human receptor within 200m of the Project and the existing A66, including Crackenthorpe	
24	164335			Environment - noise	A respondent expressing concern that the proposals would lead to greater noise impacts in Crackenthorpe due to greater traffic passing the town to access Appleby.	<p>National Highways have carried out a traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project. 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. It is acknowledged that greater traffic may lead to greater noise..</p> <p>The modelled flow for 2019 (reflecting the current situation) is 19,000 vehicles per day. Without the scheme in place, this flow would rise to 22,000 vehicles per day by the opening year of 2029 due to traffic growth. However, with our scheme in place the flow</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>on the road would drop to 2,700 vehicles per day in 2029. A drop in traffic flow of this volume would result in positive impact on noise.</p> <p>The noise and vibration impact assessment is underpinned by this transport model. 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. The community of Crackenthorpe is predicted as part of the assessment to be subject to beneficial noise impacts as a result of the Project. Further information in regards the Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for this location are contained within Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
30		Cumbria County Council		Environment - ecology	Cumbria County Council expressing concerns over the impact that the Project could have on wildlife and ecology within the Long Marton Lane End junction	It is noted that the proposals at Long Marton Lane End require more land than identified within the autumn 2021 Consultation however the land on which the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					area, stating that there is a lack of detail on the potential loss of habitats around the fringes of agricultural land, which they say would require mitigation.	new diversion and junction is being built remains primarily agricultural land with low biodiversity value. The potential impacts of the Project on biodiversity including land of low biodiversity values is reported within ES Chapter 6, Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). 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 through consultation with key stakeholders.	
31	164055			Environment - landscape and visual impact	A respondent expressing concerns that the Project would negatively impact the landscape in the Trout Beck area, as the installation of bridges over the river would undermine local views and require additional landscaping.	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.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>This has been applied to the Trout Beck Viaduct, with the result being a structure located away from residential clusters, and a design seeking to integrate with the landscape.</p> <p>The landscape design response is illustrated in the figures accompanying ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The Project Design Report sets out the route-wide and scheme-specific design principles for the Project. It confirms key features of the design proposals to be carried through to detailed design and construction, establishing the design parameters to which later stages of design development would adhere.</p> <p>The Project Design Report details aspirations for improved ecological connectivity at Trout Beck through provision of woodland planting, along with the wider planting of the A66 embankments. The detailed design of the crossing of the Trout Beck would support ecological</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and landscape connectivity, with a clean and simple, open structure which is economical with use of piers and uprights. The structure would be aesthetically pleasing but low key in this rural landscape, i.e. it is not intended to be a 'landmark'.</p> <p>Please refer to ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) for the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. During construction road users along Sleastonhowe Lane (Viewpoint 4.9) and residents at Sleastonhow Farm (Viewpoint 4.9a) would experience views towards construction of the mainline to the south-west, with residents at the farm also experiencing views towards construction of the Trout Beck viaduct. Resulting in a moderate (significant) effect.</p> <p>During year 1 of operation mitigation proposals such as hedgerows and woodland edge planting would provide limited filtering of views towards the scheme. The mainline view from viewpoint 4.9a would lie partially in cutting before creating embankment at the Trout Beck</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>overbridge, which would also feature an accommodation track underbridge. This would result in a moderate (significant) effect.</p> <p>By year 15 visual effects would be reduced for the majority of receptors as a result of mitigation proposals maturing, including woodland which would provide screening of views towards parts of the scheme. The integration of woodland edge and species-rich grassland at the Trout Beck viaduct would ensure visual integration of the structure as far as possible, whilst retaining the visual context of the beck's riparian woodland.</p>	
32		Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Environment – road drainage and water environment	<p>Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing concerns that the proposals could lead to an increase in flooding, on the grounds that the drainage run behind Kirkby Thore would discharge into the SSSI/SAC Trout Beck.</p>	<p>We note the respondents' concerns about flooding. Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in ES Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.2). 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 will be implemented at detailed design stage.</p>	
36	164046			Environment - Noise	A respondent expressing specific concerns over the potential for noise impacts around Brampton as a result of the new junction.	<p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out the study area for the noise and vibration assessment undertaken for the determined using the guidance provided within DMRB LA 111.</p> <p>The community of Brampton falls outside of the construction and operation noise and vibration assessment study area and therefore it is identified that there will be no significant effects to noise levels within this area. Furthermore, it should be noted that noise levels at the closest edge of the study area also do not exceed the lowest threshold for assessed noise change, meaning that at Brampton this will be lower still. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment fully.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
37		Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Environment - landscape and visual impact	Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing support for landscape proposals, with particular reference to the recognition of the Sleastonhow Oak and recent tree planting in the area.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the landscape proposals.	No
39		Cumbria County Council		Environment - road drainage and water environment	Cumbria County Council expressing support for proposals concerning hydrology and the local water environment, as the say that flow to the Trout Beck would be maintained.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the proposals concerning hydrology and the local water environment.	No
41		Historic England		Environment - cultural heritage	Historic England expressing support for the Appleby access arrangements on the grounds that they would not have an impact on cultural heritage sites.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Appleby access arrangements.	No
43		Historic England		Environment - cultural heritage	Historic England expressing support for the Kirkby Thore junction as it would have minimal archaeological impact and would limit HGV traffic through the town's historic environment.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Kirkby Thore junction.	No
44		Cumbria County Council		Environment - support	Cumbria County Council expressing support for the proposals on the grounds that reducing construction in close proximity to the River Eden would lessen the possibility of adverse impacts on this site.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme proposals.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
46		Cumbria County Council		Environment - support	Cumbria County Council expressing support for the scheme, on the grounds that the removal of woodland is no longer proposed.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Scheme.	No
48	164717	Eden District Council		Environment - mitigations	Respondents including Eden District Council making general suggestions regarding the proposals for the environment, including that the scheme deliver: Biodiversity Net Gain; Mitigation for Greenhouse Gas impacts and a Zero Carbon Strategy; and Landscape, Noise and Air Quality improvements.	<p>The ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) assesses the impacts of the Project on the environment and sets out the mitigation measures proposed to minimise adverse effects.</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. 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) identifies noise mitigation measures such as low noise surfacing, noise fencing, landscape bunding and construction phase restrictions on timings and construction methods. Chapter 12 also identifies where receptors may be subject to beneficial noise changes.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential impact of the proposed alignment and traffic flows. This assessment concludes that there are no significant effects to any human receptor within 200m of the Project during operation. Mitigation to reduce construction dust impacts to a negligible level are included in 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>This includes a dust management plan, with measures to monitor effectiveness of mitigation, onsite and off-site inspections and keeping a record of complaints/exceptional dust events.</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>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 context. The design process has focused on how best to conserve and enhance landscape characteristics, and the special qualities and landscape character. This will be achieved by mitigating the effects of the Project and integrating it within the landscape.</p>	
50	164721			Environment - geology & soils	A respondent making suggestions regarding soil disposal, in particular that environmental	Essential mitigation and enhancement measures in regards soil use are secured in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					benefits could be gained by using the old landfill site at the Kirkby Thore factory and capping this with impermeable membrane and spreading soils on top.	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 outlined in the Soils Management Plan, Annex B9 of the EMP. 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.	
57	164152			Environment - landscape and visual impact	A respondent raising concerns over the impact that the proposals would have on the local landscape, stating that the Project would be large and not in keeping with the existing landscape, and that it would undermine local enjoyment of the countryside.	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 would be achieved by mitigating the effects of the scheme and integrating it within the landscape. The landscape design response is illustrated in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. It is acknowledged that there will be significant effects on the local landscape (detailed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2)). ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the effects of the scheme on community assets; walkers, cyclists and horse riders; and human health outcomes including with regard to air quality, noise and open space. However there is no identified significant effects on public rights of way in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Project design has also 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>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
58	164295			Environment - carbon / alternatives	A respondent raising concerns over the potential carbon footprint of the Kirkby Thore junction as a result of the engineering require to place the junction in the hillside, and arguing that a more southern route would not require this.	<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.</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>Following extensive optioneering and subsequent public consultation exercises, the route as adopted was found to represent the optimum solution</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Climate (Application Document 3.2) describes the assessment of any likely significant climate impacts in accordance with the requirements of law and policy, including the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Infrastructure Planning</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>(Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (the EIA Regulations). 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>National Highways has carefully considered alternatives to the scheme and carbon footprints during the refinement of current design and through the options identification and appraisal process. Minimising GHG emissions through design is a core principle of our 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 Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) for the Project.</p>	
62		Cumbria County Council		Environment - wildlife/ biodiversity	Cumbria County Council stating that the proposals lack detail on mitigation measures for protected species, with particular mention of	Since PEI Report, following further survey, consultation and design refinement, the proposed ecological mitigation measures have been developed in more detail. The required mitigation is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					potential wildlife in the coniferous woodland to the north of the A66.	set out in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity, the EMP (Application Document 2.7) and the Design Principles document (Application Document 5.11). An indication of how the ecological mitigation could be delivered is shown within ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The mitigation has been designed in such a way so as to conserve protected species and habitats by replacing lost habitats (including the likes of the coniferous forest) and ensuring wildlife corridors are maintained and reconnected where severed. The biodiversity assessment has concluded no significant effects to any protected species other than barn owl and this is likely to be mitigated for in detailed design.	
65		Environment Agency		Environment - road drainage and water environment / biodiversity	The Environment Agency suggesting that National Highways continue engagement to address any flood and biodiversity issues prior to application.	The Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4) sets out how National Highways has sought to consult with stakeholders such as the Environment Agency throughout the development of the Project on matters such as biodiversity and flooding and how this has influenced the scheme design. National Highways will continue to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						work with the Environment Agency as the Project progresses.	
66		Environment Agency		Environment - road drainage and water environment	The Environment Agency suggesting that National Highways more strongly address potential flood risks arising from the Project, such as through assessments of the impact that new crossings would have on flood risks in the area, without providing further detail	Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) identifies no change to existing flood risk as a result of the Project. Throughout design, flooding has been continually taken into account, designed where practicable to limit increase in flooding at the 1 in 100 year (+40% climate change) return period.	No
71	164717	Eden District Council		Environment - biodiversity	Respondents including Eden District Council suggests that the scheme should look to deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain. They suggest in particular the scheme should consider retaining mature trees wherever possible and ensuring lighting does not interfere with wildlife.	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). National	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Highways will seek to avoid and reduce impacts on wildlife. The final scheme would provide replacement lighting at the M1 and M6 junctions and would include lighting at the divergence at the A67 at Bowes for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing lighting context. Temporary construction stage lighting would be designed to be sensitive to wildlife. As part of the DCO application, we have produced an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, including wildlife, would be managed. The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) identified no significant effects on habitats and sets out the intention to retain trees wherever possible, as does ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	
114	164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Environment - air quality	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern over the impact that the proposals could have on air quality in the local community, with particular	The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential traffic emissions from the Project at this location and considers the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					concern over negative air quality impacts on the new housing estate on Newbiggin road (Planning Reference 19/0272) and the lack of space available for mitigation . Respondents also comment that the proposals suggest moving the Kirkby Thore junction closer to properties and the impact of this on air quality is hard to determine without providing updated information on air quality modelling, and that there is a lack of detail on the nature of mitigation measures.	identified housing development. Cumulative effects due to construction traffic from the proposed development, if it occurs at the same time as the Project, as well as dust and PM10 generated by construction activities, could lead to significant adverse effects if adequate mitigation is not implemented. Mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) including measures such as dust suppression. With the implementation of this mitigation no significant effect is identified during construction. Air quality modelling has been undertaken for the revised Project design and is reported within the ES. No significant impacts are identified for human or ecological receptors during operation.	
163	163975, 164725, 164726			Land - compulsory acquisition	Respondents expressing concern over the potential for land acquisition as part of the proposals, including that there is a lack of clarity over whether agricultural land would still be used for species-rich grassland, and whether this land would be returned to landowners following	National Highways have refined the mitigation plans since PEI Report. 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>the scheme completion. Respondents also saying that the proposals do not use land effectively, without expanding further, and raising concerns over the severance of silage fields, which they say would undermine agricultural production.</p>	<p>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. A soil survey is also currently in progress and where possible has fed into the ES and outline mitigation proposals. The Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. 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>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme on agricultural land including severance.</p>	
173	164159, 164721, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County		Environment - noise	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern regarding noise impacts on local	A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project has been undertaken. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
		Council, Eden District Council			<p>residents, including on the proposed housing on Newbiggin Road. Respondents express particular concern that that having a curved slip road would lead to louder vehicle movements and that areas where the road is higher than the surrounding land would experience greater noise impacts, such as around the Dunfell View housing estate. Respondents also expressing concern over a lack of clarity around noise mitigation, including whether any measures have been proposed for Kirkby Thore, and additionally state that noise bunding would be required to mitigate impacts on the local school and playing fields.</p>	<p>impact of the scheme on noise and vibration both in construction and in operation. The road alignment including the curved slip road has been modelled to estimate the likely changes to noise through operation.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation. Noise bunding has been provided by the proposed line of the new road in the vicinity of Kirkby Thore Primary school. For design, the road sits in a cutting and the embankments have been made taller than they would usually have to be in order to act as additional noise barrier. Near the school, this puts the road at around 10m lower than the top of the embankment which will reduce noise levels. In adopting the curved slip road configuration, it has permitted a longer length of slip road (and deceleration length) to be located within the cutting, screening off a significant amount of associated noise.</p> <p>No adverse significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Primary School or Dunfell View are identified.	
182	164159	Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Environment - geology & soils / Biodiversity	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing concern that mitigation measures proposed for the environment would be insufficient, in particular that species-rich grassland would not be suitable for the fertile soil around the Trout Beck area.	National Highways have refined their mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, we had not completed all the surveys and were assuming they 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 had previously indicated. Due to this, it is now not necessary to replace habitats has been undertaken and fed into the ES and outline mitigation proposals. 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. The Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Planting is considered in the context of ecological compensation and enhancement, visual screening, and landscape integration, with each piece of planting having a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						distinct primary function and, in most cases, secondary functions.	
297	164045, 164052, 164153, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Environment – landscape and visual impact	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the Project would have a negative impact on the landscape of Sandersons Croft, on the grounds that the junction roads would reach ground level to access the overbridge, and therefore vehicles would be seen from residential properties.	Sensitive landform and planting mitigation measures have been included to minimise any additional impacts on Sandersons Croft. There would be a change to the landscape of Sandersons Croft and this is illustrated in the viewpoint within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) which has been revised since the PEI Report to show the view from these properties. Earth bunding/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts whilst considering landscape and visual implications. The required land take includes the provision for bunds that are balanced with landscape considerations. Large vehicles accessing the gypsum works would be further away from the properties, and although they may be visible they would no longer need to pass as close to the properties. There would be little change in the glare from vehicles exiting the caravan park. It should be noted that the current road	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						alignment also faces the houses at Sandersons Croft. It is acknowledged that there will be an impact on the landscape in vicinity of Sandersons Croft, however it has been minimised as far as possible and opportunity to continue to reduce this will be sought in detailed design.	
330	164159, 164329			Land - compulsory acquisition	Respondents expressing concerns over agricultural land take for new access roads and improved road gradients, on the grounds that productive farmland would be used either on a temporary or permanent basis. They argue that land acquisition would increase the distance travelled between plots of land, which would undermine grazing opportunities and agricultural productivity.	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 or 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. The costs of the Project (including the environmental impacts) have been balanced against the public and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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> <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 severance. It is acknowledged there are significant effects on various landholdings in the vicinity of Kirkby Thore and Crackenthorpe where four agricultural holdings have over 30% of their land required for the scheme.</p>	
337		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Environment / RDWE / Biodiversity	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing concerns over the impact that the Long Marton junction could have on hydrology, on the grounds that they consider:</p> <p>(i) the north-east drainage pond's proximity to the Trout Beck Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) could lead to contamination from groundwater flowing into the Beck;</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 the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and no significant effects are identified. Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					(ii) the proximity of the local road to the Trout Beck could lead to a potential flood risk; and (iii) that there appear to be limited mitigation measures proposed around the Trout Beck viaduct.	(Application Document 3.4) identifies that there is no change to flood risk as a result of the Project. Further information is provided on the anticipated impacts to the Trout Beck Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5). Both of these conclude no significant effect to the Trout Beck. Mitigation measures are set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) which sets restrictions around working in and around watercourses and more specifically the SAC itself. There are restrictions on the design itself set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) that limit where the viaduct's piers and supports can be placed, preventing them from being constructed in the watercourse itself.	
340	164050, 164054	Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Environment - landscape and visual impact	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing concerns over the impact the Project would have on the	It is acknowledged that there are likely significant effects on landscape in the Kirkby Thore area as a result of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>landscape in the area, on the grounds that new bridges and changes to the caravan storage facility could undermine views of the landscape from residential properties, and that the proposed culvert would not fully mitigate against this. Respondents also expressing concerns that the proposals could undermine the roots of the Sleastonhow Oak, sever Kirkby Thore from the Pennine fellside which would undermine the village's natural and historic landscape, and could threaten views from Dunfell View and the village school.</p>	<p>Sensitive landform and planting mitigation measures have been included to minimise scheme impacts. There would be little change in the glare from vehicles exiting the caravan park and it should be noted that the current road alignment also faces the houses at Sandersons Croft. A photomontage within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) has been compiled showing that the proposals viewed from the school (and hence Dunfell View, which is adjacent to the school) would not separate the village from its long views.</p> <p>Since PEI Report the proposed ecological mitigation measures and landscape planting have been developed in more detail to avoid any direct impacts on the Sleastonhow Oak and associated root zones.</p>	
347	163983, 164152, 164335	Kirkby Thore Parish Council	164723	Environment - noise	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing concerns over the potential noise impact arising from the Project, stating that moving the junction to Long Marton would lead to greater noise impacts for local residents</p>	<p>With the scheme in place, traffic flows on the section of Long Marton south of the proposed junction A66 would be 3460 vehicles per day in the design year of 2044. North of the proposed A66 junction the flow on</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>than other proposals due to the elevation of the road over the viaduct, and could reduce the tranquillity of the Roman trackway. Respondents also expressing concern that moving traffic onto by-roads would increase noise impacts for local residents, including around the Roman Vale.</p>	<p>Long Marton would be 2600 vehicles per day by 2044. It should be noted that without the scheme in place the flow on Long Marton would be 2400 vehicles per day in 2044.</p> <p>Noise modelling and assessment takes into account the aforementioned traffic numbers, elevation and landform. It is anticipated that the by-roads will experience a reduction in traffic with the majority of traffic moving onto the new A66 therefore reducing noise. There may be an increase in noise at Roman Vale however this is likely a result of the new A66 rather than changes to the wider road network.</p> <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>Receptors along Roman Vale and the Roman trackway are predicted to experience an increase in road traffic noise 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
405	163991, 164335			Environment - Case for the Scheme	<p>Respondents expressing general concerns over the potential environmental impact of the scheme including concerns that the scheme does not utilise the existing A66 road network and could better benefit the surrounding area.</p>	<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>A largely online route was considered, the orange route. The orange route mostly followed the route of the existing A66 along the southern edge of Kirkby Thore, before bypassing Crackenthorpe to the north.</p> <p>The orange route was discounted, post the Autumn 2021 Consultation. 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.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						On the balance it was concluded that the blue route was preferred. For more information, please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). The ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out a detailed and robust assessment of the predicted effects of the Project on the environment including proposing suitable mitigation where required to mitigate adverse effects.	
426	164052, 164153, 164721, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Environment - noise	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing specific concerns regarding potential noise impacts in Sandersons Croft due to moving slip roads closer to local properties, greater lorry movements around junctions and where the road would rise to meet the overbridge, and the proximity of traffic travelling between Long Marton and Kirkby Thore to residences. Respondents also raising concerns that increased noise would undermine local residents' enjoyment of the area, and that the potential noise	A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been undertaken. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the noise and vibration effects of the Project. 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. The Project design has been developed the mainline is now in a deeper cutting around the northern side of Kirkby Thore. The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>impacts would be worse than under previous proposals. Respondents also questioning whether mitigation would be provided for Sandersons Croft, as the new junction would use land which could be used for noise bunding, and whether National Highways would maintain initial noise standards.</p>	<p>Project has identified adverse impacts on 67 properties within Kirkby Thore due to the Project alignment and the provision of noise mitigation measures has been considered in the context of government policy on sustainability and is reported within the ES Chapter 12. A further 280 residential receptors experience a beneficial effect as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Sensitive landform and planting mitigation measures have been included to minimise any additional impacts from Sandersons Croft. There would be a change and this is illustrated in the viewpoint within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) which has been revised to show the view from these properties. Earth bunding/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts whilst considering landscape and visual implications. The required land take includes the provision for bunds that are balanced with landscape considerations. Large vehicles accessing the gypsum works</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						would be further away from the properties but may be visible but they would no longer need to pass as close to the properties.	
475		Historic England, Cumbria County Council		Environment - cultural heritage	Historic England and Cumbria County Council expressing support for the new Long Marton junction on the grounds that it would minimise potential impacts on cultural heritage sites, with particular reference to reduced land take from the Roman Camp.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the new Long Marton junction. The impacts of the scheme on the historic environment are reported in ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2)	No
477	164356	Cumbria County Council		Land - compulsory acquisition	Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing support for the proposals as they would require less land acquisition than previous plans, with reference both to reduced disruption to land in general and in relation to the Appleby Horse Fair site.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the scheme proposals.	No
556		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Environment - mitigations	Respondents Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions for environmental mitigation measures, including the installation of replacement barns, bat habitats, and wildlife corridors. Respondents also suggesting alternative uses for land taken, including restoring mire land habitat at the Mire, and using land	Potential impacts on ecology and biodiversity including bats and wildlife connectivity for identified receptors are assessed in full, in accordance with best practice/industry guidance and through consultation with key stakeholders, within the ES (Chapter 6 Biodiversity, Application Document 3.2). Appropriate mitigation (in the form	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>around the Troutbeck for woodland, rather than converting these to species-rich grassland. Respondents requesting that any woodland be planted on the village side of the road and that hedges not be used in lieu of planting woodland.</p>	<p>of bat boxes to replace known bat roosts in barns and trees, crossing points and habitat creation/planting) has been designed and included within the ES to ensure potential adverse impacts on bats as a result of the Project are avoided, where possible.</p> <p>The Mire is proposed to be restored to fen/mire habitat where possible, as part of the proposed bird mitigation habitat within this area. The Environmental Mitigation Plan (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Woodland blocks for landscape integration have been incorporated at this location (village side of the road). These plans have been carefully developed to replicate/mitigate the habitats that are being impacted/lost as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Opportunities for ecological enhancements have been identified where possible. This includes the provision of wildlife corridors along new stretches of road and the creation of habitat</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						linkages to existing corridors within the wider landscape. In relation to hedgerow planting, habitat creation ratios and the outline plan showing areas of ecological mitigation have been carefully assessed and assigned per scheme in accordance with stringent guidance. This does not allow hedge planting to be substituted for woodland as they are not considered to be of the same value or fill the same habitat niche.	
562		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Environment – landscape and visual impact /biodiversity/noise	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions to minimise potential impacts on the landscape, including:</p> <p>(i) mitigation proposals in this area should holistically consider the impacts upon noise, ecology and landscape and visual and how the impacts of all three can be collectively minimised.</p> <p>(ii) Viewpoints should be modified or additional ones provided that ensure that the effects on residents and the users of local rights of way are fully appraised and explained. Noting this is particularly relevant to the north-</p>	i) The environmental Project team have worked closely together collaborating across Biodiversity, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration and Heritage disciplines to design mitigation for potential Project impacts. This collaborative approach has allowed for identified mitigation to balance aspects such as height of noise bunds with visual impacts. The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>east of the modified Kirkby Thore junction where there are potential effects on residents of Sandersons Croft area.</p> <p>(iii) A new housing estate of 26 homes has been granted planning permission since the last consultation and this would require additional noise bunding and tree planting for visual screening.</p> <p>(iv) Were the road line to be moved further from the village the natural ground level would be at the required level of the road thus little or no cut would be required and the drumlin crest would form a natural noise bund for the village. Thus the road would sit more conformably in the landscape.</p>	<p>ii) Sensitive landform and planting mitigation measures have been included to minimise any additional impacts on Sandersons Croft. Mitigation measures for the junction at Kirkby Thore include sensitive landform shaping and extensive woodland edge and woodland planting. It is acknowledged that there would be a change to existing landscape and visual amenity, and this is illustrated in the viewpoint within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) which has been revised to show the view from these properties. The dual carriageway at this point would be largely in cutting, providing noise and visual screening.</p> <p>iii) Proposed mitigation measures between the application for residential development to the north of Dunfell View and the Project would provide sufficient screening. Landscape and visual impacts are therefore identified as negligible and not significant. The local road network (including Priest Lane and Cross Street (adjacent to the proposed development site for 26 houses) is predicted to experience a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>decrease in traffic movements and hence a decrease in noise and therefore no significant noise impact is identified.</p> <p>iv) 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. Earth bunding/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts and consider landscape and visual implications. Various junction arrangements were considered with the proposed arrangement taken forward as it allowed the majority of the slip road to be retained within the cutting, reducing the noise levels of vehicles slowing.</p>	
572	164725	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Land / Environment / Landscape and visual impact / Noise	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions regarding environmental mitigation, including that private land should not be used for mitigation so that landowners can regain use of the land following completion of the scheme, and that clearer and more detailed viewpoints be provided to fully assess the impact</p>	<p>Land identified for environmental mitigation is required in order to mitigate adverse effects from the Project and as such is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to working with landowners to avoid the need to exercise compulsory acquisition powers if appropriate agreements can be entered into. Such agreements could include management agreements or</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>that the proposals would have on local residents. Respondents also suggesting that mitigation is provided around the Trout Beck flood plain, including wetland planting to act as an acoustic barrier and planting along the high cutting for visual mitigation.</p>	<p>section 253 Highways Act 1980 in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>However, not all types of environmental mitigation are well suited to those types of contractual arrangements given the long duration of the Project and the need to maintain certain categories of mitigation over the long term.</p> <p>As such, while National Highways is committed to exploring such arrangements in appropriate circumstances, it must, nonetheless, retain the ability to acquire such land in order to safeguard the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>Any landowner impacted by this requirement has been informed and discussions are being undertaken and will continue regarding the management of the mitigation going forward.</p> <p>Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) has been revised since the PEI Report to provide updated viewpoints.</p> <p>Mitigation planting around the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Trout Beck must balance ecological enhancement and the current agricultural use of the land. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) set out how the proposed planting could be implemented within Order Limits. Outline mitigation plans have been prepared to inform the ES and that these would be further refined at detailed design stage.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). considered the implementation of noise barriers on the Trout Beck Viaduct however the noise mitigation measure was assessed as not sustainable in this area.</p>	
576		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Environment - noise	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions regarding noise mitigation measures, including that:</p> <p>i) Houses severely affected by noise should be provided with triple glazing, that noise mitigation would be required where the road is at grade or above the surrounding land, and that noise bunding and tree planting should</p>	<p>i) The new section of road is in deep cutting as it moves around Kirkby Thore. In addition, further embankment has been included at the top of the cutting to increase the effective depth at which the road is from the top of the cutting in order to reduce noise effects in such a way that minimises impact on the landscape. In places the road is up to 10m from the top of the cutting, and the embankments will be graded out to fit them into the local landscape, rather than</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>be introduced around the new housing estate and local school.</p> <p>ii) Respondents also suggesting changes to the route design would reduce noise impacts, including: Moving the on-slip road further from Sandersons Croft to allow for a taller noise bund A straight on-slip road to reduce potential noise impacts Moving the road line further from Kirkby Thore so that the Drumlin Crest could act as a natural noise bund.</p>	<p>leaving them with an artificial gradient.</p> <p>No adverse significant noise effects at the Kirkby Thore Primary School or Dunfell View are identified.</p> <p>Mitigation measures including noise insulation are discussed within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Noise insulation will be offered if and where future noise levels exceed the trigger level of 68dB LA10,18hour (façade) (i.e. above a SOAEL) and the other requirements referred to in the Noise Insulation Regulations (NIR) 1975 guidelines. Confirmation of receptors which are eligible for noise insulation will be made by the responsible authority (National Highways) before the Project comes into operation, based on built information in accordance with NIR. The DCO secures these measures as part of the EMP (Application Document 2.7), where deemed necessary having regard to the existing statutory framework.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>There are no properties within Kirkby Thore that are identified as potential noise insulation qualifiers with regard to the Noise Insulation Regulations.</p> <p>ii) In regards the design changes, proposed for slip roads, there are a number of safety standards such as visibility and slip road length that have to be considered in design. A number of different junction arrangements were considered; however, the proposed design was developed in order to allow the majority of the slip road to be retained in the deep cutting. The alignment of the road is similarly limited by safety standards and in the case of Kirkby Thore its location is also limited by the presence of the Gypsum Mineworkings to the north which would pose a risk to the new road going forward.</p>	
607	164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Environment - cultural heritage	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council raising concerns over the impact that the proposals could have on cultural heritage sites:</p> <p>i) Noting there could be undesignated archaeological</p>	<p>i) ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets (designated and undesignated). The Roman Camp Scheduled</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>resources distributed beyond the boundary of the Scheduled Monument, and therefore without further assessments, it may be that significant effects to heritage assets have not yet been mitigated against.</p> <p>ii) Respondents also raise concerns that removal of the line of woodland along the Roman Road would pose a risk to this heritage site as these trees have previously been used to mark the length of the asset. Respondents further raise concerns that the route encroaches on the Roman Road's setting and archaeology to the north of the Scheduled Monument, without providing detail on the extent of this impact.</p>	<p>Monument is located immediately adjacent to the Order Limits. A small portion of the Roman Camp is located within the Order Limits where the existing National Highways land boundary overlaps the edge of the historically scheduled area. The works proposed by the Project include improvements to the WCH route, an area of verges and earthworks and new hardstanding. Any below ground works in areas not previously disturbed will result in the loss of associated physical evidence. Potential impacts will be mitigated by preservation by record.</p> <p>A moderate significant effect is identified in this location during construction. During operation the Project results in the realignment of the A66, from currently passing through the Roman Camp Scheduled Monument and moving to the immediate. The realignment of the A66 will divert traffic, which currently passes through the site, while still retaining the former route of the A66 following the Roman Road through the scheduled area. Negligible</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						beneficial impacts are therefore identified during operation. ii) The setting of the Roman Road would be impacted by the scheme however the legibility of the Roman Road would be retained. There may be some minor tree removal in this area but trees associated with the Roman Road would be retained and protected where possible to recognise this important landscape feature.	
611	163983, 164335			Environment - air quality	Respondents raising concerns that the proposals would have a greater negative impact on air quality than the previous plans, on the grounds that traffic to and from Appleby would be moved onto local roads closer to residential villages, which could cause greater pollution in these areas.	Compared to the previously consulted option the average daily traffic past Crackenthorpe would increase by 2,200 vehicles to 2,900 vehicles per day, in the design year of 2044. Without the scheme in place the daily flow would be 26,000 vehicles per day by 2044. The air quality assessment is underpinned by this model and as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for traffic emissions from the Project at this location. Mitigation measures, where required, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105. There are no	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						identified significant effects at Crackenthorpe.	
613		Environment Agency, Cumbria County Council	164150	Environment / road drainage and water environment / Habitats Regulation Assessment / Land	<p>Respondents including the Environment Agency and Cumbria County Council raising concerns that the proposals would not significantly mitigate against the impacts of construction close to the River Eden, and that the scheme would pose a flood risk from an increase in surface water run-off, which in turn could devalue land. Respondents also expressing concern that increasing the size of structures over Moor Beck and Cringle Beck could impact the River Eden Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme 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 the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). A detailed flood risk assessment (FRA) has also been completed and is set out within the ES appendices (Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>with DMRB LA113 will be implemented at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The scheme has been designed to minimise impacts on the River Eden SAC and fluvial flood modelling has been undertaken to understand potential impacts on the River Eden contained within Appendix 14.6: Hydrogeological Impact Assessment. The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.6) also considers potential scheme impacts including functionally linked land to the SAC. No significant impacts on any SAC or SSSI have been identified.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to ‘Temple Sowerby to Appleby’ and National Highways regard to the comments

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
33			164723	Design / oppose	A respondent opposes the proposed design change at Long Marton Lane End junction and suggests an alternative.	National Highways acknowledges the range of views expressed relating to the need for the proposed route. Based on the feedback received following the autumn public consultation, it was clear that there was a demand for a junction to the dual carriageway in the vicinity of Long Marton Lane end. Due to geometric and visibility constraints, connector roads to link the previously proposed overbridge to the dual carriageway, were considered unsafe and would not comply with the highway design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges). Therefore, the road was diverted to the east so a compliant junction could be provided. Further details of this decision can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1).	No
47	164717	Eden District Council		General/ Design	Respondents including Eden District Council making general suggestions regarding the project: delivery of a socio-economic	National Highways acknowledge the suggestions made in respect of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					strategy and delivering workers' accommodation during the construction phase.	<p>The policy tests for the scheme and how our proposals meet the tests are set out in the Case for the Project (Document 2.2) and the Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement (Application Document 3.9) which demonstrate that the Project conforms with the relevant national policies (as set out in the National Networks National Policy Statement).</p> <p>We are very supportive of opportunities to improve job opportunities, encourage the development of apprentices and work with Local Authorities to maximise economic development throughout the construction period.</p> <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 route wide level. The chapter also considers the average and peak worker numbers at construction compounds and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>Annex B12 of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application 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.</p> <p>Accommodation works will be</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						discussed and considered at the next design stage of the Project.	
407	163462, 163463, 164713	Kirkby Thore Parish Council	164265	General/ Support	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing general support for the Kirkby Thore junction, including that the proposals address previous concerns raised, without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Kirkby Thore junction.	No
412	163462, 163463, 164056, 164338	Kirkby Thore Parish Council		General/ Support	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing general support for the Long Marton junction, without providing further detail.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Long Marton junction.	No
417	163464, 163467, 163851, 164152	Cumbria County Council		General/ Connectivity/ Community Impact	Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing general support for the proposals, as they say that they would make improvements for local people based on previous concerns raised, improve existing highway designs, and transform the A66 into a major road for both east and west connectivity.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme proposals.	No
422	163462, 163463, 163465, 163971			General/ Amenity	Respondents expressing general support for the proposals, including comments that they would bring improvements during the Appleby Horse Fair.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Scheme proposals.	No
438	163851, 164335	Kirkby Thore Parish Council	164265	General / listening	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					support for National Highways' consideration of their views throughout the consultation process, and in particular that the proposals have improved upon the concerns raised in the Autumn.	approach taken in the consultation process.	
4		Northern Powergrid		Impact on infrastructure/Construction	Northern Powergrid expressing concern over the impact that the overall scheme could have on infrastructure, with particular reference to the potential for the project to adversely impact electricity supplies. They comment that National Highways should be responsible for any costs incurred as a result of the movement of utility supplies and infrastructure during the project.	Following on from the engagement undertaken to date with Northern Powergrid (NPG), further liaison with all affected statutory undertakers will be undertaken during the next stages of design development. The Principal Contractor will engage with NPG prior to physical works being undertaken. Protective provisions are included in the draft DCO (Application Document 5.01) for the protection of statutory undertakers and all due care will be taken not to disrupt supply.	No
569	164721	Cumbria County Council		Impact on infrastructure/Construction	Respondents including Cumbria County Council making suggestions in relation to water infrastructure, including that Borehole 2 be recommissioned to compensate for others being removed, that National Highways review the potential impacts that the project could have on existing drainage assets, and that water	National Highways will continue to liaise and consult with the relevant affected parties as the scheme develops to ensure that sites are not unduly affected either during or after the construction of the A66. The option to recommission Borehole 2 north of Kirkby Thore and the phasing of the works will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					supply boreholes and pipeline be replaced to the North of the route before construction to reduce potential damage and loss of water supply to the surrounding area.	be considered by The Principal contractor who will liaise with the relevant affected parties to minimise disruption prior to construction.	
75	164717	Eden District Council		Consultation - Environmental information	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern that the number of residential and non-residential receptors that would have significant adverse effects and those which would benefit was not revised and included in the consultation documents.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are relevant. Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>therefore a revised environmental assessment was not provided. However, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary Consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</p>	
76		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Consultation - Environmental information	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing that due to the absence of general arrangement drawings for this supplementary consultation, they are unable to appraise the extent to which the proposed design	Each proposed design change was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of these changes would	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>changes will impact environmental assets. Respondents state that their previous comments at statutory consultation on still stand until sufficient information is provided.</p>	<p>result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>Comments in regards the level of detail within the PEI Report are noted. The PEI Report contained 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 identified where further surveys would be carried out and the next steps to be taken as part of the environmental assessment of the Project. A full Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project is now reported in the ES (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) which sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Where mitigation is identified which the ES an illustration of how it may be implemented within Order Limits is provided within the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.7) secures the implementation of proposed mitigation measures identified.	
78	164726, 164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council,		Information/consultation	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that a lack of information on environmental proposals, including environmental mitigation, heritage and environmental health, means that they cannot adequately compare the updated proposed design changes against those stated in the PEI report at statutory consultation.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are relevance. Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at the autumn 2021	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment was not provided. However, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable. This included consideration of health impacts and cultural heritage impacts.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary Consultations, in light of the above</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.	
352	164331			Consultation - clarity of information	Respondent expressing concerns that the information within the supplementary consultation leaflet did not make it clear that the existing A66 eastbound exit road onto the B6542 was being retained.	<p>National Highways confirm that access from the eastbound carriageway to Appleby would remain. Traffic would be able to leave the A66 and travel past the Appleby Fair field before passing under the A66 and travelling into Appleby as it does currently. Traffic wishing to travel west from Appleby would leave Appleby as it does now and then proceed along the existing A66. It is then able to join the new A66 at the Long Marton Junction, or it can continue along the existing A66 and re-join the A66 at Temple Sowerby.</p> <p>National Highways are also going to make the westbound slip road out of Appleby two-way rather than one way as it is currently. This allows local traffic to use the existing A66 to access Appleby at this point if required. The traffic flows on the existing A66 would be much lower than current levels as the majority of the traffic that currently uses it would be on the new dual carriageway.</p> <p>Since the consultation in November 2021, we decided to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>remove both the proposed eastbound entry slip road near the Fair Field and the proposed westbound left in/left out junction close to Crackenthorpe. Eastbound access would continue to be provided by the junction located further east on Appleby Bypass. Westbound access is provided at the new Long Marton Junction via the existing A66.</p> <p>We consider that this was clear in the materials that we provided, however, recognising that this was an issue in the community we held an additional non-statutory consultation event that was widely publicised in the community.</p>	
353	164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Information/consultation	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concerns regarding the information contained in the consultation documents, including that they lack sufficient detail to understand the specific proposals or to allow councils to consult with residents. They also question the accessibility of QR codes on posters.</p>	<p>The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation brochure provided consultees with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in autumn 2021 during statutory consultation. It provided consultees with detailed information on the revised</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposals put forward by the Project. This included additional maps outlining the proposed design changes required at the Kirkby Thore junction, the Long Marton Lane End junction, and the Appleby access arrangements.</p> <p>The brochure provided detailed information on the design changes proposed for the Kirkby Thore junction, the Long Marton Lane End junction, and the Appleby access arrangements, and the benefits of the changes to the community. Further detailed information was also provided on how we proposed to manage the environmental impacts of the proposals at the three junctions.</p> <p>Where impacts could be felt by a wider audience – for example where junction changes could impact the way in which local people travelled around – leaflet distributions, poster sites and local drop-in events were used to ensure impacted people were reached. The leaflet included details of consultation events or how to source hard copies of materials.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
359	164717	Eden District Council		Information/noise	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concerns that our approach is contrary to the Good Acoustic Design process, making it difficult to understand potential noise impacts on residential properties.	<p>The methodology for the noise and vibration assessment reported within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) follows the guidance set out within National Highways Standard Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and government policy defined within Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and National Networks National Policy Statement (NN NPS). Good Acoustic Design relies on the same policy documents and principles as used for this assessment. LA 111 has been developed specifically for assessing noise impacts and their significance for highway schemes and describes the procedures used in the assessment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 contains further information with regards to the noise and vibration mitigation measures for this location and identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
400	163740			Information/ Incorrect Information	Respondents expressing concerns that the wrong road name is used, and it is Long Marton Road, not Long Marton Lane End.	National Highways will ensure that the correct road names are used in any future material which is produced.	No
643	164151			Information/consultation	Respondents expressing specific concerns about the information in the consultation documents not including the extent of land take from Fair Hill required for a westbound exit for Appleby.	National Highways confirms that no land take will be required from the Appleby Fair field.	No
436		Cumbria County Council		Information/landscape/visual amenity	Cumbria County Council expressing specific environmental concerns on whether the existing viewpoints are sufficient to demonstrate the nature and scale of effects on landscape character and/or visual amenity.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the potential visual impact of the Project. Representative 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 Institute's current guidance. The level of visual representation is selected to best illustrate the effects of the scheme and the proposed mitigation and provides a robust representation of the nature and scale of potential effects on landscape character and/or visual amenity.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
11	164152			Information / maps	A respondent expressing support for the consultation documents, with particular reference to the maps and descriptions provided.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the consultation documents	No
532	164155, 164726, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Northern Powergrid, Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council	164727	Further engagement	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Northern Powergrid, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making general suggestions regarding continued engagement, consultation, and consideration of locals' concerns. These include visits to directly impacted residents, a consultation event to provide an explanation for the decision to remove the Appleby junction, greater promotion in public areas of future consultation events, and suggested engagement on the location of potential construction compounds. Respondents also suggesting more specialised engagement with engineers to mitigate potential impacts on utility supplies.	National Highways will continue regular discussions and engagement with the Strategic Stakeholder group, focus groups, Community Liaison Groups, host local authorities and PILs and agents. We will use these meetings to continue to share project updates and to hear from stakeholders. National Highways will also continue to engage with statutory undertakers, particularly those who are anticipated to have apparatus that may be affected by the Project. The compound locations, sizes and usage will be refined further at the detailed design stage where assessments of the construction logistics will be carried out.	No
235	163501, 163977, 164717	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Eden District Council		Maps/ Lack of Information	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Eden District Council expressing concern that the maps provided are not detailed enough to form opinions and compare plans with	National Highways provided Consultation Brochures to provide consultees with information to inform their response to the Supplementary Consultations. The Brochures provided consultees	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>previous consultation materials. This includes a lack of clarity over grey hatched areas, footpaths, details of environmental mitigation measures, and the location of buildings and heritage assets in relation to the proposed route. Respondents state a map does not show the larger extent of the larger Scheduled Monument as surveyed and that the scheme still encroaches on the old Roman road north of the Scheduled Monument. Respondents expressing concern that such lack of detail may be intended to mask certain aspects of the proposals.</p>	<p>with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in the autumn 2021 statutory consultation and set out the difference between the junctions and access arrangements presented at our autumn 2021 consultation and the junction and access arrangements proposed through our supplementary consultation. The brochure was supported by detailed drawings. The Brochures referred back to the PEI Report that was published at the Autumn 2021 consultation and provided information on environmental effects and potential mitigation approaches. Each proposed change was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The Brochures provided details of how consultees could ask questions and seek further information by phone and email and also provided details of locations of hard copy documents.</p> <p>The new arrangement of the junction moves the works and the new road away from the Scheduled Monument, removing direct impacts to the monument and associated archaeology in the surrounding area. The location of the new junction to the east remains within the setting of the Scheduled Monument but the effects are substantially reduced. The setting of the Roman Road will be impacted by the scheme however the legibility of the Roman Road would be retained. There may be some minor tree removal in this area, but trees associated with the Roman Road will be retained and protected where possible to recognise this important landscape feature.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets.	
455	163464, 163504, 163505, 163506, 163507, 163510, 163511, 163512, 163513, 163850, 163851, 163852, 163853, 164051, 164152, 164154, 164337, 164721, 165005			Reduced local impact/ Economy/ Business	Respondents expressing support for the Kirkby Thore junction on the grounds that it would not result in land take from local businesses and properties, would simplify access to British Gypsum, and would have less impact on the businesses and properties on Main Street, in particular the industrial estate and A66 Caravan Storage, which respondents describe as essential to the local community. Respondents also expressing support for initial discussions to use the site of the former social club for off-road parking and a play area for the local community, and that reducing HGV movements to a single junction would reduce the noise impact on local communities.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Kirkby Thore junction and discussions regarding the use of the former social club.	No
61		Cumbria County Council		Request for further information/WCH	Cumbria County Council requesting greater detail on diversions for Public Rights of Way at Long Marton junction as connectivity could be worsened for the bridleway on the old Roman Road.	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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						underpass or bridge. The PRoW at the Long Marton junction will be realigned around the new junction to allow safe crossing and maintained connectivity.	
67		Cumbria County Council		Request for further information/cultural heritage	Cumbria County Council suggesting that removal of the land take from the Scheduled Monument boundary does not remove the risk of undesignated archaeological resources being present and expect an evaluation of this impact to be included within the Environment Statement.	The new arrangement of the junction moves the works and the new road away from the Scheduled Monument, removing direct impacts to the monument and associated archaeology in the surrounding area. The location of the new junction to the east remains within the setting of the Scheduled Monument but the effects are substantially reduced. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. It is acknowledged that there is a risk of unknown archaeology in the vicinity. Potential effects to unknown archaeology will be managed through the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) and the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy which is an Annex to the EMP. The Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy indicates how potential loss of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						resources during construction will be mitigated through preservation by record.	
69		Cumbria County Council		Request for further information/traffic and transport	Cumbria County Council suggesting that the safety of the existing A66 needs to be reassessed and the existing A66 now attracts higher traffic flows.	The existing A66, which will be de-trunked upon the opening of the new road, will attract markedly lower traffic flows than existing. A stage 1 Road Safety Audit was undertaken in December 2021 for the project and includes an assessment of the existing A66 to be de-trunked. The recommendations identified in this audit, relevant to the de-trunked A66, have been accepted and will be assessed further and mitigated in the next stage of the design development.	No
74		Cumbria County Council		Design	Cumbria County Council supporting the proposed highway reconfiguration subject to the satisfactory provision of preliminary design drawings.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the proposed highway reconfiguration subject to the satisfactory provision of preliminary design drawings. The General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) show our latest proposals.	No
528	163974, 164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Request for further information/consultation	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making general suggestions on the information contained in the consultation	The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>documents, including the provision of more detailed maps, updated General Arrangement drawings, and greater information on potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures. Respondents comment that National Highways should do this to enable stakeholders to respond to these and influence the project design.</p>	<p>consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation brochure provided consultees with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in autumn 2021 during statutory consultation. It provided consultees with detailed information on the revised proposals put forward by the Project. This included additional maps outlining the proposed design changes required at the Kirkby Thore junction, the Long Marton Lane End junction, and the Appleby access arrangements.</p> <p>The brochure provided detailed information on the design changes proposed for the Kirkby Thore junction, the Long Marton Road junction, and the Appleby access arrangements, and the benefits of the changes to the community. Further detailed information was also provided on how we proposed to manage the environmental impacts of the proposals at the three junctions.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Where impacts could be felt by a wider audience – for example where junction changes could impact the way in which local people travelled around – leaflet distributions, poster sites and local drop-in events were used to ensure impacted people were reached. The leaflet included details of consultation events or how to source hard copies of materials. Consultation events, an email address and a telephone number were provided should consultees had any questions or concerns they wanted answered.</p> <p>Each proposed design change was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.	
619	164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Request for further information/design information	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council requesting more information regarding the proposals, including: the impact of traffic moving closer to Kirkby Thore; whether public footpaths on British Gypsum land and the local road to Kirkby Thore would be maintained; clearer section drawings to assess the impact that junction structures would have on properties in Kirkby Thore; and information on the impact of noise and air pollution on Kirkby Thore, with proposed mitigation measures requested to be provided prior to publication of the Environmental Statement.	The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 7) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without. Generally, there is a reduction in traffic flow within Kirkby Thore including along Main Street. A significant reduction in traffic is forecast on the de-trunked section of road between Appleby and Temple Sowerby. Public Rights of Way connectivity will be maintained either in their current locations or they will be realigned and reconnected where the works might sever them. The potential impacts as a result of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). The public footpath proceeding north-eastwards from Kirkby Thore, as a continuation of Fell Lane (and adjacent to the Gypsum Plant) will be unaffected. Impacts of the Project on noise and air quality levels have been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						modelled and assessed in order to determine potential effects and any required mitigation. The conclusions of these assessments and proposed mitigation are set out in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) and ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2)	
641	164158	Cumbria County Council		Request for further information - noise	Respondents including Cumbria County Council suggesting that further information be provided, in particular revised traffic and noise contour forecasts for Crackenthorpe, both for the original plans and revised proposal, and greater detail on how safe and convenient access to the Appleby Horse Fair would be maintained through the construction and operational phases.	<p>The quantity and quality of information supplied, and our consultation methodology was appropriate and has been tailored to a targeted consultation process, in line with other National Highways projects.</p> <p>The consultation material and the consultation events held are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process).</p> <p>The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>7) outlines local traffic impacts for the revised forecasts (following the removal of the westbound junction north of Appleby) and provides a diagram showing the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without for the local area. A separate diagram is also provided which shows the 'with Project' traffic forecasts for the section of existing A66 which passes Crackenthorpe. Following the removal of the westbound junction, the traffic flow on this section of carriageway remains significantly less than the scenario without the Project.</p> <p>National Highways have carried out a traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project. 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. Compared to the previously consulted option the average daily traffic past Crackenthorpe will increase by</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>1,000 vehicles to 2,700 vehicles per day, in the opening year of 2029. However, it should be noted that if the Project was not implemented, daily flow would be 22,000.</p> <p>This transport model underpins the assessment of noise and vibration within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures. Where sustainable, 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. The community of Crackenthorpe is predicted to be subject to beneficial noise impacts as a result of the Project. Further information with regards to the noise and vibration mitigation measures for this location are contained within this Chapter and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Construction activities along the route of the A66, and particularly in the area of Appleby have the potential to impact on journeys to and from Appleby Horse Fair as a result of diversions, congestion, and delays. The Appleby Horse Fair and 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. This principle is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>No significant impact is identified during operation of the Project in regards the Appleby Horse Fair.</p>	
45	164152			Safety/ Traffic	A respondent expressing support for the proposals, on the grounds that upgrading the A66 would improve road safety, as the volume of traffic and HGVs is currently high.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme proposals.	No
20	164717	Eden District Council		Timescale/consultation	Respondents including Eden District Council expressing concern about the length of the consultation period and the impact	The consultation periods were considered proportionate to the scale of the proposed changes,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>this had on Elected Members ability to discuss with their residents and feedback on the proposals.</p>	<p>the likely impact of the changes and the level of public interest. As part of phase one (as noted in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report) (Application Document 4.4), this phase included multiple issues and a statutory consultation with PILs, therefore requiring a minimum 28-day consultation period under s42 of the PA 2008. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues. The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback on the change.</p>	
17	164153			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Congestion	A respondent expressing concern over the potential negative impact that the project could have on access to Sandersons Croft, as congestion and increased HGV traffic along Fell Lane would	The proposed junction which joins on Fell Lane to the north of Sanderson Croft would allow HGV traffic associated with the British Gypsum Site to avoid using Fell Lane and travelling through Kirkby	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					restrict access for residents and the proposals could remove parking.	Thore. Similarly, other industrial traffic, including HGVs accessing the cold store to the northwest of Knock would likely be attracted to the route which runs along the east side of the proposed A66 alignment which continues north over the railway bridge. Further information on these proposals can be found in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 3). There are no proposals to remove or restrict parking on Fell Lane.	
19			164150	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Maintenance Liability	A respondent expressing concern that council-adopted roads should remain under the maintenance obligations of local authorities.	For the vast majority of roads, maintenance obligations will be retained by the local highway authority or National Highways. Where it is necessary to stop up a section of existing road, the affected parties will be consulted to agree future ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the road/land.	No
49	164717	Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ HGV Facilities	Respondents including Eden District Council suggesting that additional HGV facilities and services be provided along the route.	A new service area for HGVs 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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.	
51	164151			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Connectivity	A respondent making suggestions regarding traffic connectivity to Appleby, in particular that the bollard between the access road to the existing A66 and the road to Long Marton be replaced with a mini roundabout to ease HGV access and traffic flows.	There are no current perceived safety issues at this junction because the traffic movements (which currently caters for HGV movements) will be similar to existing. As such the junction will not be altered by the scheme.	No
68	164712			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Alternative Route	A respondent suggesting that the existing A66 be used as an alternative route for bicycles, tractors, and cars wishing not to use the new dualled A66.	Facilities for walking and cycling on the existing A66 will be implemented, which would make the scheme more attractive for these users. Similarly, owing to the markedly reduced traffic on this road, then this should facilitate the passage of agricultural vehicles.	No
102	163972, 163991, 164041, 164042, 164053, 164158, 164295,	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council	164332	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Congestion	Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council expressing concern over the impact that the project could have on traffic and congestion, on the grounds that congestion would increase because of the larger population of Appleby and	National Highways have carried out a traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project. The model is a representation of the road network in the area and of where people travelled to and from in an	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	164335, 164716				proposed new housing estates in the town, which would lead to more traffic using the local roads between Appleby and Long Marton. Respondents comment that this would lead to more congestion for residents living along the existing A66 and in Long Marton and Crackenthorpe, would make it more difficult to enter and exit properties, and that losing the Appleby junction would undermine traffic flows to and from the town.	average month. It uses an industry-recognised method of predicting future traffic flows and conditions, both with and without the A66 Project. Compared to the previously consulted option the average daily traffic passing Crackenthorpe would increase by 1000 vehicles to 2,700 vehicles per day, in the opening year of 2029. However, it should be noted that if the scheme was not implemented, daily flow would be 22,000 vehicles per day by 2029. This means that properties accessed via the existing A66 will be much easier to access with the scheme in place than without. The existing junctions to the east of Appleby will remain unchanged and the Junction to the west will be sublimated by the proposed Long Marton Junction to ensure traffic flows to and from the town are not undermined. See Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) for further details.	
184	163967, 163968, 163969, 163970, 163972,		164332	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Access/	Respondents expressing concern that moving the junction from Appleby to Long Marton would isolate the town, forcing Appleby residents to use back roads which	The current junction at the western end of Appleby (specifically the loop diverge) would be retained. Adopting the proposed junction facility at Long	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	163973, 163980, 163981, 163984, 163988, 163990, 163991, 163992, 163995, 163997, 164034, 164037, 164038, 164039, 164041, 164049, 164052, 164053, 164155, 164156, 164157, 164331, 164333, 164334, 164335, 164338, 164712, 164713				are narrow and inaccessible during the winter and Horse Fair, and lead to inconvenience from longer journey times for local residents and commuters, reduced emergency service access, and more difficult access for HGVs into the industrial estate. Respondents also expressing concern that Appleby is a large town and should therefore have its own junction, especially as current, direct access onto the A66 is used frequently, that the current proposals are a 'backwards step', and that the previous plans provided more convenient access.	<p>Marton would result in a marginally increased journey time for Appleby residents to access the A66 (the traffic modelling suggests that this increase would be about one and a half minutes) - however, the inconvenience would be offset by the fact that the existing A66, which would need to be travelled by the motorist, would have markedly reduced traffic flows making it more attractive for local traffic and WCH use and would retain its de-restricted speed limit - thus, for the motorist travelling west from Appleby, the increase in journey time is likely to be negligible in comparison with the original proposed junction arrangement.</p> <p>See Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) for further details.</p>	
221	163967, 163968, 163969, 163970, 163972,		164332	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Congestion	Respondents expressing concern that moving the junction to Long Marton could lead to an increase in congestion from Appleby residents joining the A66, with the	National Highways have carried out a traffic modelling exercise to inform the design and the environmental impact of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	163973, 163980, 163981, 163984, 163988, 163990, 163991, 163992, 163995, 163997, 164034, 164037, 164038, 164039, 164041, 164049, 164052, 164053, 164155, 164156, 164157, 164331, 164333, 164334, 164335, 164338, 164712, 164713				westbound slip road becoming especially busy during peak times. Respondents also expressing concerns that: the road infrastructure could not support an increase in traffic; there would be greater traffic passing through Crackenthorpe; the Appleby Horse Fair would increase traffic on local country roads; that there are two more housing estates planned in Appleby, which would contribute to existing congestion; and that additional signage would be required to prevent traffic from using local roads and causing additional congestion.	<p>Compared to the previously consulted option the average daily traffic passing Crackenthorpe on the de-trunked A66 would increase by 1000 vehicles to 2,700 vehicles per day, in the opening year of 2029. However, it should be noted that if the scheme was not implemented, daily flow would be 22,000 vehicles per day on that section of road by 2029. Given this substantial drop in traffic due to the scheme it is not considered that congestion will be an issue.</p> <p>Traffic flows on the proposed westbound on-slip at Long Marton are forecast to be below 200 vehicles per hour in both AM and PM peak hour by 2044. Therefore, the westbound slip road joining the A66 is expected to operate within capacity without congestion.</p> <p>The de-trunked A66 will provide more appropriate access to the Appleby Horse Fair than that currently provided by the existing A66.</p> <p>The local country road route adds a mile to the journey and is undertaken on roads whose geometry is more restrictive to vehicular passage compared to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the existing A66. In turn, the facilities for walkers and cyclists along the existing A66 are being improved as part of the scheme, which further consolidates the safety of this road user group in the area.</p> <p>It should be noted that an allowance for all proposed housing estates within the area have been included within the Transport Assessment (Application Reference 3.7), see chapter 5.</p>	
240	163743, 164045, 164050, 164159, 164329, 164721		164714	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Connectivity	<p>Respondents expressing concern that the project could have a negative impact on traffic connectivity, on the grounds that: moving the caravan park would lead to congestion from frequent vehicle movements and parked caravans; creating a two-lane access road to Priest Lane could encourage use by larger vehicles, which could cause congestion on the single-lane Priest Lane; and that access to British Gypsum would be limited during construction of the new bridge over the A66, and therefore there would be a need to provide additional access ramps. Other respondents expressing concern</p>	<p>The parking layby on the Gypsum access road at Sandersons Croft would not be altered as part of the scheme design; also, the configuration of the trading estate opposite the layby would not be altered. The location of the proposed grade separated would intercept HGV movements to and from the Gypsum plant, which would result in markedly reduced HGV traffic outside Sanderson's Croft.</p> <p>The Priest Lane diversion is still a narrow road to make it less attractive for use by large vehicles.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					that the new trackway from the west end of Kirkby Thore would lead to public and farming vehicles intersecting on the overbridge, and therefore this trackway should be moved to the north side of the road.	Access to the British Gypsum site will be maintained during the construction phase. Liaison with affected parties will continue at the next design stage and by the Principal Contractor during construction. The shares footpaths/bridleways and accommodation tracks are provided to the north and south of the proposed dual carriageway. The overbridge width is sufficient for vehicles and WCH users to pass.	
304	163962, 163963, 163964, 163978, 163979, 164053, 164333, 164335	Crackenthorpe Parish Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ Safety	Respondents including Crackenthorpe Parish Council expressing concern that the proposals would lead to greater health and safety risks, on the grounds that the route would retain use of part of the existing A66 by people accessing Long Marton Junction from Appleby and direct traffic down narrow back roads, which would be unsuitable for greater volumes of high-speed traffic. Respondents also raising concerns that this would increase the number of accidents on an already dangerous road, including for residents attempting to exit their properties in Crackenthorpe, for vulnerable road users, and for	The Project would lead to a significant reduction in traffic on the de-trunked A66 between Appleby and Kirkby Thore. Compared to the previously consulted option the average daily traffic past Crackenthorpe would increase by 1000 vehicles to 2,700 vehicles per day, in the opening year of 2029. Without the scheme in place the daily flow would be 22,000. As part of the safety appraisal, an assessment of the impact on accidents due to the Project has been undertaken. This predicts the number of accidents over a 60-year appraisal period. The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					agricultural vehicles. Respondents also commenting that proposed speed limits have not been included in the current plans.	<p>section of existing A66 carriageway between just north of Appleby and the proposed new junction at Long Marton shows a predicted number of accidents just above 200 over the 60 year appraisal period without the Project. This drops to approximately 20 accidents with the Project and is a result of the significant reduction in traffic flow. More information describing the assessment methodology are provided in the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>The proposed speed limits can be seen on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans (Speed Limits) (Application Document 5.23).</p>	
316	163854, 163857, 163966, 163985, 164151, 164154, 164713			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Access	Respondents expressing concern that the proposals would reduce westbound access, with westbound vehicles required to travel through Appleby to access Fair Hill, and that the previous proposals provided better access arrangements for Brampton and Appleby. Respondents saying that the westbound exit at Appleby should be retained instead of	It should be noted that access from the eastbound carriageway to Appleby would remain. Traffic would be able to leave the A66 and travel past the Appleby Fair Field before passing under the A66 and travelling into Appleby as it does currently. Traffic wishing to travel west from Appleby would leave Appleby as it does now and then proceed along the existing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					introducing a junction at Long Marton.	<p>A66. It is then able to join the new A66 at the Long Marton Junction, or it can continue along the existing A66 and re-join the A66 at the Temple Sowerby. This ensures westbound access is not reduced.</p> <p>National Highways are also going to make the westbound slip road out of Appleby two-way rather than one way as it is currently. This allows local traffic to use the existing A66 to access Appleby at this point if required. The traffic flows on the existing A66 would be much lower than current levels as the majority of the traffic that currently uses it would be on the new dual carriageway.</p> <p>Since the consultation in November 2021, we have decided to remove both the proposed eastbound entry slip road near the Fair Field and the proposed westbound left in left out junction close to Crackenthorpe. Eastbound access would continue to be provided by the junction located further east on Appleby Bypass. Westbound access is</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						provided at the new Long Marton junction via the existing A66.	
323	163461, 163961, 163981, 163990, 164039, 164151		164150	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Access	Respondents expressing concern that the proposed Appleby access arrangements would reduce eastbound access, on the grounds that: the proposals would require eastbound vehicles to first travel west down local back roads, increasing journey times and emissions; the eastbound slip road is vital for HGVs and agricultural vehicles accessing the industrial estate; and the proposals would lead to more traffic through Appleby, especially with the new proposed housing developments. Respondents also comment that the existing exit road could be maintained without encroaching on Fair Hill.	<p>It should be noted that access for all vehicles) from the eastbound carriageway to Appleby would remain as existing. Traffic would be able to leave the A66 and travel past the Appleby Fair field before passing under the A66 and travelling into Appleby as it does currently. Traffic wishing to travel west from Appleby would leave Appleby as it does now and then proceed along the existing A66. It is then able to join the new A66 at the Long Marton Junction, or it can continue along the existing A66 and re-join the A66 at the Temple Sowerby.</p> <p>National Highways are also going to make the westbound slip road out of Appleby two-way rather than one way as it is currently. This allows local traffic to use the existing A66 to access Appleby at this point if required. The traffic flows on the existing A66 would be much lower than current levels as the majority of the traffic that currently uses it would be on the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>new dual carriageway.</p> <p>Since the consultation in Autumn 2021 we have decided to remove both the proposed eastbound entry slip road near the Fair Field and the proposed westbound left in / left out junction close to Crackenthorpe. Eastbound access would continue to be provided by the junction located further east on Appleby Bypass. Westbound access is provided at the new Long Marton junction via the existing A66.</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken to support our proposals does make an allowance from the planned housing developments in Appleby.</p>	
333	164045, 164153, 164712		164266	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Safety	<p>Respondents expressing concerns over safety around Sandersons Croft, on the grounds that Fell Lane should not become a main road as it is already busy, and more traffic could undermine the safety of road users and pedestrians. Respondents also expressing concern that moving access to the caravan park closer to the access road and the sharp left hand turn into Main Street</p>	<p>By moving the Kirkby Thore junction west from Main Street to the British Gypsum access road, large HGVs that currently access the British Gypsum works by travelling up through the village and then along Fell Lane and into the works would no longer need to do this as they would be able to access the works directly from the new junction. Additionally, HGVs and other traffic which currently</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					would be dangerous for all vehicles, but especially HGVs.	<p>use Main Street to access businesses and other villages to the north of Kirkby Thore would be able to exit the new A66 at the Kirkby Thore Junction and then travel north via a new road that would link to Main Street just north of the village.</p> <p>The access to the industrial estate where a number of industrial units and a caravan storage park are located would be re-designed to the latest standards to give better visibility and allow safer movements for vehicles as they enter and exit the estate.</p>	
357	164725		164723	Traffic, transport and junctions/ Access	Respondents expressing concerns regarding traffic access, on the grounds that the proposals would not provide suitable access to private land, and that blocking the existing carriageway to Brougham would increase journey times and undermine accessibility to private land.	The realignment of the Long Marton Road is necessary so as to comply with the geometric standards required by this category of road, and also to connect with the alignment of the A66 mainline route. The design has been developed to ensure any impacts are minimised and that access to properties and agricultural land is maintained. The existing access to Brougham will be maintained through the realignment of Long Marton Road, and therefore journey times should not be impacted.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
360	163962, 163979, 163984, 163993, 163995, 164039, 164041, 164053, 164151, 164152, 164333, 164335, 164712, 164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ Safety	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council expressing concerns that the proposals would pose a risk to the safety of road users, on the grounds that: they extend journeys along single-lane, narrow back roads, which would be especially dangerous during the winter; fast-moving traffic compensating for increased journey times could cause incidents, which are already frequent involving pedestrians, vehicles, and horse-drawn carriages; there would be greater risk of collision with farm traffic; increasing traffic on the existing A66 would reduce its safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders; the proposals could lengthen emergency service response times; and traffic would increase around Crackenthorpe, making its junctions more dangerous than in the original junction proposed.</p>	<p>The provision of an all-movement junction at Long Marton, together with the changes to the current westbound on-slip at Appleby to make it 2 way will allow local traffic to use the de-trunked A66. Our assessment is that people making short local journeys between Appleby and the small villages located to the west such as Bolton, Brougham and Long Marton will use the de-trunked A66, the traffic flows on the de-trunked A66 are predicted to be significantly lower with the Project in place.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment, Application Document 3.7, chapter 8.1 shows that the daily flows on the de-trunked A66 past Crackenthorpe would be 2,700 with the project on place compared to 22,000 vehicles per day without the project in place.</p> <p>The Road Safety Audit highlighted the potential for increased traffic speeds along the existing de-trunked section of A66 (although this is due to decreased traffic levels rather than traffic trying to compensate for extended journeys along access routes) and a potential increase in use by non-</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>motorised users (NMUs). 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.</p> <p>This significant reduction in flow makes it a safer option than using the narrow and twisty country lanes which surround it. The back roads route adds roughly a mile to the journey. Additionally, the facilities for walkers and cyclists along the existing A66 are being improved as part of the scheme, which further consolidates the safety of this road user group in the area.</p> <p>Generally, traffic using the new A66 for part of their journey will save time due to the dualling of single carriageway sections and increased speed limit. This is likely to offset some if not all of any increase due extended routes accessing the A66 and therefore we don't envisage traffic trying to compensate for increased journey times.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
378	163856, 163964, 163974, 163977, 163978, 163979, 163981, 163983, 163987, 163988, 164034, 164037, 164042, 164155, 164338, 164712	Appleby in Westmorland Town Council, Crackenthorpe Parish Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ Connectivity	<p>Respondents including Appleby in Westmorland Town Council and Crackenthorpe Parish Council expressing concerns that the proposals would reduce traffic connectivity, saying that they would not support a junction at Long Marton at the expense of one at Appleby, on the grounds that: Appleby is a major market town with a larger industrial estate than Kirkby Thore, and therefore should have its own junction; the removal of the Appleby junction would send vehicles down narrow, winding roads and increase journey times; reducing access could deter tourists from visiting the town; the road infrastructure would not be able to support high volumes of traffic; and the plans would still require HGVs to travel along minor roads to Long Marton, thus not solving safety and traffic issues. Respondents also expressing specific concerns regarding the Appleby Horse Fair, including that placing a junction to the West, rather than East, of Crackenthorpe, would encourage the travelling community to park at the Appleby junction during fair times, and that as Fair Hill is common land, its access should</p>	<p>It should be noted that access from the eastbound carriageway to Appleby would remain alongside the provision of a new access at Long Marton. Traffic would be able to leave the A66 and travel past the Appleby Fair field before passing under the A66 and travelling into Appleby as it does currently. The existing westbound on-slip to the A66 to the west of Appleby (currently the B6542) will become 2-way, in effect becoming the de-trunked A66. Thus, traffic wishing to travel west from Appleby would leave Appleby as it does now, travelling along the de-trunked A66 (currently the B6542). It is then able to join the new A66 at the Long Marton Junction.</p> <p>The traffic flows on the existing A66 would be much lower than current levels as the majority of the traffic that currently uses it would be on the new dual carriageway.</p> <p>Since the consultation in Autumn 2021 National Highways have decided to remove both the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					neither be removed nor prioritised over the needs of the local community itself.	proposed eastbound entry slip road near the Fair Field and the proposed westbound left in/left out junction close to Crackenthorpe. Eastbound access would continue to be provided by the junction located further east on Appleby Bypass. Westbound access is provided at the new Long Marton junction via the existing A66. Thus, the junction at Fair field is not being altered in any form, and access will be unaffected.	
401	163743, 164045, 164047			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Safety	Respondents expressing general concerns over safety, on the grounds that moving access to the industrial park could lead to increased traffic and safety risks, and that the proposals do not provide for safe parking.	The Access to the industrial estate is not being relocated. It is to be re-designed to the latest standards to give better visibility and allow safer movements for vehicles as they enter and exit the estate. The existing parking areas in front of the properties on the opposite side of the road to the industrial estate entrance will not be affected. The works plans which form part of the DCO Application provide details of the proposals regarding the Industrial Estate access.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
444	163467, 163741, 163745, 163971, 164331, 164336, 165005			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Congestion	Respondents expressing support for the Appleby access arrangements on the grounds that they would improve traffic and congestion, due to: moving traffic from local, residential areas to the Long Marton junction; dualling the westbound slip road; adding access roads into Appleby; better alignment of the A66 with existing roads; improving traffic flows for the Appleby Horse Fair; and avoiding an increase in traffic around the local school and along Long Marton Road.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Appleby access arrangements.	No
451	163961, 164151, 164356, 165005			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support	Respondents expressing support for the Appleby access arrangements, saying that they provide a simple road layout and enable both east- and west-bound access to Appleby, including through the availability of alternative routes, use of Long Marton, and two-way access between Appleby and the existing A66.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
479	163510, 163853, 163971, 164152, 164356			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Safety	Respondents expressing support for the proposals, as they say that moving the junction to Long Marton would enhance safety by reducing traffic on local roads and	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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					making it safer for vehicles to access the A66.		
484	163464, 164152, 164295			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Safety	Respondents expressing support for the proposals, on the grounds that they would improve safety of the Appleby junction both compared to the original proposals and to the current layout which they say is dangerous with poor visibility.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
487	163464, 163467, 163511, 163740, 163741, 163971, 164051, 164154, 164159, 164267, 164295, 164331, 164336, 164356, 164713, 164716, 164721, 165005	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Safety	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing support for the revised junction on the grounds that it would reduce traffic and congestion by: improving connectivity between local villages such as Long Marton, Kirkby Thore, and Bolton; enhancing access from Long Marton to the A66, including through improved slip road access; improving access to Birkshead Mine; ensuring that residents would not have to leave the new A66 at Kirkby Thore or Appleby; avoiding increased traffic through Long Marton and along local roads; reducing traffic around local properties; and protecting the Roman Fort.	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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
507	163467, 163511, 163512, 163740, 163744, 163850, 163852, 164159, 164295, 164336, 164356, 164721, 165006	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Access	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing support for the revised Kirkby Thore junction, as it would improve HGV access to British Gypsum through a simpler route, ensure that they do not have to travel through Kirkby Thore and on narrow Main Street, and confine HGV access to one junction. Respondents also expressing support for the proposals due to potential traffic flow benefits, including that Fell Lane would be more suited to an increase in traffic; that traffic flows through Kirkby Thore would be reduced; that there would be less congestion at the end of Main Street and the turning onto Fell Lane; and that connectivity would be improved to the Industrial Estate and A68.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
525	163464, 164721, 165006			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Support/ Safety	Respondents expressing support for the revised Kirkby Thore junction, on the grounds that it would improve safety for all road users, including walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, with specific reference to fewer HGVs travelling through the village and improved safety on Main Street.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
616	163986, 163987, 164712			Traffic, transport and junctions/ Safety	Respondents raising specific concerns over the impacts that the project could have on safety along Battlebarrow Road in Appleby, on the grounds that the road has poor visibility due to the railway bridge and is located close to a busy school road, and that making the slip road two-way would increase the risk of accidents along this road.	All our proposals are designed in accordance with the latest standards available and are also subject to independent Road Safety Audit to ensure that they are safe and fit for purpose. Additionally, we use the latest software to model the junctions and ensure that they are capable of accommodating the vehicles which use them. The Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7 Section 8) outlines local traffic impacts for each Project scheme including Temple Sowerby to Appleby. This shows the change in traffic flows with the Project compared to without. The modelled daily flow on Battlebarrow Road reduces marginally with the scheme in place, as more journeys are undertaken on the improved A66 rather than on other local roads, therefore it would be expected that accident numbers would not increase.	No
25	163500			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Segregation	A respondent expressing concern that the proposals would not provide for a separate cycle lane.	A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	
29	163500			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Segregation	A respondent expressing concern that there would not be a separate cycle lane installed as part of the proposals.	A shared path for pedestrians and cyclists would be provided primarily in the verge of the de-trunked existing A66.	No
34		Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Support/ Connectivity	Cumbria County Council expressing general support regarding provision for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, stating that moving the Kirkby Thore junction to Fell Lane would enhance pedestrian connectivity, and that the width of the road leading to British Gypsum would make it better suited for active travel users.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
40		Kirkby Thore Parish Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Support	Kirkby Thore Parish Council expressing support for provisions for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, with particular reference to a continuous cycleway along the existing A66.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
42	164056			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Support	A respondent expressing support for the closure of specific footpaths, without expanding further.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
64	164717	Eden District Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Access	Respondents including Eden District Council suggesting improvement to access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders,	A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. Further information	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					with specific reference to improvement of east-west connectivity for active travel users and the re-routing of any severed Public Rights of Way.	can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19). All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. Where 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.	
70	163500			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Safety	A respondent suggesting the introduction of cycling provision to improve safety along the route.	A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	No
92	164334	Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Access	Respondents including Cumbria County Council expressing concern over access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, saying that the previous proposals included better provision for footpaths and cycle lanes and that the removal of the junction for Westbound traffic would lead to an increase in traffic on the existing A66, undermining its use for non-motorised travellers.	There would be a marked decrease of traffic on the existing A66; in addition, facilities for walkers and cyclists (including crossing provision) have been improved significantly under the new proposal. Traffic free shared use walking and cycle paths have been proposed for all schemes, apart from Scheme 9 in which a shared equestrian/pedestrian route is proposed in keeping with the users in this area. Further	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						information can be found in the Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4) and the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).	
94		Crackenthorpe Parish Council, Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Connectivity	Crackenthorpe Parish Council, Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing concern over connectivity for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, on the grounds that earlier proposals for improved active travel routes have not been included, which would undermine the ability for children to walk or cycle to school, and that diversions could reduce connectivity for the bridleway on the old Roman Road. Respondents expressing concern that the new trackways shown on the plans would not be part of the Sustrans network.	<p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. The route has been developed to minimise land take and reduce crossings of the carriageway as much as possible. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it would 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 Riding underpass or bridge. The bridleway along the old roman road will remain. The latest plans for the route and the changes made around Long Marton</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>junction has allowed us to move the alignment of the new A66 further south creating more space between bridleway and the new carriageway.</p> <p>Concerns that the new trackways will not be part of the Sustrans network are acknowledged, however it is noted that as a charity, the majority of the network isn't owned by it, but by local authorities and other landowners.</p>	
98	164333, 164334, 164335	Crackenthorpe Parish Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Safety	<p>Respondents including Crackenthorpe Parish Meeting expressing concern over potential safety risks for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, on the grounds that slip-roads in Appleby and on the existing A66 are considered to be dangerous, especially for pedestrians due to poorly visible pedestrian crossings. They feel that an increase in traffic around Crackenthorpe would lead to greater safety risks, and that previous plans provided safer access.</p>	<p>Facilities for walking and cycling on the existing A66 would be implemented, which would make it all together more attractive for these users; similarly, there would be markedly reduced vehicle flows on this road, which would result in markedly improved opportunities to emerge from junctions (and also cross the carriageway) than at present. Where the new A66 cuts through a public right of way, this is being reconnected by 'grade separated' means (i.e., bridge or underpass). The existing A66 would see markedly reduced vehicle flows and better-defined crossing points for pedestrians also. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Our Transport Assessment document (Application Document 3.7) contains information on the assessments that we have undertaken. Additionally, all our designs are subject to Road Safety Audits which are undertaken by independent Auditors.</p>	
117	163854, 164153, 164721	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Severance of PRow	<p>Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing concern over the impact that the proposals would have on access for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders. Particular reference is made to severance of footpaths, including to the Pennines, the British Gypsum plant, and Main Street. Respondents also comment that the removal of the bridge at Main Street means that there would not be a quiet active travel route for vulnerable road users to the wider Public Right of Way network.</p>	<p>A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRow) would remain. If a PRow is severed by the new dualling scheme, it would 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 proposed bridge on Fell Lane acts as a diversion route for Main Street where it is severed by the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						dual carriageway. This will provide better footpath connectivity than currently existing on Main Street and it is a wider road which provides more space for motorised vehicles to pass vulnerable road users.	
442		Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Support	Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council expressing support for proposals for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders, including the establishment of an active travel route along the existing A66, which they say abides by the Government's Transport Strategy and improves previous severance of cycle lanes, with particular reference to Spitals Farm.	National Highways acknowledges the support for the Project.	No
567	163857, 164056			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Suggestion	Respondents making suggestions for walking, cycling, and horse-riding provision as part of the project, including dedicated cycle lanes to encourage sustainable travel and enhance safety, and a full footpath diversion to reduce the length of diversion and keep routes separate from the new A66.	A new east-west shared cycleway (for cyclists and walkers) has been proposed within the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme extents. The route follows the line of the existing A66 which is to be de-trunked. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19). 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>(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>Where possible routes have been kept separate from the proposed A66 and are maintained on a direct a route as possible. Diversions have been kept to a minimum (the longest diversion route is 600m).</p> <p>Detailed information on diversions 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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
586	164056, 164721	Kirkby Thore Parish Council, Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Suggestion/ Connectivity	Respondents including Kirkby Thore Parish Council and Cumbria County Council making suggestions regarding walking, cycling, and horse-riding connectivity, including that lost	A shared cycle/footway has been proposed within the Scheme 4&5 extents along the de-trunked existing A66. The route has been developed to minimise land take and reduce crossings of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>footpaths are replaced, there is physical separation or barriers between active travel routes and the A66, there are designated cycle lanes and footpaths where these intersect with the new road, and that any new trackways are linked to existing footpaths.</p> <p>Respondents requesting that access through the new junction is facilitated, through a crossing of the new road to the west for bridleways, a bridge for active travel users to avoid the junction, and a footway and crossing through the junction. More specific suggestions are made to connect existing footpaths, including between Kirkby Thore Hall and Lady Anne Way; between Sandersons Croft and the school; around the new housing estate; to British Gypsum; and between Hale Grange and footpaths to the north-east.</p>	<p>carriageway as much as possible. Where practicable existing crossings have been utilised. Further information can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it would 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>Where possible WCH routes have been kept separate from the proposed A66 and a fence or other physical separation will be provided.</p> <p>Footways or shared use footway/cycleways have been provided where footpaths or bridleways intersect with the new roads.</p> <p>In response to the more specific comments to connect existing footpaths:</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirkby Thore Hall and Lady Anne Way – The new alignment runs through Sleastonhow Lane, and an overbridge is being provided; this will ensure the continuation of Lady Anne Way, and hence connection to the footpath at Kirkby Thore Hall. • Sandersons Croft and the school – not included in the design as an existing right of way links these areas. • Around the new housing estate – We are proposing improved footpath connectivity around the school and the Cross Street overbridge. • British Gypsum – Existing footway and right of way improvements included in the design. 	
596	163500, 164056, 164720, 164717	Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Suggestion/ Design	Respondents including Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council making suggestions regarding walking, cycling, and horse-riding provision, including that: a separate cycle lane be installed;	A shared cycleway (for cyclists and walkers) has been proposed along the full extent of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme and follows the line of the existing A66 which is to be de-trunked. The new route ties into existing provision at each end of the scheme. The route has been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>existing paths are maintained where possible;</p> <p>suitable pedestrian crossings are introduced; separated active travel routes are made suitable for vulnerable road users and horse-riders;</p> <p>safety is ensured for all users accessing the Appleby Horse Fair;</p> <p>and that the de-trunked A66 is used to provide segregated access for horse-drawn carriages.</p>	<p>developed to minimise land take and reduce crossings of the carriageway as much as possible.</p> <p>The position of the cycleway in relation to the de-trunked A66, and the segregation from the road, varies along the length of the route. The segregated route provides a significant safety improvement for users (including vulnerable road users). Horse riders are not permitted to use the shared cycleway. Standalone facilities for horse riders are not proposed due to the limited demand and the additional land that would be required to provide parallel bridleway facilities.</p> <p>Further information can be found in 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>All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would remain. If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it would 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge.</p> <p>The final detail of all WCH provision (including crossing points) will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project.</p> <p>Additionally, all our designs are carried out in accordance with the latest design standards and are subject to Road Safety Audits which are undertaken by independent Auditors.</p> <p>The Appleby Horse Fair is an large scale event that will require careful traffic management to ensure it can take place safely and 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).</p> <p>The de-trunked section of A66</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>within the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme is likely to be suitable as part of the Local Authority's traffic management routing for the event.</p> <p>The scheme will significantly reduce the flow on the existing A66 between Appleby, Crackenthorpe. Given this significant drop in traffic it considered that the old A66 will be more suitable for horse drawn traffic without the need for segregated infrastructure, particularly if suitable signage was provided to warn motorists.</p>	
602	163993, 164294, 164335, 164716	Cumbria County Council		Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders/ Safety	<p>Respondents including Cumbria County Council raising concerns over safety for walkers, cyclists, and horse-riders as part of the proposals, on the grounds that an increase in traffic along the existing A66 and in Crackenthorpe would make journeys more dangerous for active travel users, and that the existing Appleby slip road lacks footpaths and is already dangerous, which would be made worse by making it two-way.</p>	<p>A shared cycleway (for cyclists and walkers) has been proposed along the full extents of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme and follows the line of the existing A66 which is to be de-trunked. The new route ties into existing provision at each end of the scheme. The route has been developed to minimise land take and reduce crossings of the carriageway as much as possible.</p> <p>The position of the cycleway in relation to the de-trunked A66, and the segregation from the road,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>varies along the length of the route. The new route bypasses the Appleby slip road mentioned in the comment</p> <p>Further information can be found in 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 scheme will significantly reduce the flow on the existing A66 between Appleby, Crackenthorpe and the proposed junction at Long Marton. The modelled flow for 2019 (reflecting the current situation) is 19,000 vehicles per day. Without the scheme in place, this flow would rise to 22,000 vehicles per day by the opening year of 2029 due to traffic growth. However, with the scheme in place the flow on the road would drop to 2,700 vehicles per day in 2029 as evidenced in Chapter 8.1 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). There is therefore no increased safety risk anticipated at Crackenthorpe.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
185		Cumbria County Council		Access track/WCH	Cumbria County Council expressing support for off-carriageway provisions of walking, cycling and horse riding between B6542 at Barrow Coombe garage and onwards parallel to the existing A66 as retained, but adds that further detail is required to confirm segregation.	National Highways thanks you for your support of our proposals for off carriageway provisions of walking, cycling and horse riding between B6542 at Barrow Coombe garage and onwards parallel to the existing A66. Further details regarding the proposals will be provided during the detailed design phase and we will continue to liaise with the council to obtain your feedback into the final proposals.	No
97		Cumbria County Council		Drainage/ Request for Further Information	Cumbria County Council requesting further information regarding detail on how flow rates would be maintained to Trout Beck and expect this information in the Environment Statement.	The effects of the scheme 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. Further detail on how flow rates would be maintained to Trout Beck can be found within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	No
180		Cumbria County Council		Environmental/ Request for Further Information	Cumbria County Council express concern that until they further understand how far mitigation can resolve the environmental impacts on Sandersons Croft they cannot	Each proposed design change was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					determine the most appropriate design.	<p>none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>Further information in regards the proposed Project design and potential environmental impacts and identified mitigation is set out within the ES (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4).</p> <p>The relocation of the junction would bring it closer to Sandersons Croft. 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 at this location. Mitigation measures, where required, are based on guidance in DMRB LA 105.</p> <p>Earthbundling/landscaping has been elevated as much as</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts during operation of the Project, whilst considering landscape and visual implications. Mitigation has been built into the design to reduce impacts of noise and visual setting. This includes landscape and ecological planting and an indication of how this could be implemented within Order Limits is set out in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>During construction there is likely significant temporary noise and air quality impacts on residents located close to the route, however, we are committed to measures that would help minimise impacts such as protecting air quality by implementing a an Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
199		Cumbria County Council		Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution/ Property	Cumbria County Council expressing concern over the air quality and noise impacts that the proposals could have on the new housing estate on Newbiggin Road	<p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) and the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential air quality emissions and changes to noise and vibration from the Project at this location.</p> <p>This assessment concluded that there is no significant effect on this development.</p>	No
644		Cumbria County Council		Flood risk/ Groundwater	Cumbria County Council expressing concerns over the impact that the Long Marton junction could have on hydrology, on the grounds that the north-east drainage pond's proximity to the Trout Beck Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) could lead to contamination from groundwater flowing into the Beck, the proximity of the local road to the Trout Beck could lead to a potential flood risk, and that there appear to be limited mitigation measures proposed around the Trout Beck viaduct.	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface water quality and quantity, have been assessed in detail and this is reported in detail in ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). No adverse impacts to water quality of Trout Beck are anticipated.</p> <p>Further detail is provided on the anticipated impacts to the Trout Beck Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5). Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4) identifies no change to flood risk as a result of the Project.</p> <p>In regards mitigation measures proposed for the Trout Beck Viaduct, the viaduct will comprise an open span and the length of the crossing minimised to reduced impacts on the aquatic environment and allow natural river processes to continue as secured by the EMP (Application Document 2.7). Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) also set out that the orientation of the piers at Trout Beck Viaduct must be informed by detailed flood modelling so that they do not influence the migratory nature of the river. With all piers to be designed as in-channel structures, to allow for the movement of the river and avoid the need to add scour protection in future.</p>	
178		Cumbria County Council		Public footpaths/ Design	Cumbria County Council express concern at the removal of the bridge at Main Street, stating that pedestrians' cyclists and	Both the previous design and this proposed design only had one bridge spanning the new A66 alignment. The previous	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					vulnerable road users will no longer have a quieter route to use.	alternative with the bridge at Main Street would have operated as the main route for traffic coming off the A66, the same way the bridge on Fell Street in the proposed design will be. By having the bridge crossing on Fell Lane this also maintains the existing footpath (FP336013) along its route in situ. Any existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would remain where possible. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of PRoW throughout the area and concludes no significant effects.	
213		Cumbria County Council		Safety Access/ Appleby Horse Fair	Cumbria County Council suggest the Applicant should liaise with the Council to ensure that access to and from Appleby Horse Fair in both the construction phase and the operational phase of the A66 NTP is safe for all road users and that the proposals are designed to ensure efficient movements for all.	There will be a Construction Traffic Management Plan that will minimise the construction phase disruption as far as practicable with measures in place specifically for users of the Appleby Horse Fair and other similar sites locally. Safety of all road users will be factored into the management plan. During operation the junction off the A66 into the Appleby Fair site will remain as it is currently. There is also potential for travellers to use the existing A66 to gain access into the site. This	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						will reduce the conflicts that currently exist between strategic traffic which uses the A66 and the slow-moving caravans and horses which use the route during fair week. National Highways will continue to work with Cumbria County Council through the detailed design to refine the proposals for the de-trunked A66 and access into the Appleby Fair Field.	
205		Cumbria County Council		Landscape/visual	Cumbria County Council expressing concern that the project would have a negative impact on the landscape of Sandersons Croft, on the grounds that the junction roads would reach ground level to access the overbridge, and therefore vehicles would be seen from residential properties.	Sensitive landform and planting mitigation measures have been included to minimise impacts to Sandersons Croft. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) provide an indication of how planting could be implemented in this area . There will be a change to the landscape of Sandersons Croft and this is illustrated in the viewpoint within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). which has been revised to show the view from these properties.	No
645		Environment Agency		Environment – Flood risk	The Environment Agency suggesting that the proposed revisions, increasing the size of the structures over Moor and Cringle Beck have the potential to	Flood risk modelling has been undertaken on these structures, the result of which are set out in Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					impact on flood risk the River Eden Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Environment Agency suggest that the impacts of the crossings are fully considered through the necessary flood risk, geomorphology and ecological assessments and seek to avoid impacts where possible. Where this is not possible, National Highways should demonstrate that appropriate measures can be provided to mitigate any detrimental impacts that are identified.	Strategy (Application Document 3.4). This concludes and identifies no change to flood risk as a result of the Project and therefore no significant effect is identified. .	
648	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Heritage/ Lack of Information	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern that the map does not show the larger extent of the scheduled monument identified in recent surveys and that the scheme still encroaches on the old Roman Road north of the Scheduled Monument.	Though not shown on maps presented at consultation, these areas were included in the heritage assessment. The new arrangement of the junction moves the works and the new road away from the Scheduled Monument, removing direct impacts to the monument and associated archaeology in the surrounding area. The location of the new junction to the east remains within the setting of the Scheduled Monument but the effects are substantially reduced. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets within this area.	
646		Cumbria County Council		Heritage/ Impact	Cumbria County Council raise concerns that removal of the line of woodland along the Roman Road would pose a risk to this heritage site as these trees have previously been used to mark the length of the asset, and that the route encroaches on the Roman Road's setting and archaeology to the north of the Scheduled Monument, without providing detail on the extent of this impact.	<p>The setting of the Roman Road will be impacted by the scheme however the legibility of the Roman Road would be retained. There may be some minor tree removal in this area, but trees associated with the Roman Road will be retained and protected where possible to recognise this important landscape feature.</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. Potential effects to unknown archaeology will be managed through the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy which is an Annex to the EMP. The Mitigation Strategy indicates how potential loss of resources during construction will be mitigated through preservation by record</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
647		Cumbria County Council		Environmental/ Request for Further Information	Cumbria County Council suggest sight of section drawings would aid the understanding of the effects of the junction structures upon properties in Kirkby Thore. The Councils would expect mitigation proposals in this area to holistically consider the impacts upon noise, ecology and landscape and visual and how the impacts of all three can be collectively minimised.	<p>The Project team has worked closely together collaborating across Biodiversity, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration and Heritage disciplines to design mitigation for potential Project impacts. This collaborative approach has allowed for identified mitigation to balance aspects such as height of noise bunds with visual impacts. The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.</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 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>representation is selected to best illustrate the effects of the scheme and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>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. Earthbundling/landscaping has been elevated as much as practicable to minimise road traffic noise impacts and consider landscape and visual implications. The required land take includes the provision for bunds that are balanced with landscape considerations. The ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Amenity, Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration and Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) set out the full assessment of impacts and any likely significant effects on these properties.</p>	
649		Cumbria County Council		Noise/ Property	Cumbria County Council express concern that properties to the north of Kirkby Thore will experience a greater increase in road traffic noise as a result of the amended proposals compared to the proposals consulted upon at	A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration considers the noise and vibration impacts of the Project. Mitigation measures have also been designed into the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>statutory consultation. Also, the noise and air quality impacts on the proposed housing on the site to the north of The Old Rectory. This site, on Newbiggin Road, is very close to the current proposals. It has planning permission (19/0270) for 26 homes. The Councils expect to see information identifying the noise and air pollution impacts on the proposed housing and the appropriate mitigation in order to determine the acceptability of the road line at this point.</p>	<p>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. 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. The Project has identified adverse impacts on a few properties between Long Marton and Kirkby Thore due to the Project alignment. The provision of noise mitigation measures have been considered in the context of government policy on sustainability and the is reported in the ES and any measures are secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The local road network (including Priest Lane and Cross Street adjacent to the proposed development site for 26 houses) is predicted to experience a decrease in traffic movements and hence a decrease in noise levels. No significant noise impact is identified. The air quality assessment, as set out in ES</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential traffic emissions from the Project at this location and considers the identified housing development. The assessment concludes that there is no significant effect and no mitigation required.</p> <p>NB - We believe there is a typo and planning ref is 19/0272</p>	
650		Cumbria County Council		Noise/ Traffic	Cumbria County Council expressing concern of increased road traffic noise at properties north of Kirkby Thore as a result of the proposals.	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration considers the noise and vibration impacts of the Project on local receptors. 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. 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. Following these mitigation measures, there are 67 residential</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						receptors likely to be subject to significant adverse effects because of the scheme. Of these 67 receptors, 57 residential dwellings are located to the north of Kirkby Thore at Sandersons Croft to the south of the new A66 alignment. The majority of these dwellings are predicted to experience a major or moderate impact in the short-term, with 39 experiencing a reduction in impact in the long-term to either moderate or minor. The remaining 10 residential receptors are located to the north of the new A66 alignment around the areas of Spitals Farm, Halefield Farm, Sleastonhow, Powls House, Castrigg Hill and Roger Head. These dwellings are predicted to experience a major or moderate impact in the short-term, with 9 experiencing a reduction in impact in the long-term to either moderate or minor. Due to engineering constraints the noise barrier could not be designed to mitigate these residual effects, therefore the residual effects remain.	
651		Cumbria County Council		Request further information - Noise	Cumbria County Council requesting more information regarding the proposed noise	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out the detailed noise	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					mitigation measures at Kirkby Thore.	<p>and vibration assessment undertaken for the Project and identifies the potential noise and vibration impacts at Kirkby Thore. 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> <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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>experience a significant permanent beneficial effect. One non-residential property at Spitals is expected to experience a significant permanent adverse effect.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 within 50m of close receptors, and the use of less intrusive vehicle reversing warnings. Application Document	
652		Cumbria County Council		Safety - WCH	Cumbria County Council suggest a bridge will be necessary following the alignment of Main Street to allow pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to avoid the junction.	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.	No

Appleby to Brough - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
81		Cumbria County Council		Access/WCH/Design	Cumbria County Council express concern as to the ownership, designation, maintenance, liability and design of the access track (Warcop). They expect WCH to be accommodated along this route.	<p>The east-west WCH route on the Appleby to Brough scheme (including around Warcop) is typically a standalone shared cycleway (cyclists and walkers) other than sections at the western end of the scheme that are shared cycleways combined with Private Means of Access.</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>It is envisaged that the ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/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, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the lengths of shared cycleway adjacent to the de-trunked A66 will be owned and maintained by the local authority. The ownership and maintenance</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						of lengths of shared cycleway remote from the de-trunked sections will default to National Highways or the local authority. National Highways confirm that we will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development as part of the wider de-trunking processes.	
59	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Access/traffic and transport	Respondents express concern for no local road access for Sandford Junction to farms and dwellings along Appleby to Brough	National Highways acknowledges your comment with regard to the provision of local access. A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and would run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby Horse Fair, is running. Additionally, a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for non-motorised users such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders so that they do not have to use the new dual carriageway. Farm underpasses and local access tracks are also to be provided where required to ensure connectivity is maintained	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						for agricultural land which may be affected by our proposals.	
187		Cumbria County Council		Access track/traffic and transport/WCH	Cumbria County Council express concern for the ownership, designation and maintenance liability for new local access road north of the A66 and expects WCH to be accommodated	National Highways acknowledge the comments from Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council and will continue to work closely with them as the Project develops. The route parallel to the A66 around Warcop would provide WCH access and further details will be provided during the detailed design phase of the Project. National Highways will also continue to discuss de-trunking, ownership, designation and maintenance arrangements as the Project moves towards construction. Ultimately, it is anticipated that the future maintenance responsibilities (including gritting) on the local access road 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.	No
188		Cumbria County Council		Access track/traffic and transport	Cumbria County Council express concern that the ownership, design and overall land take requirements must be developed	National Highways are committed to working with Cumbria County Council and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					further prior to completion of the DCO application, regarding the new access track at the Eastbound Junction.	into detailed design. Our proposals with regard to the new access track can be found on the Works Plans (Application Document 5.16) and Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19) which form part of our DCO application.	
51	TR0200039			Agricultural Land/ Property	Respondents express concern at the impact of the proposals on property. Implying that the whole alignment should be moved further into MoD land which was said to be impossible but is implied to be possible in the new proposals at Sandford Junction	National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66). This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p>	
29	ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9			Carbon/ Air Pollution	Respondents express concern about the potential impact of proposals and greenhouse gas emissions on the climate	<p>Impact to climate and the potential for release of greenhouse gas (GHG) formed a part of the process by which alternatives, including the alternatives presented at supplementary consultation, were considered. It was determined that there was no material difference in GHG emissions between alternatives considered.</p> <p>The potential impact of GHG emissions associated with the Project on climate change is assessed in ES Chapter 7, Climate (Application Document 3.2). In the context of the UK</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>carbon budget targets, it is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project would not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets. Therefore, the Climate (GHG) assessment does not predict any likely significant effects on GHG emissions arising from the Project Please see Chapter 7 for greater details of the assessment.</p> <p>Minimising GHG emissions through design is a core principle of National Highways' 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 Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) for the Project. The EMP also sets out requirements for monitoring of GHG emissions through quarterly reporting to National Highways.</p>	
98		Cumbria County Council,		Biodiversity/ Conservation	Cumbria County Council support placing the Project on a viaduct due to the positive effect upon protected aquatic species present within Moor Beck and Cringle Beck and the integrity of the	National Highways acknowledge 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Special Area of Conservation (SAC).		
27	ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9, ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Climate Change/ Air Pollution	Respondents oppose construction of the scheme as it will increase vehicle usage and reliance on HGV/Diesel freight and adversely impact the climate.	<p>The existing A66 has higher than average percentage of HGV traffic, and current traffic modelling assumes that this will increase in the future whether the A66 is upgraded or not. Accommodating this growth is an objective of the Project, however there are others, including the need to improve the safety of the A66 to reduce the number of accidents occurring along its route.</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). In the context of the UK carbon budget targets, it is concluded that the GHG emissions of the Project would not have a material impact on the Government meeting its carbon reduction targets. Therefore, the Climate (GHG) assessment does not predict any likely significant effects on GHG emissions arising from the Project. Please see Chapter 7 for greater details of the assessment.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
104	TR0200054			Communication / National Highways Communication	Respondents suggest a visit from someone from National Highways would be helpful in educating respondent on proposals for Moor Beck	Landowners and other stakeholders whose land may be required for the scheme or who have a business which will be directly affected by the scheme have been visited to date. Consultation events have been held for the local community and others with an interest in the schemes to express their views and review the latest proposals. Landowner engagement will continue during the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
122			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Consultation/ Lack of Information	Respondents oppose proposals stating that the consultation is not sufficient and does not follow minimum periods specified in the act	Following the Autumn 2021 consultation, several changes to the Project were identified, and the need for additional consultation on these changes was considered. The need for and approach to consultation was considered against Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application Approach), which sets out three key considerations relevant when deciding the approach to be taken. These are: the scale and physical nature of the change; material change to the environmental impact of the Project; and the level of public interest.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The changes were considered against these considerations, and it was concluded that a non-statutory supplementary consultation would be undertaken, focused on the proposed changes and people that would be impacted by or interested in the changes.</p> <p>As such, the approach to the consultation was not required to adhere to the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. The Appleby to Brough supplementary consultation was carried out on both the west and central sections to provide those with land interests, members of the local community and other key stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes in the local area. The consultation ran from 28 January 2022 to 27 February 2022. The duration of the consultation is considered adequate and proportionate to the proposed changes. .</p>	
125			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Cultural heritage/ Historic Monuments	Respondents express concern regarding the impact of the scheme on historic monuments and features close to the road.	The Project has undertaken extensive Cultural Heritage assessment, using desk-based methods to identify known archaeological features such as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Roman Forts and features related to the known route of a Roman Road, followed by extensive field surveys such as non-intrusive scans and trial trenching.</p> <p>These assessments have helped National Highways identify the true extent of archaeological features. Where such features have interacted with the proposed route, the design has been altered where feasible, such as at the proposed Long Marton junction where the alignment has been moved away from previously unidentified features of the Redlands Bank Roman Camp. Where avoidance is not feasible, such as at the Settlement ENE of Brougham Castle, extensive consultation has been undertaken with Historic England and a set of restrictions have been placed on the design to prevent further intrusion.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Annex B3 of the EMP presents an</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy (Application Document 2.7). This sets out the mitigation proposals for the scheme to be applied during detailed design and construction in relation to heritage assets, including archaeological investigation and recording.	
96		Cumbria County Council		Cultural heritage/ Further Assessments	Cumbria County Council raising concerns over the impact that the proposals could have on cultural heritage sites, on the grounds that there could be undesignated archaeological resources distributed beyond the boundary of the Scheduled Monument, and therefore without further assessments, it may be that significant effects to heritage assets have not yet been mitigated against.	The new arrangement of the junction moves the works and the new road away from the Scheduled Monument, removing direct impacts to the monument. Geophysical survey of the Warcop area had identified additional areas of archaeological interest outside of the scheduled monument that have been avoided through design. ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Annex B3 of the EMP presents an Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy (Application Document 2.7). This sets out the mitigation proposals for the scheme to be applied during detailed design and construction in relation to heritage	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						assets, including archaeological investigation and recording. Works in the vicinity of known heritage assets will be undertaken following strict set out in Annex B3 that will reduce the risk to unknown heritage features.	
145	ANON-66J6-X8ZD-T			Design/alternatives	Respondents suggest to keep the local road and build a dual carriageway to the north. It would keep local traffic off the dual carriageway and so be safer, would be a need for fewer junctions, would save some mature trees and would keep traffic flowing if there as an accident.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to an alignment with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary design stage we engaged 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>Consultation and the assessment supported the case for exceptional circumstances for the incursion of the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB.</p> <p>This exceptional 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>route alignment against alternatives.</p> <p>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 on the AONB and MoD operations and are therefore considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and would run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally, a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for information on the work carried out to review and consider the options and alternatives within this section of the scheme.	
116	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Engagement process/ Further Engagement	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern about lack of mitigation and given the proximity of the North Pennines AONB they would like to see a formal engagement with the North Pennines AONB Partnership.	The presence of the AONB has been taken into account in the design of the landscape planting and mitigation, with the intention to screen the road as far as possible. There may be an effect on the landscape as a result of the works, however with the establishment of planting, there is not expected to be an impact in the long term. The AONB Partnership has been engaged with throughout the process, having been involved in technical working groups and having been engaged with specifically in relation to works	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>around the Appleby to Brough scheme, alongside Natural England.</p> <p>As part of the Supplementary Consultation, a letter notifying the AONB Partnership of the consultation was sent. The Partnership were also invited to a mitigation walkthrough that was aimed to go through and clarify current plans and mitigation.</p> <p>A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared with both the Local Authorities and Strategic Environmental Bodies, which includes the AONB Partnership.</p>	
110	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Engagement process/ More Detailed Information	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern about the limited consultation and want more detailed information on impacts and proposed mitigation.	The purpose of the non-statutory supplementary consultation on Appleby to Brough was to seek feedback from the local community on the proposed changes to Warcop west and Warcop Central made since the statutory consultation in autumn 2021. The need for and approach to the consultation was considered against Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application Approach), which sets out three key considerations relevant when deciding the approach to be taken. These are: the scale and physical nature of the change; material	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>change to the environmental impact of the Project; and the level of public interest.</p> <p>This was a focused consultation, on the specific design changes proposed, and the approach including those consulted, the material provided, and the duration of the consultation was proportionate to the scale and nature of the changes in accordance with the 2015 DCLG guidance.</p> <p>The Consultation Brochure provided during the consultation, detailed information on the design changes proposed for the Warcop west and Warcop Central sections of the Appleby to Brough section of the A66, and the benefits of the changes to the community.</p> <p>Further information was also provided on how National Highways proposed to manage the environmental impacts of the proposals at the two sections. Reference was also made to the PEI Report, which was published at the autumn 2021 consultation, and made available at this consultation in hard copy and online.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The Environmental Statement submitted with the DCO application (Application Document 3.2) sets out the full environmental assessment as well as the potential impacts and proposed mitigation. Updated ecological and landscape mitigation plans are presented within the ES Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) 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).	
106	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Engagement process/ Wider Programme	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern around the consultation process. They would have preferred to see wider exercise which involved several stakeholders, as well as more detail and time.	The purpose of the non-statutory supplementary consultation on Appleby to Brough was to seek feedback from the local community on the proposed changes to Warcop west and Warcop Central made since the statutory consultation in autumn 2021. The need for and approach to the consultation was considered against Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Approach), which sets out three key considerations relevant when deciding the approach to be taken. These are: the scale and physical nature of the change; material change to the environmental impact of the Project; and the level of public interest.</p> <p>This was a supplementary consultation, on the specific design changes proposed, and the approach including those consulted, the material provided, and the duration of the consultation was proportionate to the scale and nature of the changes in accordance with the 2015 DCLG guidance.</p> <p>The Consultation Brochure, provided during the consultation, detailed information on the design changes proposed for the Warcop west and Warcop Central sections of the Appleby to Brough section of the A66, and the benefits of the changes to the community.</p> <p>Further information was also provided on how National Highways proposed to manage the environmental impacts of the proposals at the two sections. Reference was also made to the PEI Report, which was published</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>at the autumn 2021 consultation, and made available at this consultation in hard copy and online.</p> <p>The consultation did involve several stakeholders, with a notification letter sent to 35 land interests, Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council, the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England and the AONB Partnership. The consultation ran from 28 January 2022 and 27 February 2022.</p>	
233			TR0200089	Engagement process/ Further Consultation	<p>Respondents express concern that the consultation period is not sufficient and disagrees with the view that this is not statutory consultation and that the changes are too significant to constitute not requiring statutory consultation</p>	<p>Following the statutory consultation process and ongoing engagement process National Highways reviewed the range of feedback received.</p> <p>This resulted in the identification of design changes to the layout of several schemes including, M6 junction 40 to Kemplay Bank, Temple Sowerby to Appleby, Appleby to Brough, and Bowes Bypass. In addition, changes to walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions, and the location of construction compounds across the schemes were identified.</p> <p>The conclusion that additional consultation was required came in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>view of a consideration of relevant guidance and legislation. In particular, this included the DCLG Guidance on the Pre-Application Process (2015) (the Guidance) and Section 44 of the Planning Act 2008. Paragraph 73 of the Guidance notes that "when considering the need for additional consultation, applicants should use the degree of change, the effect on the local community and the level of public interest as guiding factors." In accordance with the Guidance, National Highways reviewed the proposed changes against the following points to determine the need for, and approach to additional consultation: The degree of change and level of anticipated public interests of sufficient scale to contemplate supplementary consultation; it introduces a material change to the environmental impacts of the Project.</p> <p>The proposed design changes were however localised geographical changes related to particular issues and would not have resulted in a project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>on or introduce a material change to the environmental impacts. As such, it was decided that a further statutory consultation on the entire Project was not required, and that supplementary consultation should take place that was focused on the specific changes and the relevant consultees.</p> <p>Paragraph 76 of the guidance notes that "<i>in circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, targeted consultation.</i>"</p> <p>The duration of the non-statutory supplementary consultation reflected the scale of the proposed changes and material provided and were considered adequate to enable an informed response.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report provides further detail of the approach to the Supplementary Consultations.</p>	
107	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Engagement process/ Further Consultation	Respondents including Eden District Council suggest local input will be key in ensuring that negative impacts are minimised and that mitigation measures are	National Highways recognise the value of local input to the supplementary consultation, especially given the local nature of the proposed changes. As such,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>comprehensive, and a longer engagement would have ensured this.</p>	<p>the consultations were focussed on local people that the proposed changes would be of interest to, in addition to relevant stakeholder organisations. The consultations were well publicised (by letter, email, leaflets, posters, online) and a period followed for consultees to provide feedback. The Project team remained open to ongoing engagement with local people and stakeholders following these consultations, through the established channels of communication (i.e., Community Liaison Groups, project email and phonenumber).</p> <p>The need for and approach to consultation was considered against Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application Approach), which sets out three key considerations relevant when deciding the approach to be taken. These are: the scale and physical nature of the change; material change to the environmental impact of the Project; and the level of public interest.</p> <p>The changes were considered against these considerations, and it was concluded that a non-statutory supplementary</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consultation would be undertaken, focused on the proposed changes and people that would be impacted by or interested in the changes.</p> <p>As such, the approach to the consultation was not required to adhere to the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. The Appleby to Brough supplementary consultation was carried out on both the west and central sections to provide those with land interests, members of the local community and other key stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed changes in the local area. The consultation ran from 28 January 2022 to 27 February 2022. The duration of the consultation is considered adequate and proportionate to the proposed changes.</p>	
114	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Environmental/ Biodiversity	<p>Respondents including Eden District Council suggests that the scheme should look to deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain. They suggest in particular the scheme should consider retaining mature trees wherever possible and ensuring lighting does not interfere with wildlife.</p>	<p>Some design alterations have been made to allow for the retention of ancient and veteran trees such as at Sleastonhow Lane. Should trees require removal, replacement planting will be undertaken to ensure that there is no net loss. The Project is committed to No Net Loss of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Biodiversity while seeking to enhance existing biodiversity where possible.</p> <p>National Highways will seek to avoid and reduce impacts on wildlife. The scheme would provide replacement lighting at the M1 and M6 Junctions and would include lighting at the divergence at the A67 at Bowes for safety reasons, however the rest of the scheme is unlit to retain the existing dark sky context. National Highways would also introduce woodland in the junction itself to provide additional screening. Temporary construction stage lighting would be designed to be sensitive to wildlife. 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 wildlife, would be managed.</p>	
72			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Environmental / RDWE	Respondents express concern about potential increase in flood risk as a result of the proposed changes to the western section of	National Highways note the consultees concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk assessment undertaken for the Project and the project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					route as it passes the Sandford junction	<p>drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy including Sandford Junction.</p> <p>The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project in this area during construction is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that would be taking place within the flood risk areas. There is an area of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 present within the temporary land take associated with Moor Beck and therefore detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), this 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>Fluvial modelling of the proposed scheme has been carried out for the operational period and mitigation has been included to ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
38	ANON-66J6-X8ZZ-G	Warcop Parish		Environmental / RDWE	<p>Respondents including Eden District Council express concern about potential increase in flood risk at Warcop as a result of the proposed changes to the central section as it crosses Moor Beck.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk assessment undertaken for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project in this area during construction is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that would be taking place within the flood risk areas. There is an area of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 present within the temporary land take associated with Moor Beck and therefore detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), this 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>Fluvial modelling of the proposed scheme has been carried out for the operational period and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						mitigation has been included to ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.	
5	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C			Environmental / RDWE	Respondents express concern about potential increase in flood risk through the village of Warcop, as a result of the proposed changes to the central section as it crosses Moor Beck	<p>National Highways note the consultees concerns about flooding, details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project in this area during construction is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that would be taking place within the flood risk areas. The is an area of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 present within the temporary land take associated with Moor Beck and therefore detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), this 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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Fluvial modelling of the proposed scheme has been carried out for the operational period and mitigation has been included to ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.	
52	TR0200039			Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution	<p>Respondents express concern about the potential noise and air pollution impacts. Concern is also raised in regards safety issues for local traffic.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised in regards the potential social implications for those with disabilities of the proposals as a result of impacts to a developing community farm at Dyke Nook.</p>	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration. In the area around the proposed Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some increase to operational noise (assessed as minor impact) due to the Project. No additional noise mitigation measures were proposed for this location.</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 air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on sensitive human receptors, within 200m of the ARN, that are located in Warcop.</p> <p>The Population and Health Chapter assesses the potential implications of the Scheme on the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>physical and mental health and wellbeing of the population. The health assessment looks at the potential changes in health determinants including (air quality, noise and landscape and visual, transport) and through a review of relevant literature established qualitative level, relationships between changes in health determinants of health as a result of the Project and possible changes in health effects. The health effect for environmental conditions, including air quality, noise, landscape and visual is assessed as neutral for Appleby to Brough Scheme. The health effect for severance and accessibility is assessed as positive health due to shorter, more reliable journey times, new shared cycleway/footpath and improved safety due to introduction of grade separated junctions at Sandford, Warcop and Brough. Additionally, the Road Safety Assessment reported a saving of 129 slight, 36 serious and five fatal casualties over the 60-year appraisal period due to improvements of junctions, diversion of traffic from rural network and removal of single carriageway which would bring</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						about a positive health effect in this area. As the proposed community farm at Dyke Nook is not yet subject to a granted planning permission an assessment has not been undertaken on the potential impacts of the Project on this potential receptor.	
219		Cumbria County Council		Environmental / LVIA	Respondents including Cumbria County Council express concern as to whether the proposed planting will re-establish the tree line when viewed from the AONB and request further information be provided within the ES.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. Proposed planting would re-establish the treeline when viewed from the AONB. Proposed planting can be found in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The landscape and visual assessment concludes that there are no significant effects likely to the AONB as a result of the works, though there would be some changes to the southern boundary but these are not significant and would be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.	No
127			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U, TR0200089	Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution	Respondents express concern at the potential noise, air and atmospheric pollution within the rural area, affecting residential receptors. Noting there are no	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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					residential receptors within land to the north.	<p>Document 3.2). The study area for construction noise extends to 300m and for operation noise extends to at least 600m from the scheme.</p> <p>The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures. 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 have 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, would be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it would be implemented.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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. OS Address Base 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 road network expected to experience changes in traffic as a result of the Project, referred to as the Affected Road Network (ARN). For existing receptors, sensitive human locations have been adjusted accordingly to ensure they are on the building façade closest to the ARN. The air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on sensitive human receptors, within 200m of the ARN, that are located in Warcop.	
70			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Environmental / Biodiversity / LVIA	Respondents express concern for Sandford Junction related to the removal of mature trees and replacement of new trees from the north side of the present road	ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) sets out potential impacts to ecology and habitats. It also sets out the requirement that trees lost as a result of the Project will be replanted as part of mitigation planting. The Project is committed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>to achieving No Net Loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The replacement of any planting lost through construction works would mitigate any visual impacts at Sandford Junction. No significant visual impacts are identified within the ES.</p> <p>Illustrative planting can be found in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) and mitigation planting is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
132	TR0200053		ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Environmental / RDWE	<p>Respondents express concern for the revised proposals at Moor Beck given its connectivity with Crooks Beck which flows through Warcop and is in close proximity to proposals. Concerns are raised in regards the potential for flooding in the area as a result of the Project.</p>	<p>National Highways note the consultees concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk assessment undertaken for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project in this area during construction is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that would be taking</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>place within the flood risk areas. The is an area of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 present within the temporary land take associated with Moor Beck and therefore detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), this 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>Fluvial modelling of the proposed scheme has been carried out for the operational period and mitigation has been included to ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.</p> <p>As a result of the scheme it is acknowledged that there would be an increase in impermeable area due to a change from single carriageway to dual carriageway. However this is adequately mitigated through the scheme drainage design including climate change uplift factors. Discharge rates from the scheme drainage</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						design would be limited in accordance with Cumbria County Council guidance therefore no adverse effects are anticipated.	
249		Environment Agency		Environmental/Land	The Environment Agency express concern with regard to the impact of cut and fill activities on the environment and that the Project should be aware of the applicability of the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Code of Practice.	The EMP (Application Document 2.7) and Site Waste Management Plan (Annex of the EMP) acknowledge the requirements of the CL:AIRE code of practice. Each scheme has been designed so as to minimise excess cut or fill, seeking where practicable to deliver an earthworks balance within the scheme extents. Further ground investigation and detailed design will be undertaken during detailed design that will further inform earthworks design.	No
58	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Environmental/Property	Respondents express concern in regards proposals at Sandford Junction due to the loss of part or whole of a barn which would have a significant impact and on site operations of the community farm.	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 holdings. The barn would not be impacted by the Project. Surrounding land is required for a utility diversion during construction. Following these works this area would be restored.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
163	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution	Respondents express concern with regards to proposed changes to the central section as it crosses Moor Beck and potential impacts of the flyover to those living in Sandford, stating there is the potential for increased noise and air pollution and landscape impacts on the AONB.	<p>In the area around the proposed Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some operational noise impacts (assessed as minor impact) due to the Project. This assessment of noise effects on the AONB can be found in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared which identifies measure to mitigate construction noise. Mitigation measures have also been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the adjustment of the road alignment, cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise. No additional noise mitigation measures were assessed to be sustainable this area.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The assessment notes that the proposed road at the crossing of Moor Beck would not be visible from the village of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Warcop due to the rise in landform north of St Columba's Church, the heavily wooded railway embankment and the intervening MoD base. Other representative local viewpoints have been assessed. Viewpoint 6.3 Sandford Fold, looking north, has been assessed as experiencing no significant residual visual effects. Viewpoint 6.6 PRoW (bridleway) 372008 south of Langford Farm, looking north-east has been assessed as experiencing no significant visual effects due to distance and intervening landform. Viewpoint 6.7 PRoW (footpath) 372021 north of Warcop Training Centre, looking north-east has been assessed as experiencing a significant visual effect during construction and in the year of opening, however the assessment notes there would be no significant effect after year 15 due to the maturing vegetation. Viewpoint 6.8: Adjacent to Warcop Railway Station entrance, looking north would experience a significant residual visual effect, which will be mitigated in time due to maturing vegetation but would still represent a change in view from those receptors close to the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>railway station. The assessment also concluded no significant effects on the AONB.</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. A number of sensitive human receptors were identified, considered and assessed in the Warcop area, in relation to the potential impact of emissions to air from vehicle movements during the operational phase of the Project.</p> <p>HSR 45, 46, 47 and 48 are those receptors identified in Warcop area within the Air Quality Chapter and were selected as being representative of the potential impacts in the area as a result of the Project and of potential human exposure. Existing background pollutant concentrations in the area are very low and well below the relevant Air Quality Objectives (AQO) for nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and fine particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5)</p> <p>The predicted NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations at these</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>receptors, with the Project in place are also well below the relevant AQOs, and the changes in concentrations are not considered to be significant.</p> <p>No air quality impacts are anticipated for the AONB since the air quality assessment specifically deals with impacts to ecological sites (rather than landscape elements).</p>	
162	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution	<p>Respondents express concern in regards proposed changes to the central section as it crosses Moor Beck and potential impacts on Warcop, stating there is the potential for increased noise and air pollution and tourism.</p>	<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. This assessment is underpinned by noise modelling which considers the height and topography of the Project.</p> <p>With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Warcop the Project is predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon a small number of residential receptors around Warcop. These affected receptors are located in very close proximity to the Project. A small number of properties are expected to experience a beneficial effect. The majority of receptors within the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>community of Warcop itself are not predicted to experience adverse likely significant effects due to the distance from the road and the topography of the land and built features between the road and the village. Further details can be found in Appendix 12.4: Operational Assessment Results (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>For those receptors that are predicted to experience a significant effect, an assessment of the viability of providing additional mitigation measures has been undertaken following the methodology presented in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 3.2) under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures. No sustainable additional mitigation, e.g. roadside barriers have been identified for the receptors listed above and therefore the residual effect will remain. The Project has been designed to minimise the noise effects as far as practicable and sustainable to do so through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles such as road alignment selection and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>implementation of low road noise surface.</p> <p>With regards to construction impacts, National Highways has produced an EMP (Document Reference 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction 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.</p> <p>The air quality assessment for the Project is set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2). A number of sensitive human receptors were identified, considered and assessed in the Warcop area, in relation to the potential impact of emissions to air from vehicle movements during the operational phase of the Project.</p> <p>HSR 45, 46, 47 and 48 are those receptors identified in Warcop area within the Air Quality Chapter and were selected as being representative of the potential impacts in the area as a result of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the Project and of potential human exposure.</p> <p>Existing background pollutant concentrations in the area are very low and well below the relevant Air Quality Objectives (AQO) for nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and fine particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). The predicted NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 concentrations at these receptors, with the Project in place are also well below the relevant AQOs, and the changes in concentrations are not considered to be significant.</p> <p>Whilst any differences in route options in this area may change potential impacts at a small number of sensitive receptors in close proximity (both positive and negative depending on alignment), any changes in air quality would be minor and not considered to be significant. No human receptors would be predicted to experience any significant adverse effects or pollutant concentrations above the AQO, as a result of the alternative route options in this area.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on human health and tourism is provided in ES Chapter</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 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. During construction, the scheme is anticipated to lead to temporary indirect minor adverse impacts due to the construction phase works including dust, noise and vibration and landscape impacts. The resulting effect upon the following community land and assets, which are of very high sensitivity, will be moderate adverse and significant. Large effects are not anticipated as there will be no land take from the community receptors, and they will still be able to function in their existing capacity.</p> <p>During operation. the scheme is anticipated to lead to improvements in travel conditions which will be particularly beneficial at peak times during summer months and the holiday seasons. This will help to reduce any perceived barriers to accessibility, with associated benefits in terms of access to community land and assets. These improvements will</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>have a minor impact upon the tourism sector by improving access to and from the North Pennine's AONB. Overall, the scheme could therefore lead to permanent moderate beneficial effects which would be significant.</p> <p>The limits of deviation set out within the DCO allow for the watercourse crossing at Moor Beck to be lowered during detailed design, if further detailed modelling demonstrates that this can be done without affecting flood flows or the geomorphology of the watercourse (i.e. whilst protecting the features that are important in relation to the Special Area of Conservation). This would allow the road alignment to be lowered through this section of the scheme. The Environmental Statement therefore considers the worst case effects that could arise as a result of implementing the proposed alignment, but if improvements are identified through detailed design these could be implemented within the parameters of the DCO.</p>	
135	TR0200054			Environmental/ Biodiversity	Respondents express concern in regards Sandford Junction	Trees lost at Sandford Junction would be replaced. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					proposals due to the loss of conifer trees.	(Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme.. The replacement of any planting lost through construction works would mitigate any visual impacts at Sandford Junction as set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7). No significant visual impacts or biodiversity impacts are identified within the ES.	
160	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Environmental/traffic and transport	Respondents express concern in regards the proposed changes to the western section of route as it passes the Sandford junction stating that an additional carriageway would not significantly reduce the environmental impact compared to running to the south. Concerns are also raised in regards congestion on the existing road during construction.	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. The refinement of the design at this location that was consulted upon was undertaken with the aim of reducing the environmental impact on properties to the south of the existing A66. Given the nature of the existing route at this location and existing constraints the proposed change was determined to be the best option in relation to environmental impact.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<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 regarding the comparison of environmental impacts (and other factors that informed the development of the design at this location) for the options considered.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out the noise and vibration assessment of effects on local receptors. With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Sandford Junction, the Project is not predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon nearby receptors in Kirkdale, Dyke Nook Cottage and the Dyke Nook holiday let. Therefore, no sustainable additional mitigation, e.g. roadside barriers have been identified for the receptors in this area. The Project has been designed to minimise the noise effects as far as practicable and sustainable to do so through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles such as road alignment</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>selection and implementation of low road noise surface. It is noted however, that for the receptor at Kirkdale, if the centrelines are moved closer to the dwelling to the maximum extent of the Limits of Deviation (LoD), then the predicted magnitude of impact may result in a moderate adverse impact and would be assessed as an adverse likely significant effect at this receptor. As stated in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), further noise modelling will be undertaken during detailed design once information about the exact location of the road centrelines is established to identify the level of impact at this receptor and, where a likely significant adverse effect is predicted, mitigation measures will be investigated and, following the principles in section 12.9.6 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures, implemented should such mitigation be considered to be practicable and sustainable.</p> <p>With regards to construction impacts, National Highways has produced an EMP (Document Reference 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The ES includes a viewpoint from Sandford, located at Sandford Fold. The assessment identifies that the impact of the scheme in this location would result in a minor change to the view and is not significant.</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 air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on human sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network including those located near Sandford.</p> <p>There may be congestion through the construction phase as a result of the additional construction</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>traffic. 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 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>	
57	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Environmental / RDWE	<p>Respondents express concern of increase flooding at Sandford Junction as a result of increase water runoff and climate change.</p>	<p>As a result of the scheme, it is acknowledged that there would be an increase in impermeable area due to a change from single carriageway to dual carriageway. However this is adequately mitigated through the scheme drainage design including climate change uplift factors. Discharge rates from the scheme drainage design would be limited in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>accordance with Cumbria County Council guidance therefore no adverse effects are anticipated. ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) includes further information.</p> <p>The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project in this area during construction is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that would be taking place within the flood risk areas. The is an area of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 present within the temporary land take associated with Moor Beck and therefore detailed mitigation to address flood risk during construction is contained within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), this 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>Fluvial modelling of the proposed scheme has been carried out for the operational period and mitigation has been included to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.	
251		Environment Agency		Environmental / RDWE	Respondents express concern that the scheme may have a detrimental impact on the abstraction associated with licence no. 2776003011 and will require appropriate mitigation measures to be agreed with relevant parties.	The identified abstraction would be impacted by the Project and would require appropriate mitigation. ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) identifies the potential impacts of the Project on the abstraction and the potential mitigation requirements including adherence to Annex B7 Ground and Surface Water Management Plan within the EMP (Application Document 2.7). An alternative source of supply would be provided in consultation with stakeholders if appropriate.	No
69			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Environmental / land	Respondents express support for Sandford Junction due to the reduction in land take in the new proposals for Appleby to Brough	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Sandford junction.	No
24	ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9, ANON-66J6-X8ZZ-G	Warcop Parish Council		Environmental Alternatives / Noise / Air/ Landscape	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council suggest both carriageways are constructed north of Sandford Junction. Doing this would prevent the destruction of hundreds of trees, and provide a natural screen to help reduce noise, air and visual impact	National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66).</p> <p>This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The proposed change to the alignment at Sandford Junction was undertaken with the aim of reducing the environmental impact on properties to the south of the existing A66. Given the nature of the existing route at this location and existing constraints the proposed change was determined to be the best option in relation to environmental impact.</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 regarding the comparison of environmental impacts (and other factors that informed the development of the design at this location) for the options considered.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the proposed alignment will result in the loss of trees to the north of the carriageway. The existing strip of woodland at this location is coniferous plantation of relatively low biodiversity value. The trees lost will be replaced with a large area of broadleaved woodland</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>mosaic habitat to the north, utilising appropriate local species. A greater area of woodland will be planted than lost, and the woodland will be of greater biodiversity value.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) sets out the noise and vibration assessment of effects on local receptors. With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Sandford Junction, the Project is not predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon nearby receptors in Kirkdale, Dyke Nook Cottage and the Dyke Nook holiday let.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The ES includes a viewpoint from Sandford, located at Sandford Fold. The assessment identifies that the impact of the scheme in this location would result in a minor change to the view and is not significant.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential for</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						increased traffic emissions from the Project. The air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on human sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network including those located near Sandford.	
120			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Environmental/Soil	Respondents suggest excess soil be used to help mitigate pollution at Sandford Junction	The Project would seek to utilise as much soil sourced from within the Order Limits as reasonably practicable, including for identified mitigation measures. Further information on soil reuse and management are provided within ES Chapter Material Assets and Waste (Application Document 3.2).	No
15	ANON-66J6-X8Z6-C			Environmental/Mitigation	Respondents suggest reducing the environmental impact wherever possible at Sandford Junction adding that established trees should be retained wherever possible.	Established trees will be retained where practicable. Where the unavoidable loss of small areas of woodland is required, this has been replaced with additional areas of woodland. Trees lost at Sandford Junction would be replaced. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The replacement of any planting lost through construction works would mitigate any visual impacts at	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Sandford Junction as set out in the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7). No significant visual impacts or biodiversity impacts are identified within the ES.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) assesses the potential impact of the Project and has identified mitigation to be established (set out in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application 2.8)) including tree planting. 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>	
90		Cumbria County Council		Environmental/ Mitigation/ Air Pollution	Cumbria County Council suggest that the revised proposals will not impact significantly on air quality.	ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of air quality across the scheme. There are no significant effects to human receptors identified as a result of the Project.	No
56	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Environmental/ Noise/ Air Pollution	Respondents express concern that proposals for Sandford Junction will lead to increased	In the area around the Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some operational noise impacts	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>noise, light and air pollution. Respondent raises concerns of the impact of proposals on health and organic farm produce.</p>	<p>(assessed as minor impact) due to the Project. An EMP (EMP) has been prepared which secures measures to mitigate environmental effects including on noise, light and air pollution. Mitigation measures have also been designed into the Scheme to reduce environmental impacts during construction and operation, including the adjustment of the road alignment, cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise. No additional noise mitigation measures were assessed to be sustainable this area.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme including light pollution from car headlights. Due to the distance of the scheme from sensitive receptors no significant visual impacts were identified in this location.</p> <p>The air quality assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 5, Air Quality, (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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>considers the potential for increased traffic emissions from the Project. The air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on human sensitive receptors within 200m of the ARN, that are located near Sandford.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) assesses the potential implications of the scheme on the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the population. The health assessment looks at the potential changes in health determinants (including air quality, noise and landscape and visual) and through a review of relevant literature established qualitative level, relationships between changes in health determinants of health as a result of the Project and possible changes in health effects. The health effect for environmental conditions relating to this scheme, including Sandford Junction, is assessed as neutral. This chapter also addresses potential effects on local agriculture. It is anticipated there are some significant effects on local</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						landholdings, and so we will work closely with landowners to determine appropriate mitigation during the detailed design stage of the Project..	
7	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C, ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z, ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9		ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	E Alternatives/ Northern Alignment	Respondents suggest northern alignment be reconsidered. The AONB is currently occupied by the MoD, stating it severely impacts public access, area is littered with MoD detritus between Appleby and Brough. Adding that precedent has been set for roads and trains to build through AONB's	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB. During the preliminary design stage there was engagement with the MoD, Warcop Parish Council,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>details on the work carried out in assessing the route alignment against alternatives.</p> <p>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 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.	

Appleby to Brough - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
105	TR0200054			Flood risk	Respondents express concern about the potential for increased flood risk at their land adjacent to Cringle Beck	National Highways note the consultees' concerns about flooding. Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design around Cringle Beck can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). Fluvial modelling has been conducted for the operational period of the proposed scheme and mitigation has been included to ensure there is no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme.	No
80		Cumbria County Council		Flood risk	Cumbria County Council express concern that the alteration to the viaduct across Moor Beck and Cringle Beck do not take account of local flood risk. They need to be better linked with the Cumbria County Council innovative flood resilience programme.	National Highways acknowledge the comments made with regard to flood risk at Moor Beck and Cringle Beck. Flood Modelling work has been undertaken specific to the local area using data from EA flood maps and surveys that have been undertaken to ensure that the new structures do not represent an increased risk of flooding in the area.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Our remit is to ensure that our proposals do not make flooding any worse, and National Highways will continue to engage with Cumbria County Council to make sure our proposals do not have a detrimental effect on other proposals planned for the area. National Highways will look to work together where it is feasible to do so to minimise disruption and benefit from any efficiencies that may be available.</p> <p>Further detail is contained in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment. (Application Document 3.2). Appendix 14.2 contains specific information on Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy</p>	
87		Cumbria County Council		General	Cumbria County Council support the proposed highway reconfiguration proposed for the scheme (subject to the satisfactory provision of the preliminary design drawings).	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the proposed highway reconfiguration proposed for the scheme (subject to the satisfactory provision of the preliminary design drawings).	No
137	TR0200054			Flood risk/design	Respondents express concern about potential flood risk as a result of the reduction of holding dams.	National Highways note the consultees' concerns about flooding and details of the flood risk assessment under taken for the Project and the project	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>drainage design are reported in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Fluvial modelling has been conducted for the operational period of the proposed scheme and mitigation (including holding dams) has been included to ensure no increase to downstream flood risk to the village of Warcop.</p>	
167	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Flood risk / land	<p>Respondents express concern about the potential for increased flooding in Warcop as a result of the loss of agricultural fields, the increase of impermeable surfaces and the construction of the Project within a floodplain.</p>	<p>As a result of the scheme it is acknowledged that there will be an increase in impermeable area however this is adequately mitigated through the scheme drainage design including climate change uplift factors. Discharge rates from the scheme drainage design will be limited in accordance with Cumbria County Council guidance therefore no adverse effects are anticipated. Further detail is contained in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment. (Application Document 3.2). Appendix 14.2 contains specific information on Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
244			TR0200089	Flood risk/ design	Respondents express concern that the proposed infrastructure would increase run-off and the proposed ponds would not successfully mitigate flooding in the area.	As a result of the scheme, it is acknowledged that there will be an increase in impermeable area however this is adequately mitigated through the scheme drainage design. Drainage ponds have been designed to the latest standards including climate change uplift factors. Discharge rates from the scheme drainage design will be limited in accordance with Cumbria County Council guidance therefore no adverse effects are anticipated.	No
169	ANON-66J6-X8ZQ-7, ANON-66J6-X8Z7-D			Flood risk	Respondents express support for the central section as it crosses Moor Beck due to potential decrease in flood risk at their residential property.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the central section.	No
173	ANON-66J6-X8ZP-6			Flood risk	Respondents express support for the central section as it crosses Moor Beck due to the potential decrease in flood risk in winter and the retention of a public footpath.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the central section.	No
186		Cumbria County Council		Flood risk	Cumbria County Council suggest that the proposed changes impacting Moor Beck and Cringle Beck floodplain need to be better linked with the Cumbria County Council (EA funded) innovative flood resilience programme.	Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design around Cringle Beck and Moor Beck can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The Project has worked with Cumbria County Council and the EA to develop mitigation proposals.</p>	
166	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Environmental - visual impact	Respondents express concern about the negative visual impact of proposals on the local residents, with reference to the impact on the ancient pastoral landscape at Warcop.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The replacement of any planting lost through construction works will mitigate any visual impacts on Warcop village. No significant visual impacts are identified within the ES.	No
140	TR0200047			General - traffic and transport	Respondents express concern if the new dual carriageway follows the existing alignment of the A66, Appleby to Brough is a farming area, so all tractors, farm machinery and stock trailers will slow all other vehicles down.	National Highways acknowledge your comment with regard to the provision of local access. A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and will run to the north of the new dual carriageway this will provide access for locals including farm vehicles and will be available for use when the Appleby Fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for non motorised users such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders so that they do not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>have to use the new dual carriageway. Farm underpasses and local access tracks are also to be provided where required to ensure connectivity is maintained for agricultural land which may be affected by our proposals.</p> <p>In the event that slow moving vehicles are present on the new A66 then the fact that it is a dual carriageway will make it much easier and safer for vehicles to overtake. Additionally there will be no direct access to the new road from farm and field accesses as is the case currently. Safer grade separated junctions will also be provided with associated slip roads.</p>	
26	ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9			Alternatives/design	Respondents express concern that alternative to bridge construction of Moor Beck, such as tunnel have not been considered	In developing proposals National Highways have engaged in a detailed and comprehensive optioneering process leading to the application as outlined in the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR) A tunnel is not considered to be a viable solution in this case mainly due to cost, buildability and existing ground conditions. Our teams are comprised of a specialists who work together to consider options	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and develop solutions which are both robust and defendable.	
191		Cumbria County Council		WCH	Cumbria County Council express concern that confirmation is required from National Highways, that the route parallel to the new A66 at Warcop is for WCH use and that the connectivity, WCH facilities at the new junctions and re-routing of PROW and private means of access are confirmed to the satisfaction of Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council.	<p>The east-west WCH route on the Appleby to Brough scheme (including around Warcop) is typically a standalone shared cycleway (cyclists and walkers) other than sections at the western end of the scheme that are shared cycleways combined with Private Means of Access.</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>The shared cyclway is expected to be approximately 3m in width. There would be no segregation between walkers and cyclists, the path shall be shared.</p> <p>National Highways confirm that we will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development as part of the wider de-trunking processes.</p>	No
43	ANON-66J6-X8ZZ-G	Warcop Parish Council		Consultation	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council express concern that people from Flitholme and Langrigg/Musgrave should also be	Following the statutory consultation process and ongoing engagement with stakeholders,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>able to feedback as they frequently use the roads in Warcop</p>	<p>landowners and those persons with an interest in the land, potential design changes were identified to several of the schemes.</p> <p>The consultations undertaken in respect of these potential changes were non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with the specific design changes. The consultation material was limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The alignment changes at Warcop do not impact peoples journeys and therefore it is not considered there will be wider impacts from those in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, Filtholme and Langrigg/Musgrave are outside of the targeted consultation area, however feedback and comments were not restricted. Public consultation event where open to all.</p> <p>When determining the need for and approach to additional consultation the proposed changes were reviewed in regard to Government guidance (DCLG 2015, Guidance on the Pre-</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Application Process) and in particular, three key points that can be summarised as: the scale of the changes, potential for a change in environmental impacts and effects; and the likely level of public interest. On this basis, the additional consultation took the form of focused supplementary consultation on each of the schemes and overarching topics.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultations including the duration, the level of publicity of the consultation and the consultation material and events is considered proportionate to the proposals and was in accordance with the Guidance. Furthermore, the approach was tailored for each set of scheme and topic changes.</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders that National Highways consulted directly include: directly impacted persons with an interest in the land; relevant host local authorities; statutory environmental bodies; the AONB Partnership; the Gypsy and Traveller community representatives (where relevant to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the scheme) and local residents where relevant to the scheme. Chapter 7 of this Consultation Report sets out the approach to the supplementary consultation in more detail.	
44	ANON-66J6-X8ZZ-G	Warcop Parish Council		Consultation	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council express concern that the best route option will not be pursued over fears of consentability	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These exceptional circumstances case has been developed following the Autumn 2021 Consultation and is presented in the Case for the Project (Application Document</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.	
3	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C			Community Impact	Respondents express concern that the proposal for Moor Beck will not be an improvement for the local community as it will result in increased noise and potential flood risk.	National Highways acknowledges your comments in relation to the proposals around Moor Beck. The changes to the bridges have been made to avoid any detrimental effects on the watercourses in this area and ensure that the new route does not cause any additional issues with regard to flooding. Local connections are to be maintained in the area for both vehicles and non-motorised users. Further detail on the proposals around Moor Beck is contained in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment. (Application Document 3.2). Appendix 14.2 contains specific information on Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy. There is no increased flood risk as a result of the Project on the basis that the Project	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>design (which takes into account the increase in impermeable area of the Project) incorporates the recommendations for mitigation based on detailed modelling where relevant.</p> <p>The assessment contained within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). It is noted that whilst the road height will be raised compared to the existing road there are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the Project that will be subject to adverse likely significant effects. Therefore, no sustainable additional mitigation is identified.</p> <p>With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Warcop the Project is predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon a number of residential receptors. These receptors are located in close proximity to the Project A66 dualling. The majority of receptors within the community of Warcop are not predicted to experience adverse likely significant effects. Further details can be found in Appendix 12.4: Operational Assessment Results (Application Document 3.4). For these</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>receptors, an assessment of the viability of providing additional mitigation measure has been undertaken following the methodology presented in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 3.2) under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures. No sustainable additional mitigation, e.g. roadside barriers have been identified for the receptors listed above and therefore the residual effect will remain. The Project has been designed to minimise the noise effects as far as practicable and sustainable to do so through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles such as road alignment selection and implementation of low road noise surface.</p> <p>With regards to construction impacts, 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, as well as other environmental impacts, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.	
47	TR0200032			General - Support	Respondents express support for the Appleby to Brough Scheme stating it is a good compromise	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme	No
17	ANON-66J6-X8Z6-C			General - Support	Respondents express support for the Appleby to Brough Scheme. Respondent hopes that the ideas generated by this current consultations will also be considered, especially those regarding the environmental impact.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme . Any further ideas or views expressed during this suplimentary consultation will be considered and acted on where appropriate.	No
40	ANON-66J6-X8ZZ-G	Warcop Parish Council		WCH	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council express support for inclusion of walking, cycling, horse-riding tracks and safety path that links Warcop centre with the school and parish hall	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the WCH provision.	No
172	ANON-66J6-X8Z8-E			WCH	Respondents express support for Moor Beck as it will join local communities together, in particular the new cycle and walking paths	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Moor Beck.	No
35	ANON-66J6-X8ZX-E			WCH	Respondents express support for Moor Beck, in particular the road layout and idea of walk and cycleways	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Moor Beck.	No
9	TR0200023			General - support	Respondents express support for Sandford junction at Appleby to Brough stating it is the best option;	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Sandford Junction.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					economically, environmentally and socially.		
8	TR0200022			General - support	Respondents express support for Sandford junction at Appleby to Brough	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Sandford Junction.	No
67	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			General - support	Respondents express support for Sandford Junction but hopes the voices of local communities are heard for all sections of this road, that the number of expensive junctions is avoided and the lives and livelihoods of the inhabitants are preserved and that National Highways will take seriously its discussions with MoD.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Sandford Junction and our proposals are now been taken forward through the DCO application. National Highways acknowledge the comment about local voices being heard and have engaged with all stakeholders including local residents, landowners and tenants to help develop the design as presented. The EMP contains details of the mitigation measures that are proposed around Sandford Junction which ensure sufficient measures are in place to mitigate any impacts at the junction .	No
253			TR0200100	Design	Respondents express support for the Appleby to Brough scheme stating Northern Power Grid welcome engagement with National Highways on the proposal, however due to the level of detail available at this stage continue to object to the proposals until such time that their engineers	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme. National Highways have carried out preliminary engagement with all utility companies comensurate with the stage of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					are satisfied that their statutory duty is not compromised	The DCO will include protective provisions within it with regard to statutory undertakers. Further engagement will take place at the during detailed design of the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary works.	
21	ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z			WCH	Respondents express support for the inclusion of walking, cycling and horse riding tracks using parts of the old A66 or by creating a new track	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the WCH provision.	No
12	TR0200025			General - Support	Respondents express support for the Moor Beck scheme	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Moor Beck scheme.	No
134	TR0200054			General - Support	Respondents express support for Sandford Junction stating they are relieved the A66 is going north, minimising noise, pollution and visual impact.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Sandford Junction.	No
53		Historic England		Cultural Heritage	Historic England express support of the Appleby to Brough scheme as the realignment appears to reduce the impact on the scheduled monument.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme.	No
171	ANON-66J6-X8Z7-D			Road safety	Respondents express support stating that Moor Beck improvement is needed due to how dangerous the current road is	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for Moor Beck.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
13	ANON-66J6-X8Z6-C			Land take	Respondents express support that the plans at Sandford Junction have improved. As moving the route further to the north in this area reduces land loss by the farm.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for revisions to the plans for Sandford Junction.	Yes
149	ANON-66J6-X8ZK-1			Design - alternatives	Respondents support new proposals which widen to the north rather than the south of the A66 around Sandford Junction. They still have reservations with regard to the proximity of the new road to properties and they make the point that they still believe a route which runs even further to the north as proposed by Warcop Parish Council and others would be preferable.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66).</p> <p>This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>eastbound carriageway to the north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p>	
118			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Design - alternatives	Respondents suggest both dual and local roads are required for Sandford Junction	<p>National Highways acknowledge your comment with regard to the provision of both dual carriageway and local access at Sandford Junction. Our proposals will dual the A66 in this section by creating a new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66 and utilising the old A66 for the westbound carriageway.</p> <p>A local access road is also to be provided between Brough and Sandford and will run to the north of the new dual carriageway this will provide access for locals including farm vehicles and will be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for non-motorised users such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders so that they do not have to use the new dual carriageway. Farm underpasses and local access tracks are also to be provided where required to ensure connectivity is maintained for agricultural land which may be affected by our proposals.	
45		Ramblers		Design - segregation	The Ramblers suggest footpath segregated from any other traffic at Moor Beck	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Project. Designs will be carried out to the latest standards and will also be subject to independent audit to ensure that they are safe.	No
139	TR0200047			Design - WCH	Respondents suggest the junction will need to be re-organized to allow pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders to access the footpath	National Highways acknowledge the consultees comments and NMU and junction designs will be carried out to the latest standards. Any bridleways that are severed by the scheme will be reconnected and diverted as necessary. Where necessary paths will be segregated between horseriders and other non motorised users to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						ensure that they can be used safely.	
146	ANON-66J6-X8ZK-1			General - support	Respondents support Sandford Junction as an improvement on the previous plan	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the revised design for Sandford Junction.	No
46		Ramblers		General - crossings	The Ramblers support the crossing at Moor Beck as an improvement	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the crossing at Moor Beck.	No
193		Cumbria County Council		WCH	Cumbria County Council support the improvement for WCH provision along the scheme, assuming that the details of the connectivity and re-routing of PROW are confirmed.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the WCH provision. Detailed information on proposals (including connectivity and re-routing of PROW) can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).	No
192		Cumbria County Council		General - support	Cumbria County Council support the proposed plans for Appleby to Brough	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the scheme.	No
111	TR0200057	Eden District Council		Consultation - heritage	Respondents including Eden District Council express concern about the maps provided in the brochure being small and not showing surrounding buildings/structures resulting it being hard to assess impacts of	National Highways believe that the quantity and quality of information supplied and our consultation methodology was appropriately tailored to a targeted consultation process, in line with other National Highways projects.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					the proposed changes on heritage sites.	<p>The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</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>	
236			TR0200089	Cultural Heritage	<p>Respondents express concern at the impact on the culture and heritage in the area. References include the Roman Road and monuments, including a neolithic stone circle and four bronze age barrows.</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. Trial trenching and geophysical survey have been carried out to assess archaeological sites such as Roman Roads. 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 type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Officers by means of an Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>Where possible National Highways have minimised impacts on archaeological sites through design, and remaining impacts will be mitigated by what is called 'preservation by record' wherein anything discovered during construction will be formally recorded and the heritage value recorded. This is where National Highways investigate the archaeological remains prior to construction, analyse the artefacts and publish the results of what is found.</p>	
221		Cumbria County Council		Heritage - Further Assessments	Respondents including Cumbria County Council express concern that the proposals do not remove the risk of the presence of undesignated archaeological resources and request this is evaluated within the ES.	ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) provides a full assessment of the scheme with regard to archaeology and heritage assets. Trial trenching and geophysical survey were carried out in support of the ES to understand the presence of archaeological sites. The type and location of mitigation required has been agreed with the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Cumbria, County Durham and North Yorkshire Archaeological Officers by means of an Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy, submitted as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). There are plans Annexed to this document that set out appropriate methods to protecting archaeology encountered in the construction, primarily in the Detailed Heritage Mitigation Strategy (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>This involves investigating the archaeological remains prior to construction, analysing the artefacts and publishing the results of what is found.</p>	
220		Cumbria County Council		Heritage - support	Respondents support the revised plans which will result in less land take from within the Scheduled Monument	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the revised proposal.	No

Appleby to Brough - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
128			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Environmental/AONB/ Visual Impact	Respondent express concern in regards the landscape and visual impact of proposals including the design of structures and the potential impact on the AONB.	<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. 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) provides further information on the schemes design and how the scheme has had consideration to the careful location and sensitive design of structures and materials.</p> <p>The landscape and visual impact assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 10, has used representative viewpoints throughout the scheme, as agreed through the Technical Working Groups. Additional viewpoints, including elevated views from the AONB have been reviewed. The assessment concludes there is no significant effect on the AONB is though there will be some</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						changes to the southern boundary but these are not significant and will be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.	
196		Cumbria County Council		Information - environmental mitigation	Cumbria County Council expressing that their previous comments on the environment still stand as the full environmental mitigation has not been shown on the latest set of drawings.	<p>The material published for statutory 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. The Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.	
223		Cumbria County Council		Information - biodiversity	Cumbria County Council express concern about lack of information provided on protected species within the viaduct area and confirmation of the alignment of the Project in proximity to watercourses.	<p>Full details of all potential biodiversity receptors (including all protected species) potentially impacted by proposals around the viaduct and associated watercourses located within the Order Limits and surrounding Zone of Influence/study area is presented in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p>	
176		Cumbria County Council		Information - plans	Cumbria County Council express concern at lack of information and limited detail included in the small number of plans contained as part of this consultation pack	National Highways provided consultation brochures to provide consultees with information to inform their response to the Supplementary Consultations. The Brochures provided consultees with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in the Autumn 2021 statutory consultation and set out detailed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>information on the revised proposals National Highways put forward. The Brochures referred back the PEI Report that was published at the Autumn 2021 consultation and provided information on environmental effects and potential mitigation approaches.</p> <p>Each proposed change, as set out in the supplementary consultations, was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI Report. It was concluded that none of these changes would and therefore information was provided within each brochure confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The Brochures provided details of how consultees could ask questions and seek further information by phone and email and also provided details of locations of hard copy documents.</p>	
216		Cumbria County Council		Information - noise	Cumbria County Council express concern that no noise modelling results have been provided in support of the revised proposals.	In the area around the Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some operational noise (assessed as minor impact) due to the Project. At the time of consultation detailed noise modelling had not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>been completed. It has since been undertaken and is presented in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>The ES identifies the predicted effects on residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures. Where sustainable, the assessment proposes mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of adverse noise effects, these are set out in the ES.</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, will be managed.</p>	
217		Cumbria County Council		Information - biodiversity	Cumbria County Council express concern that there is insufficient information included within the consultation material to comment further on the adequacy of any mitigation proposals for protected species that may be present in the coniferous woodland to the north. Full details are expected to be	National Highways provided Consultation Brochures to provide consultees with information to inform their response to the Supplementary Consultations. The Brochures provided consultees with an introduction to the design that was initially proposed in the Autumn 2021 statutory	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					provided in Environmental Statement.	<p>consultation and set out detailed information on the revised proposals National Highways put forward. The Brochures referred back the PEI Report that was published at the Autumn 2021 consultation and provided information on environmental effects and potential mitigation approaches.</p> <p>Each proposed change, as set out in the supplementary consultations, was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI Report. It was concluded that none of these changes would and therefore information was provided within each brochure confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The Brochures provided details of how consultees could ask questions and seek further information by phone and email and also provided details of locations of hard copy documents.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of potential impacts and required mitigation measures as a result of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Project on designated sites for nature conservation and all protected/notable/sensitive habitats and species. This covers all areas of habitat located within the Order Limit and associated Zone of Influence/study as specified for each biodiversity receptor within the ES. Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) set out the proposed mitigation.	
266		Environment Agency		AONB	Environment Agency express support for the fact that the Appleby to Brough scheme is being guided by minimising the impact on the AONB	<p>National Highways acknowledges the continued support for the scheme and notes the comment around minimising impact on the AONB. Minimising impact on the AONB has been a key driver in consideration of alternatives in this scheme. ES Chapter 3 Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) sets this out in greater detail, as does the the Project Design Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2). This assessment has concluded no significant effect on the AONB.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Further information on proposed mitigation planting can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	
263		Natural England		AONB	<p>Natural England express support for the Appleby to Brough scheme stating it is welcome that changes to the scheme continue to be guided, alongside other considerations, by the need to minimise impact on the North Pennines AONB. The respondent notes that the Appleby to Brough section of the widened road will be within the immediate setting of the AONB with some consequential effects on views from and to the designated landscape. It is also noted that changes to the design, particularly more elevated river crossings, will increase the visibility of the road within the landscape .</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the continued support for the scheme and notes the comment around minimising impact on the AONB. Minimising impact on the AONB has been a key driver in consideration of alternatives in this scheme. ES Chapter 3 Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) sets this out in greater detail, as does the Project Design Overview Report (Application Document 4.1)</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the scheme on the visual amenity of receptors is set out in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Further information on proposed planting to mitigate the visual intrusion of the road can be viewed in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
264		Natural England		Information - design	Natural England express support for Warcop Central stating the changes in the bridge design for Moor Beck and Cringle Beck will reduce the risk of adverse environmental impact on these watercourses and the River Eden SAC. And if there are any further changes please consult Natural England	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Warcop Central.	No
260		Natural England		Information - alternatives	Natural England provided a response which tabulates their relevant comments on the specific route consultations	<p>National Highways acknowledge the comments.</p> <p>During the early stages of this project 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 . 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 in 2019. The proposals and plans have been through a lengthy design and assessment process during the current stage including</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>extensive consultaion and engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>During this preliminary design phase, 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>Further details of the environmental assessment on the various alternative routes considered can be found in 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
261		Natural England		Information – water environment	Natural England suggest that the Long Marton Land End Junction road design will be closer to Troutbeck (River Eden SAC) and that there will be a discharge to the beck. Respondents note that the Habitats Regulations Assessment will need to assess the new road design to ensure it avoids adverse impacts to the River Eden SAC.	<p>The effects of the scheme 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 the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Further information is provided on the anticipated impacts and mitigation measures, where required, in relation to the River Eden Special Area of Conservation (SAC) within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and accompanying Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Application Document 3.5).</p>	No
203		Cumbria County Council		Information - design	Cumbria County Council express concern the council requires section drawings to aid the understanding of the effects of the junction structures upon properties in Kirkby Thore.	National highways acknowledges your comments. Where possible drawings will be shared with Cumbria County Council as part of our ongoing engagement activities with you.	No
66	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Land take/ Economy	Respondent express concern for Sandford Junction stating that	As part of the scheme development process National Highways have and will continue	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					plans will result in their farm becoming non-economically viable	to work with affected landowners. Our lands team and district valuers will continue their discussions as the scheme continues towards construction	
143	ANON-66J6-X8ZY-F			Land take/ Business	Respondent express concern regarding the potential loss of land on the proposed community farm at Dyke Nook cottages. The community farm is an aspiration of the owners who recently purchased the property and associated land, and does not currently exist.	National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. National Highways have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66. This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the north results in minor incursion into the MoD. National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						area. However moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.	
218		Cumbria County Council		AONB/ Lack of Information	Cumbria County Council express concern that without GA drawings, it is not possible to identify whether the revised proposals bring the road closer to the AONB.	National Highways can confirm that the proposed alignment will, in locations (most notably at Kirkby Thore and Warcop), bring the A66 closer to the North-Pennines AONB. Engagement has been ongoing with the North-Pennines AONB Partnership to discuss designs and mitigation to reduce or make acceptable any impacts incurred. Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2), includes a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the route. Discussions with both Cumbria County Council and the NP AONB Partnership will continue once they have had full sight of the ES Chapter 10 and the submitted route General Arrangement drawings to confirm whether any residual concerns exist.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						In addition, both Cumbria County Council and the AONB Partnership have been included within the Landscape Technical Working Group which has met periodically to discuss landscape related matters.	
95		Cumbria County Council		Landscape and visual amenity / biodiversity	Cumbria County Council express concern that due to a lack of information they cannot comment that the 'balance' is appropriate regarding the height/visibility of the Project within the landscape and the reduction of impacts on ecological sites and species.	The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The Project Environmental team have worked closely together collaborating across Biodiversity, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration and Heritage disciplines to design mitigation for potential Project impacts. This collaborative approach has allowed for identified mitigation to balance aspects such as the height of structures with the impacts on key SAC species. The Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Amenity (Application Document 3.2) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors, how the project fits into the landscape and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>where required, proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The proposed changes were assessed and it was concluded that the significance of effects arising from the proposed change were no different to those described in the PEI Report, therefore an updated PEI Report was not provided. The differences arising from the changes were explained within the brochure, including the balance sought between visual impacts and impacts on protected sites and species.</p> <p>On this basis, the level of detail provided was considered appropriate.</p>	
148	ANON-66J6-X8ZK-1			Environmental - Landscape and visual effects	Respondent opposes the proposal for a flyover at Sandford Junction due to the visual impact.	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. The Project Design Report (Application Document 2.3) and the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) provides further information on the schemes design and how the scheme has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>had consideration to the careful location and sensitive design of structures and materials.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) contains the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The replacement of any planting lost through construction works will mitigate any visual impacts at Sandford Junction. No significant visual impacts are identified within the ES.</p>	
232			TR0200088	Mitigation - noise	Respondent is in favour of a northern route within the AONB and MOD land. They request that in order to mitigate local traffic noise, any road to the south of the A66 should remain close to the existing A66 as possible.	The proposed route has been maintained as close to the existing alignment as is feasible. 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. This assessment is underpinned by noise modelling which considers the alignment of roads, height and topography of the Project. This assessment of noise effects on the AONB can be found in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared which identifies	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>measure to mitigate construction noise. Mitigation measures have also been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the adjustment of the road alignment, cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. This assessment also concluded no significant effects on the AONB.</p>	
224		Cumbria County Council		Mitigation - noise	Cumbria County Council express concern that the proposals will result in increased noise levels and request further detail within the Environmental Statement on proposed noise mitigation.	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) presents the noise assessment undertaken to DMRB Guidance LA111 Noise and Vibration. Embedded design mitigation included and assessed within the noise model includes alignment in cutting, false cutting and earth bunds and low noise road surface. Where the assessment has determined a need further noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers has been proposed. The location where these may be installed are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>presented in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>In terms of construction mitigation an Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) is included with the DCO submission. This includes at Annex B5 a Noise and Vibration Management Plan. This sets out measures which the Principal Contractor will have to develop, in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Noise control measures at construction will include restrictions on timings and preference for low noise activities. Noise control measures are secured by the Register of Environmental Actions and commitments presented in Table 3.2 of</p>	
235			TR0200089	Mitigation/AONB	Respondent expresses concern that the strategy to mitigate going through the AONB was to put the new road along the route of the existing A66 or to the south of it near the villages as extent of the potential damage was already known.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AONB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for constructing the new route in the AONB a sifting exercise was carried out and an initial</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
11	TR0200025			Mitigation - and take	Respondent suggest land take required for balancing ponds for the Project be kept to a minimum.	Balancing ponds have been sized in line with design standards and have been included within the land take near to Warcop. The design has been informed by highway drainage design and flood risk modelling.	No
243			TR0200089	Mitigation - alternatives	Respondent suggest National Highways consult with the MoD on	National Highways acknowledges consultees’ request for a route	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					the impact of moving the new road north into their land	<p>even further into the AONB and MOD land to the north of the existing A66, but these routes would have considerable impact on the AONB and MOD operations and are therefore considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent.</p> <p>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>Throughout the design process regular meetings have been held with the MoD to discuss the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>scheme and the impacts it would have on their operations. One of the key factors relate to the safety zone that is needed around their ammunition's facilities any significant encroachment further north of the A66 would mean that this safety zone could not be maintained which would mean that the current facilities would need to be relocated at significant expense.</p> <p>As a result of our discussions with the MoD National Highways have been able to move the original preferred route slightly further north by relocating their existing tank storage and fuel filling facilities further to the east. This has meant that National Highways have been able to lower the route close to Warcop and move it further away from the village.</p>	
34	ANON-66J6-X8ZX-E			Mitigation - flooding	Respondent suggest placing a viaduct for flood risk mitigation at Moor Beck	National Highways acknowledges your comment. As a result of further flood modelling work around Moor Beck a number of changes have been made to the structures in this area including significantly increasing the span of the bridge over Moor Beck .	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
206		Cumbria County Council		Mitigation - biodiversity	Cumbria County Council expressing concerns over the impact that the Project could have on wildlife and ecology, stating that there is a lack of detail on the potential loss of habitats around the fringes of agricultural land, which they say would require mitigation.	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. 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 through consultation with key stakeholders.	No
204		Cumbria County Council		Mitigation - environmental	Cumbria County Council suggest mitigation proposals should holistically consider impacts on noise, ecology, landscape and visual in order to to minimise the impacts collectively.	The Project Environmental team have worked closely together collaborating across Biodiversity, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration and Heritage disciplines to design mitigation for potential Project impacts. This collaborative approach has allowed for identified mitigation to balance aspects such as height of noise bunds with visual impacts. The Environmental Statement	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.	
48	TR0200034			Modified design	Respondent express support for the northern alignment of the east bound carriageway as it will reduce noise and disruption at Sandford Junction	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project.	No
142	TR0200047			Modified design/ Access	Respondent suggest a modified design for a northern route would mean only one junction near Warcop would need to be provided for the army who are the only people wanting access to the dual carriageway between the A66 and Brough.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These exceptional circumstances case has been</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
231			TR0200088	Modified design/ alternative	Respondent suggest a road to the north of the A66 is the best choice for visitors and local traffic	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees’ requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>circumstances for the incursion of the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>networks infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
124			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U, TR0200089	Modified design/ alternatives	Respondent suggest all objections could be met by the dual carriageway being moved north of the existing road into the AONB.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees’ requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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.” The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.	
6	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C			Modified design/ alternative alignment	Respondent suggest alternative northerly road alignments to improve Moor Beck. Adding it would be easier, cheaper with less junctions and have a smaller environmental impact on the area	National Highways acknowledges the consultees’ requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for constructing the new route in the AONB a sifting exercise was carried out and an initial</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>In response to the comment regarding the northerly route being cheaper with less junctions and lower environmental impact this is unlikely to be the case A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. The results of these assessments are detailed within our Environmental Statement</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 3.2). . The impact on the AONB would be significant compared to the route that is being promoted and there are also several roads used by the MoD where junctions would need to be provided to ensure full access to the ranges could be maintained. Additionally, a number of changes to the MoD infrastructure would be required which again would have a cost associated with it	
20	ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z			Modified design/ alternative alignment	Respondent suggest alternative road alignment north of the existing road at Moor Beck, slightly into MoD land, behind Toddygill Hall and then on to Turk's Head after the Langrigg junction.	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 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 by policies of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) and by legislation as a nationally designated site. Following feedback from stakeholders regarding concerns about the proximity of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposed route to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm the road alignment was changed to an alignment with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 on the AONB and MoD operations and are therefore considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>important that new national networks infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The proposed route does encroach slightly into the MoD land and following detailed discussions with them National Highways have confirmed that this is acceptable. National Highways note your suggestion to take the route a little further to the north behind ToddyGill Hall. This has been considered but as well as the additional encroachment into the AONB tha this would result in National Highways would also start to have significant effects on the operation of the MoD ranges. The most notable of which would be the requirement to relocate their ammunitions storage facilities in order to maintain the required safety zone around them.</p> <p>Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
22	ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z			Modified design/ alternative alignment	Respondent suggest alternative road alignments to the north of the existing road. Adding complex junctions at Flitholme and Langrigg should be redesigned to move the link road further away from properties at Langrigg.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>support for this alternative when compared with the Preferred Route design announced in May 2020. As such, the revised route alignment was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These 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.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>Changes are not proposed to the link road at Flitholme and Langrigg access road and the design in this location has no implications for WCH provision, which was the subject of this supplementary consultation. National Highways note though that there are a number of constraints including the MoD land and the AONB in this area which restricts the ability to make design changes to the access road.</p>	
65	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Mitigation - noise	Respondent suggest any excess soil from excavation be used as a partial sound barrier north of the current A66 Sandford Junction	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. In the area around the proposed Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some road traffic noise increases (assessed as minor impact) due to the Project. No additional noise mitigation measures were assessed to be required in this area.	No
23	ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z			Modified design/	Respondent suggests going slightly further north into MoD/AONB behind Toddygill Hall	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a more northerly	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					to Turks Head and asks for drawings to be shown to MoD and Natural England	<p>route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges to the north of the old A66. Through the Preliminary 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 by policies of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) and by legislation as a nationally designated site.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders regarding concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route from Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm the road alignment was changed to an alignment with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary design stage there was engagement with the MoD, Warcop Parish Council, local landowners, and Statutory Bodies including Natural England and the AONB Partnership on the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 on the AONB and MoD operations and are therefore considered highly unlikely to be granted development consent.</p> <p>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>The proposed route does encroach slightly into the MoD land and following detailed discussions with them National Highways have confirmed that this is acceptable. National Highways note your suggestion to take the route a little further to the north</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						behind ToddyGill Hall. This has been considered but as well as the additional encroachment into the AONB that this would result in National Highways would also start to have significant effects on the operation of the MoD ranges. The most notable of which would be the requirement to relocate their ammunitions storage facilities in order to maintain the required safety zone around them.	
168	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggest modified design for significantly more northern route in MoD land which is predominantly brownfield sites, concreted over with roads, scattered with military detritus, from litter to derelict huts. Moreover, the vegetation is typically a monoculture of coniferous plantations in stark contrast to the variety of the pastoral landscape beside the existing road, especially on the southern side.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. We note your comment regarding the condition of the MoD land which forms part of the AONB and the issue of litter and military detritus as well as the quality of the vegetation. The management and maintenance of the AONB is a matter for the MoD and the North Pennines AONB Partnership. National Highways do not have a role in terms of the quality of the AONB we are bound by the fact that the land has been designated and that means we are unable to carry out works within it	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>or have a detrimental effect upon it unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated as outlined below. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>2020. As such, the revised route alignment was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These 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.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges consultees' requests for a route even further into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>existing A66, but these routes would have considerable impact 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
39	A66 Northern Route Campaign Group	Warcop Parish Council;		Modified design - alternative alignment	Warcop Parish Council and A66 Northern Route Campaign Group suggest moving all four carriageways to a more northerly alignment as the AONB and MOD estate are already being taken at Moor Beck.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AONB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB. During the preliminary 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>support for this alternative when compared with the Preferred Route design announced in May 2020. As such, the revised route alignment was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These 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.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.	
41		Warcop Parish Council; A66 Northern Route Campaign Group		Modified design/ alternative alignment	Warcop Parish Council and A66 Northern Route Campaign Group suggest moving the alignment of the new road north would achieve the new cycle, horse rider / pedestrian routes more easily	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary design stage there was engagement with the MoD, Warcop Parish Council, local landowners, and Statutory Bodies on the alignment alternative. All were given the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>assessing the route alignment against alternatives.</p> <p>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 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>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and would run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway.</p>	
241			TR0200089	Modified design - cost	Respondent suggest moving the dual carriageway even just 100m north, as it would be less messy and expensive.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>The proposed route does encroach slightly into the MoD land and following detailed discussions with them National Highways have confirmed that this is acceptable. National Highways note your suggestion to take the route a little further to the north by around 100m. This has been considered but as well as the additional encroachment into the AONB that this would result in National Highways would also start to have significant effects on</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the operation of the MoD ranges. The most notable of which would be the requirement to relocate their ammunitions storage facilities in order to maintain the required safety zone around them.</p> <p>Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out.</p>	
129			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggest moving the new road alignment north of the existing road	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These exceptional</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
131			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U	Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggest Moving the new road alignment north of the existing road into MoD land and that this options requires further exploration	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees’ requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
151	ANON-66J6-X8ZK-1			Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggest new dual carriageway to go north of current a66 as proposed at Sandford junction.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees’ requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>circumstances for the incursion of the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>networks infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
119			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggests moving the new road north of the existing A66 starting east of Sandford through to Brough	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>supported the case for exceptional circumstances for the incursion of the Preferred Route alignment into the AONB. These 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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>important that new national networks infrastructure does not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p>	
158	ANON-66J6-X8ZM-3			Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggests that for Sandford Junction, a more northern route retaining the present road as a local road would reduce local fatalities.	National Highways acknowledges the consultee’s concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p> <p>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford. Our traffic modelling shows that a low number of local vehicles would use this route making it much safer than the existing A66. It would be to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists providing a safe route for them so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway. All the design proposals are carried out to the latest design standards and are also subject to a Road Safety Audit which is carried out by an independent Road Safety Auditor.	
247			TR0200089	Modified design - alternative road use	Respondent suggests that the carriageway takes a more northern route and this enables the old road to be kept as a local route.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N. Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual and noise impact on nearby	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These exceptional circumstances case has been</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford. Our traffic modelling shows that a low number of local vehicles would use this route making it much safer than the existing A66. It would to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists [providing a safe route for them so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out.	
234			TR0200089	Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggests that to mitigate pollution in the villages the dual carriageway must go as far north as possible.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the scheme to follow a much more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the MoD training ranges and the AoNB to the north of the old A66. The issue with regard to moving the new road further to the north does not form part of this supplementary consultation. For details with regard to our position on this please refer to Annex N.</p> <p>Further details of the environmental assessment including air quality assessments can be found in the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders in regard to concerns about the proximity of the original preferred route, announced in Spring 2020 to the village of Warcop and East Field Farm. It was decided to revise the road alignment to one with lower visual</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB.</p> <p>During the preliminary 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 was presented at the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>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. These exceptional</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compromise the safe and effective use of any defence assets.”</p> <p>The NNNPS requirements in respect of development in designated areas sets a high bar and where development elsewhere has been consented in these areas it would have been with regard to such requirements including the need to consider the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere, outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.</p> <p>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford. Our traffic modelling shows that a low number of local vehicles would use this route making it much safer than the existing A66. It would to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists [providing a safe route for them so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
63	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Modified design - junction	Respondent suggests the Sandford Junction revert to the proposal made as part of the Winter 2020 Junctions Update where it was shown as been further west.	An alternative location for the Sandford junction was developed as part of the Winter 2020 update to determine if the preferred route announcement location was appropriate for all proposed uses. Following stakeholder feedback it was determined that the current proposed location which is as per the Preferred Route announcement is the most appropriate location as it has a reduced effect upon good quality agricultural land in the area and as such this has been taken forward as part of the intended DCO design submission. In developing proposals National Highways have engaged in a detailed and comprehensive optioneering process leading to the application as outlined in the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR)	No
71			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Modified design - alternative alignment	Respondent suggests the whole dual carriageway to the north of the existing A66 allowing for local and through traffic separation and reduction for Sandford junction	National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66).</p> <p>This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p>	

Appleby to Brough - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
4	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C, ANON-66J6-X8ZJ-Z, ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9	Warcop Parish Council and the Northern Route Campaign Group		Noise / visual impacts	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council and the Northern Route Campaign Group express concern about air, noise and visual impacts of raising the road height at the central section as it crosses Moor Beck.	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration. This assessment is underpinned by noise modelling which considers the height and topography of the Project. Whilst the road height will be raised compared to the existing road there are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the Project that will be subject to adverse likely significant effects. Therefore, no sustainable additional mitigation is identified.</p> <p>With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Warcop the Project is predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon a number of residential receptors. These receptors are located in close proximity to the Project A66 dualling. The majority of receptors within the community of Warcop are not predicted to experience adverse likely significant effects. Further details can be found in</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Appendix 12.4: Operational Assessment Results (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>For the receptors identified, an assessment of the viability of providing additional mitigation measure has been undertaken following the methodology presented in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 3.2) under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures. No sustainable additional mitigation, e.g. roadside barriers have been identified for the receptors listed above and therefore the residual effect will remain. The Project has been designed to minimise the noise effects as far as practicable and sustainable to do so through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles such as road alignment selection and implementation of low road noise surface.</p> <p>With regards to construction impacts, National Highways has produced an EMP (Document Reference 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</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 air quality modelling presented in the ES does not predict any significant effects on sensitive human receptors, within 200m of the ARN, including those located in Warcop.</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. The assessment notes that the proposed road at the crossing of Moor Beck would not be visible from the village of Warcop due to the rise in landform north of St Columba's Church, the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>heavily wooded railway embankment and the intervening MoD base. Other representative local viewpoints have been assessed. Viewpoint 6.3 Sandford Fold, looking north, has been assessed as experiencing no significant residual visual effects. Viewpoint 6.6 PRoW (bridleway) 372008 south of Langford Farm, looking north-east has been assessed as experiencing no significant visual effects due to distance and intervening landform. Viewpoint 6.7 PRoW (footpath) 372021 north of Warcop Training Centre, looking north-east has been assessed as experiencing a significant visual effect during construction and in the year of opening, however the assessment notes there would be no significant effect after year 15 due to the maturing vegetation. Viewpoint 6.8: Adjacent to Warcop Railway Station entrance, looking north would experience a significant residual visual effect, which will be mitigated in time due to maturing vegetation but would still represent a change in view from those receptors close to the railway station.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
115		Eden District Council and Friends of the Lake District		Noise / Design	Eden District Council and Friends of the Lake District express concern about the noise impacts of elevating sections of the proposed new carriageway over the becks at Warcop.	<p>A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out. Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the impact of the scheme on noise and vibration. This assessment is underpinned by noise modelling which considers the height and topography of the Project. Whilst the road height will be raised compared to the existing road there are no sensitive receptors in close proximity to the Project that will be subject to adverse likely significant effects. Therefore, no sustainable additional mitigation is identified.</p> <p>With regards to operational noise effects, around the area of Warcop the Project is predicted to give rise to likely significant effects (LSE) upon a number of residential receptors. These receptors are located in close proximity to the Project A66 dualling. The majority of receptors within the community of Warcop are not predicted to experience adverse likely significant effects. Further details can be found in Appendix 12.4: Operational</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Assessment Results (Application Document 3.4).</p> <p>For the receptors identified, an assessment of the viability of providing additional mitigation measure has been undertaken following the methodology presented in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference 3.2) under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures. No sustainable additional mitigation, e.g. roadside barriers have been identified for the receptors listed above and therefore the residual effect will remain. The Project has been designed to minimise the noise effects as far as practicable and sustainable to do so through the process of design development and consideration of good design principles such as road alignment selection and implementation of low road noise surface.</p> <p>With regards to construction impacts, National Highways has produced an EMP (Document Reference 2.7) as part of the DCO application, which explains how the impact of construction activities on the environment, such</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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.	
113		Eden District Council and Friends of the Lake District		Noise / Design	Eden District Council and Friends of the Lake District expressing concerns that not following the Good Acoustic Design process, making it difficult to understand potential noise impacts on residential properties.	The methodology for the noise and vibration assessment reported within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) follows the guidance set out within National Highways Standard Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 111 Noise and government policy defined within Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) and National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). Good Acoustic Design relies on the same policy documents and principles as used for this assessment. LA 111 has been developed specifically for assessing noise impacts and their significance for highway schemes and describes the procedures used in the assessment. Further information with regards to the Noise and Vibration mitigation measures for this location are contained within Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Document 3.2). The ES identifies the predicted effects on existing residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures.	
157	ANON-66J6-X8ZM-3			Noise mitigation	Respondents suggest improvements could be made to the Sandford Junction through the provision of a noise embankment adjacent to the community farm.	<p>A noise assessment has been undertaken within Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The ES identifies the predicted effects on existing residential and non-residential receptors and provides a visual representation within operational noise contour figures.</p> <p>In the area around the Sandford Junction, there are predicted to be some operational changes to noise due to the Project, though these were not found to be significant for existing receptors. As such, no additional noise mitigation has been identified for this area.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared which identifies measures to mitigate construction noise. Mitigation measures have also been designed into the scheme to reduce noise impacts during operation, including the adjustment of the road alignment,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						cuttings, low noise road surfacing and landscaped earthworks to mitigate visual impact and reduce noise.	
85		Cumbria County Council		Request further information - WCH	Cumbria County Council express concern and require confirmation that the route parallel to the new A66 at Warcop is for WCH use and that the connectivity, WCH facilities at the new junctions and re-routing of PROW and private means of access are confirmed to the satisfaction of Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council. Inc. - widths and segregation for users from traffic and between pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.	<p>The east-west WCH route on the Appleby to Brough scheme (including around Warcop) is typically a standalone shared cycleway (cyclists and walkers) other than sections at the western end of the scheme that are shared cycleways combined with Private Means of Access.</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>The shared cyclway is expected to be approximately 3m in width. There would be no segregation between walkers and cyclists, the path shall be shared.</p> <p>National Highways confirm that we will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>	No
86		Cumbria County Council		Request further information - connectivity	Cumbria County Council express concern and wants confirmation of how local connections will be	National Highways acknowledges the comment regarding the provision of local access. A local	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					maintained, in regards to the proposed treatment of the decommissioned length of the old A66 at Warcop Central.	access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and would run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway. Farm underpasses and local access tracks are also to be provided where required to ensure connectivity is maintained for agricultural land which may be affected by our proposals. Further details can be found on the Rights of Way and Access plans which form part of the DCO application (Application document 5.19).	
101		Cumbria County Council		Request further information - Noise	Cumbria County Council express concern and would like more detail on the mitigation proposals for noise.	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) presents the noise assessment undertaken to DMRB Guidance LA111 Noise and Vibration. Embedded design mitigation included and assessed within the noise model includes alignment in cutting, false cutting	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and earth bunds and low noise road surface. Where the assessment has determined a need further noise mitigation in the form of noise barriers has been proposed. The location where these may be installed are presented in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8)</p> <p>In terms of construction mitigation an Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) is included with the DCO submission. This includes at Annex B5 a Noise and Vibration Management Plan. This sets out measures which the Principal Contractor will have to develop, in consultation with the relevant local authorities. Noise control measures at construction will include restrictions on timings and preference for low noise activities. Noise control measures are secured by the Register of Environmental Actions and commitments presented in Table 3.2 of the EMP.</p>	
138			TR0200052	Request further information - Flooding	Respondents express concern about ability to operate the farm south of the road particularly regarding access for large farm	National Highways acknowledge the consultee's comment and the viaduct proposed at Cringle Beck would have appropriate headroom	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>machinery through the viaduct and the protection of the farmhouse from flooding as a result of the new road</p>	<p>to allow farm machinery to safely pass under it to the land on the south side of the new A66.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges the comments made with regard to Flood Risk. Our remit is to ensure that our proposals do not make any flooding worse in the area.</p> <p>Further detail is contained in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment. (Application Document 3.2). Appendix 14.2 contains specific information on Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy</p>	
227		Cumbria County Council		AONB/ Lack of Information	<p>Cumbria County Council express concern in regards the lack of detail within the consultation material regarding impacts upon the AONB.</p>	<p>The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The supplementary consultations have been non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. Where environmental impacts of changes made under the supplementary consultation were different to those in the PEI report they were detailed in the supplementary consultation brochure and online. Where there was not additional details the changes impacts outlined in the PEI report.</p> <p>The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues. The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Documents 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme.</p> <p>The assessment concludes the AONB is not affected by the works although there would be some changes to the southern boundary but these are not significant or considered material and would be mitigated through time by planting as it matures.</p>	
88		Cumbria County Council		Consultation/ Lack of Information	Cumbria County Council express concern in regards the level of information provided within consultation material.	The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). Consultation Brochures	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and where required proposed mitigation measures.	
10	TR0200024			Access/ Junctions	Respondents express concern of impact of proposed Sanford junctions and access points A and B asking if any changes will affect access to fields 1 and 2	As part of the scheme development process we have and will continue to work with affected landowners and their tenants to ensure that access to any land not required for the scheme is maintained. Our lands team and district valuers will continue their discussions with affected landowners and their agents as the scheme moves through the DCO process towards construction. Please refer to the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19) that have been produced as part of the DCO application these show all new, stopped up and replaced private means of access.	No
230		Cumbria County Council		Request further information/ Impact	Cumbria County Council express concern that more detail is needed to understand the impact of the Project and whether the revised proposals presented during supplementary consultation are preferable to those presented during previous engagement.	The approach to the supplementary consultation including: the duration; the level of publicity of the consultation; the consultation material; and the consultation events are considered proportionate to the proposals and are in accordance with the Guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Process). Consultation Brochures were published in hard copy, available at deposit points and online. The brochures provided a detailed overview of the revised proposals, this included additional maps, and overview of the benefits and additional environmental information where necessary. The consultations have been largely non-statutory and within a targeted area associated with specific design changes. The consultation material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.	
74		Cumbria County Council		Consultation information/ Lack of Information	Cumbria County Council express concern that the background detail and in-depth knowledge needed has not been provided for this consultation. They are anticipating more detailed plans to be shared with them in mid-March 2022.	<p>For the supplementary consultation the material has been limited to the targeted area and specific issues associated with the design change, including the key environmental issues.</p> <p>The stakeholders consulted, the area for consultation, the publicity for the consultation and the timescales are appropriate given the nature and scope of the targeted consultation. The information provided for the consultation is sufficient to allow consultees to understand the change and the implications of the change and to allow them to provide feedback.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>National Highways confirm further engagement has taken place with Cumbria County Council since and will continue beyond DCO submission. Engagement has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						continued with Cumbria County Council which is outlined in the Joint SOCG between Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council and National Highways (Application Document 4.6).	
82		Cumbria County Council		Request further information Land take	Cumbria County Council express concern that the ownership, design and overall land take requirements of the segregated lane that has been added to the local connector road at Warcop be developed further prior to DCO submission	National Highways are committed to working with impacted stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. 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).	No
211		Cumbria County Council		Mitigation strategy/ Landscape/ Visual	Cumbria County Council express concern that they cannot comment on the landscape and visual effect of the revised proposals without further detail on the mitigation strategy.	The impact of the project to the wider Landscape has been assessed in detail within Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual) within Volume 1 of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2). Chapter 10 has concluded that the combined predicted residual effects to the M1 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank Scheme, Penrith to Temple Sowerby Scheme, and the Appleby to Brough Scheme would not be significant. The combined predicted residual effect as a result of the Temple	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Sowerby to Appleby / Crackenthorpe has been assessed as significant.</p> <p>The overall approach to the landscape design is set out within the Project Design Report (Document reference 2.3) which accompanies the DCO submission.</p> <p>We have sought to address the issues of concern, and discussions will continue once the Council's have had full sight of the documents referred to above.</p>	
121			ANON-66J6-X8ZF-V	Traffic/access	Respondents express concern for Sandford Junction stating It becomes more and more important to keep strategic traffic on the new dual carriageway and local traffic on the local network	National Highways acknowledges your comment with regard to the provision of local access. A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and will run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This will provide access for locals, including farm vehicles and will be available for use when the Appleby Fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for non motorised users such as walkers and cyclists so that they do not have to use the new dual carriageway. Farm underpasses and local access tracks are also to be provided where required to ensure	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						connectivity is maintained for agricultural land which may be affected by our proposals.	
126			ANON-66J6-X8ZE-U, TR0200089	Community Impact/ Brough Hill Fair	Respondents express concern in regards the loss of a playing field and the Brough Hill Fair site.	<p>The proposed alignment will result in the loss of the Ministry of Defence playing field and helipad. Relocation of these assets will be provided to the south of the scheme, located off Castlehill Road. This site is likely to include a parking area, pavilion and storage shed; however, the details are still to be confirmed with the Ministry of Defence. The replacement facilities will be fully operational before the closure of the existing provisions due to the potential use as an emergency services helipad.</p> <p>Brough Hill Fair, which is of high sensitivity, would be subjected to land take due to the realignment of this scheme. Following Supplementary Consultation, Site 1 Central Site has been selected as the preferred site for the relocated fair. This site has been chosen following the supplementary consultation, for the following reasons: it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site; it has the ability for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses; it has good access from Station Road; it has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Brough Hill Fair Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
150	ANON-66J6-X8ZK-1			Landscape / visual	Respondents express concern in regards the visual impact on residents in Langrigg/Broomrigg.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. A significant effect is identified during construction at this location with the removal of woodland and construction of a permanent access track. Following the reinstatement of woodland the impact reduces to a slight impact in Year 15. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) outline how the landscape and ecological mitigation planting could be delivered.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
62	ANON-66J6-X8Z1-7			Community Impact / Health and Wellbeing	Respondents express concern in regards proposals at Sandford Junction and the social impacts on vulnerable people such as those with physical or mental health problems, blind, deaf, autistic school children and refugees.	The Equalities Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) has been carried out as part of the environmental assessment to assess equality impacts on protected characteristics. Where significant adverse effects upon residents or users with protected characteristics are identified then suitable mitigation is proposed within the Equality Impact Assessment.	No
141	TR0200047			Construction / Traffic	Respondents express concern about construction of the new road as traffic cannot be re-routed through Kirkby Stephen whilst the dual carriageway is being built because of existing restrictions to HGVs.	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. 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 would be limited to weekend and off peak times, and any closures or potential diversions would be publicised in advance, as outlined in Environmental Management Plan Annex B13 Construction	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Application Document 2.7).The PC is required to develop this CTMP in consultaiothn with the local / highways authority to ensure disruption is minimised.</p> <p>The planning of the construction works has started and will be further developed during subsequent stages of the Project.</p>	
165	ANON-66J6-X8Z3-9			Traffic / alternatives	Respondents suggest improvement of railways to remove freight from road and implementing average speed limit along route	<p>National Highways acknowledges the views expressed. 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,</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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. Further information can be found in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2).</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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.	
28	ANON-66J6-X8ZS-9			Traffic / congestion/alternatives	Respondents suggest alterations to existing road to avoid the need for the Appleby to Brough Scheme. The respondents state the A66 could be improved without making it dual carriageway by: imposing lower speed limits; introducing acceleration and deceleration lanes; and introducing underpasses or bridges to remove the need for vehicles to turn right.	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 2017 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. National Highways have since been given	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						a remit from the Department for Transport to deliver the project. Refer to the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2) and the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information including an outline of what the benefits of dualling the A66 are.	
2	ANON-66J6-X8ZV-C			Traffic / congestion / alternatives	Respondents suggest alternative route north of the old road allowing locals to utilise the old road to improve proposals at Sandford junction, stating current alterations offer no benefit to local people	National Highways acknowledges the consultee's concerns. We have received feedback from stakeholders outlining concerns about the proximity of the proposed route to the properties at Dyke Nook and Sandford. In response to this, an alternative design was developed to construct the new eastbound carriageway to the north of the existing A66. The existing A66 will become the westbound carriageway which means National Highways no longer need to build it to the south of the existing A66). This has resulted in reduced land take from the properties and increasing the distance from the properties to the new A66. The construction of the new A66 eastbound carriageway to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>north results in minor incursion into the MoD.</p> <p>National Highways have worked closely with the MoD to make this change and it can be undertaken without affecting their operations in the area.</p> <p>However, moving the entire A66 into their land would obviously result in a much greater land take. This would have too great an effect upon their operations in the area and is therefore not possible in accordance with National Policy.</p> <p>A local access road is to be provided between Brough and Sandford and would run to the north of the new dual carriageway. This would provide access for locals including farm vehicles and would be available for use when the Appleby fair is on. Additionally a track is to be provided between Appleby and Brough for walkers and cyclists so that they do not have to use the local access road or the new dual carriageway.</p>	
103	TR0200054			Environmental/ Trees	Respondents support Sandford Junction stating the plans minimising noise, pollution and visual impact. However the	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Sandford Junction aspects of the Project. Tree retention will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					respondent notes that tree retention should be maximised.	maximised as far as practicable across the Project and in accordance with Project requirements. Where it is not feasible for design or construction purposes, trees will be replaced through replacement planting. 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).	
240			TR0200089	Visual impact/ AONB	Respondents express concern about the visual impact of the proposals within an ancient landscape stating the MoD use of the area has already negatively impacted the land that is within the AONB.	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 AONB. This route option reduces the impact on the village of Warcop, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) training ranges and the AONB.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The assessment detailed within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) concludes there is no significant effects to the AONB though there will be some changes to the southern extent.</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. 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) provides further information on the schemes design and how the scheme has had consideration to the careful location and sensitive design of structures and materials.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to 'Walking, Cycling and Horse riding' and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
179	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Access/PRoW	At the new junction to the West of Brough, there is a need to maintain access to/from the PRoW network to the south (BW 309003, FP 309004, and BW 309009).	All existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will remain. Where 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. In the case of BW 309003, FP 309004, and BW 309009, these all remain with diversions made to accommodate the new A66 alignment and junction. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
245	WCH044			Appleby to Brough - Access	Concern about vehicle access to the access road to the north (local to Café Sixty Six) of the A66 near	The solution for the Cafe Sixty Six access is an eastbound diverge in advance of the Cafe Sixty Six with a one way Private Means of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					client's land at Coupland Beck Farm.	<p>Access (PMA) link road around the back of the cafe joining to an eastbound merge. Attached to this is another PMA that provides a link to New Hall Farm Underpass.</p> <p>Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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>	
130	WCH037			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Access/ Demand	Concern over how much demand there is for the PRoW between Cross Lanes and Greta Bridge following the A66	One of the principle aims of the Project, within its defined extents, is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The section of the route highlighted in this feedback is to be provided to avoid a gap over this section between Greta Bridge and the Rokeby junction, from which point the route continues west beyond Rokeby. With this improved connectivity in place, the demand for the route is expected to increase.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						National Highways are committed to working with impacted landowners & other stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into the detailed design stage. This process will be carried out by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
25	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Access/ Security	Concern that the proposed access track to Low Bank End farm will cause unwanted road users near to the farm and the proposed farm access will be used to access the Café Sixty Six even though the Café has its own private access.	The solution for the Cafe Sixty Six access is an eastbound diverge in advance of the Cafe Sixty Six with a one-way Private Means of Access (PMA) link road around the back of the cafe joining to an eastbound merge. Attached to this is another PMA that provides a link to the Underpass. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development. 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).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
12	WCH003			Project-level - Access/ Connectivity	Introduction of cycle paths/pedestrian footpaths will improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists.	National Highways appreciate the continued support for the proposed WCH infrastructure.	No
208	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Farm Traffic	Need for local access parallel to the north side of the widened A66 (through the Winderwath Estate) to allow both estate and agricultural traffic to access to all of the land adjoining.	Access to the land on the northern side of the A66 in this location is provided by a new shared public right of way and private means of access track. 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).	No
213	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Damage to PRoW	Oppose that the current track (through the Winderwath Estate) route is not tight to field boundaries and would cause difficulty in farm vehicles turning leading to damage of the track	A certain degree of flexibility has been allowed for in the design in this location to ensure the tracks can be constructed within the DCO order limits. National Highways acknowledge this feedback and will seek to ensure the proposed shared public right of way and private means of access track is located as close to the field boundary as is feasible. In terms of negotiation of the tracks by farm vehicles, the track designs have included swept path analysis to ensure alignment and bends are suitable for the design vehicles (typical agricultural	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>vehicles). A certain degree of flexibility has been allowed for in this location to ensure the tracks can be constructed within the DCO order limits.</p> <p>We are committed to working with impacted landowners & other stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into the detailed design stage. This process will be carried out by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p>	
212	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Oppose	Oppose the layout of the current access track (through the Winderwath Estate)	<p>A certain degree of flexibility has been allowed for in the design in this location to ensure the tracks can be constructed within the DCO order limits. National Highways acknowledge this feedback and will seek to ensure the proposed shared public right of way and private means of access track is located as close to the field boundary as is feasible. In terms of negotiation of the tracks by farm vehicles, the track designs have included swept path analysis to ensure alignment and bends are suitable for the design vehicles. A certain degree of flexibility has been allowed for in this location to ensure the tracks</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>can be constructed within the DCO order limits.</p> <p>We are committed to working with impacted landowners & other stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into the detailed design stage. This process will be carried out by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p>	
60	WCH017			Appleby to Brough - Access/alternatives	<p>Opposition to the position of the proposed new A66 as it will require the development of a new dual carriageway and access road (at the Langrigg Junction) which will be between the existing A66 and the resident's cottage. Respondent calls for new A66 to be built to north of the existing route, within the AONB.</p>	<p>The call for an alternative route for the A66 section at Langrigg to go north of the current road, is not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. National Highways consulted on the route choice as part of the Statutory Consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of this Consultation Report. 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. The proposed route has an incursion into the AONB for the construction of a new local road to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the north of the old A66 and the design considers the impact on stakeholders and landowners. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out in arriving at the final solution taken forward to DCO.	
180	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Access/ Design	Provision should also be made when diverting FP 309004 (west of Brough) for the new walking/cycling route to connect back to this footpath on the northern side of the scheme.	This suggested provision is included within the design. FP 309004 connects into the south side of new local access junction, west of Brough. A new PRoW is provided across the junction linking FP309004 to the new and existing PRoW on the north side of the junction	No
236	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Access/ Design	Request that access to client's land (to the south of new the A66) at Low Moor must be provided with suitable bell mouth to swing larger farm machinery in through gateways.	National Highways note your comments with regard to the provision of suitable bell mouths at access points to land. These details will be discussed with landowners as part of any agreed accommodation works during the detailed design phase of the Project.	No
209	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Farm Traffic	Respondent suggests local access route, through the Winderwath Estate, for local agricultural, estate and National Highways maintenance vehicles,	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access and PRoW. To separate them out would require additional land for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					with ownership and maintenance responsibilities to be clarified.	both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/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, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	
210	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	Suggested that a separate walking and cycling route, through the Winderwath Estate, alongside the dual carriageway with a separate local access road is provided, with different ownership and maintenance arrangements for each.	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access and PRoW. To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/PRoW will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	No
215	WCH041			Penrith to Temple	Suggestion that any local access road and the cycle and walking	National Highways acknowledge this view however if the track were	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Sowerby - Access/ Design	track be located between any balancing ponds and the new highway, through the Winderwath Estate. This would straighten the route of both accesses probably reducing the area of land that would be required even with a separated public access and local access road, but also making the logistics of travelling the route significantly easier.	to be relocated between the pond and A66, the pond would need to be moved further north which would not result in any saving in terms of land take.	
34	WCH007			Appleby to Brough - Access/ Design	Supports the changed position of the exit and entry lanes to the A66 from Main Street to Fell Lane.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
10	WCH002			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Access/ Support/ Connectivity	Supports the east-west connectivity provision for walking, cycling and horse riding alongside the detrunked A66 on Stephen Bank to Carkin moor to connect to Mainsgill Farm Shop.	National Highways appreciate the continued support for the proposed WCH infrastructure.	No
214	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	The 90-degree bends in the route, through Winderwath Estate, which circumnavigate the balancing ponds in the north are not suitable for large-scale farm machinery	The accommodation tracks will be subject to further review and refinement at the detailed design stage. An initial swept path analysis has been carried out to ensure larger vehicles can use the route. This will be further refined at the detailed design stage with further localised widening of the tracks incorporated as necessary. We will also look at opportunities to incorporate passing bays at the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						detailed design phase of the Project.	
28	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Access/ Security	The introduction of a track near Low Bank End farm will allow a number of parties access to the farm which previously had limited access.	<p>The proposed access arrangement is in place to provide both farms with direct access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66. One of the project objectives is to minimise direct accesses to/from the A66 on safety grounds, as well as there being a need to minimise the number of new structures crossing the A66. The access to the two farms therefore needs to be combined to avoid multiple accesses and multiple structures in close proximity (reducing road user safety and increasing project cost and construction complexity).</p> <p>Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
295	WCH049			Project-level - Active Travel/ Design	Retaining the westbound on-slip at Appleby would allow create traffic free cycle route at less cost and to a higher quality	A traffic free shared use walking and cycle paths has been proposed between Temple Sowerby and Appleby. This utilises the westbound on-slip (B6542) at Appleby. 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).	No
300	WCH049			Appleby to Brough - Active Travel	The section of existing A66 between Warcop and Brough does not serve any significant clusters of dwellings and therefore this should allow active travel users to share the carriageway space.	A local access road will be provided between Warcop and Brough. This will be comprised of some sections of the existing A66 and sections of new single carriageway to the north of the existing A66 where required. The local access road is predicted to have low flows and will be available for active travel users as well as local traffic.	No
64	WCH017			Project-level - Additional PRoW/ Necessity	In principle support the idea of providing WCH facilities however there are already existing footpaths, therefore additional PRoW is unnecessary.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and new PRoWs are provided to achieve this goal. Existing PRoW have been reconnected where they have been severed by the proposed dualling.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
228	WCH042			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Additional PRow/ Public Access	Oppose additional PRow on at Brougham Castle Farm due to current limited public access.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and this section at Brougham Castle Farm forms part of the proposed route. The shared cycle track and private means of access will be fenced on both sides to segregate from adjacent private land. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.	No
74	WCH020 WCH017			Appleby to Brough - Additional PRow/ Environmental	Respondent raises concerns that provision of additional PRow does not compensate for the environmental impact of the Project or impact on quality of life local to their property near Broomrigg.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. These additional PRow form part of these enhancements the Project is to include. A detailed environmental impact assessment of the Project has been carried out, which considers the potential impact of the Project on the environment, including impact on peoples health and quality of life. Within the Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Document 3.2) considers the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						impact 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.	
134	WCH038			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Additional PRow/ Necessity	Oppose the proposed additional bridges to support proposed PRow local to Ravensworth, along the A66 as they are considered unnecessary	National Highways acknowledge the response. 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 however needs to be balanced with keeping lengths of diverted local roads and PRow to a minimum also to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions.	No
50	WCH011			Temple Sowerby to Appleby -	Opposition to the introduction of a new PRow local to Crackenthorpe on the basis that the proposed	The existing direct route is a bridleway and is to be maintained on its current alignment. The route	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Additional PRow/ Land	new PRow will be located next to an existing footpath - using up further agricultural land.	that deviates from this is the diverted footpath and private means of access (PMA) which utilises an existing farm track as well as a new section to be constructed around the pond. 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).	
51	WCH012			Appleby to Brough - Additional PRow/ Land	Opposition to the proposed new cycle/pathway on client's land as it crosses severed and retained land on the topside of the new highway local to Moor Beck.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. These additional PRow form part of these enhancements the Project is to include. National Highways acknowledge your comments regarding the location of the proposed shared cycleway in the vicinity of Moor Beck. The shared cycleway is to be inside the highway boundary and will be segregated from private land with a suitable boundary treatment. The alignment of the track needs to deviate away from the new A66 in this location due to the topography of the surrounding land and the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						fact the A66 is on a structure crossing Moor Beck, whereas the shared cycleway is to follow the existing ground levels.	
137	WCH040			Project-level - Additional PRow/ Connectivity	Supportive that the Councils' proposal for additional facilities for walking, cycling and horse-riding are now proposed to be incorporated into the A66 NTP scheme. At a strategic level, this provides a connected East-West route, with much of the route separated from traffic.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
85	WCH024			Appleby to Brough - Additional PRow/ Request for Further Information	Query as to why, rights of way have been extended northwards (at West of Brough) up the carriage drive and respondent is unsure as to why this is the case. It is assumed no further public rights of way would be created other than the bridleway which currently comes down the carriage drive which will be diverted over the bridge.	Bridleway 309/031 is diverted from the new junction, along the south side of the A66 to Musgrave Lane where it joins an existing Bridleway. An existing section of Bridleway 309/031 between the A66 and Cherry Tree House is to be stopped up. A new footway is to be included on the new bridge to link the severed footpaths to the north and south sides of the A66. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
128	WCH036			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Agricultural Land/ Additional PRoW	Opposition to the introduction of a new PRoW local to Crackenthorpe on the basis that the proposed new PRoW will be located next to an existing footpath - using up further agricultural land.	The existing direct route is a bridleway and is to be maintained on its current alignment. The route that deviates from this is the diverted footpath and private means of access (PMA) which utilises an existing farm track as well as a new section to be constructed around the pond. 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).	No
253	WCH046			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Agricultural Land/ Severance	Concern PRoW will sever agricultural land and impact upon the profitability of Monks Rest farm business.	The proposed footpath connection runs east/west and is required to provide the diversion of footpath 20.23/8/1 which is severed by the proposed highway alignment. The footpath is to run tight to the highway boundary to minimise the land required. 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).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
88	WCH025			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Agricultural Land/ PRoW	Concern that proposed PRoW will be at the expense of agricultural land and query why an underpass cannot be include at the Grove	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. The proposed shared private means of access and cycle track between the Rokeby Junction and Greta Bridge will be fenced along both sides with gates to be provide secure access to only those who require access.	No
254	WCH046			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Agricultural Land/ Compensation	Concerns that the proposed PRoW will impact upon farmers compensation claims	As part of the Development Consent Order process, National Highways is committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>scheme and how they are affected. It is only upon exhausting all options to find an agreeable solution between parties that we will seek compulsory purchase powers as a means of acquiring land for the delivery of the scheme.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p>	
135	WCH038			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Agricultural Land/ Additional PRow	Oppose additional bridges proposed to support new PRow as they will take up additional agricultural land.	<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 however needs to be balanced with keeping lengths of diverted PRow to a minimum also to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
91	WCH025			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Agricultural Land/ Security	Provision of an underpass at the Grove would ensure reduced security risk.	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. The proposed shared private means of access and cycle track between the Rokeby Junction and Greta Bridge will be fenced along both sides. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						restrcutions and security measures.	
90	WCH025			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Agricultural Land/route selection	Provision of an underpass would ensure retained agricultural land	<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>The proposed shared private means of access and cycle track between the Rokeby Junction and Greta Bridge will be fenced along both sides. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrcutions and security measures.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
251	WCH045			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Agricultural Land/ Design	Suggestion that the PRow should 'hem' the A66 in order to limit the severance of agricultural land	National Highways acknowledge this view however if the east-west cycle track in the location were to be relocated to be tight along the highway boundary for its full length i.e. between the ponds and A66, the ponds would need to be moved further north which would not result in any saving in terms of land take.	No
294	WCH049			Project-level - Align with guidance or policy/ Design	Suggestion that the creation of new traffic-free paths should adhere to LTN1/20's recommended minimum horizontal separation between carriageway and path.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. Over the length of the project, the chosen solution needs to vary to take into account other factors such as private access and reconnection of severed PRow. There are sections of the project where shared cycleways are proposed with minimum separation from the new or de-trunked A66. That is not however, always the optimum solution and as such there are other sections where greater separation is required, for example where a PRow is shared with a private means of access and the alignment and functionality of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>private access has been prioritised.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
138	WCH040			M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank - Align with guidance or policy/ Design	The Councils would wish to see improvements at J40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout in line with the recommendations within the Penrith Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).	The primary objective of the Project at these two junctions is to increase capacity for the benefit of both the strategic and local road network, and to do so within the constraints of the sites. The project does include safe routes across both junctions for both walkers and cyclists which include signalised crossing points. The Project has taken on board recommendations within the Penrith Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) albeit within the bounds of what can be achieved within the constraints of the sites . National Highways are unable to deliver any of the wider	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						LCWIP aspirations under the A66 Project.	
140	WCH040			Project-level - Align with guidance or policy/ Design	These guidance documents make it clear that schemes focused on motorised users should still improve conditions for active travel	One of the key objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. Over the length of the project, the chosen solution needs to vary to take into account other factors such as private access and reconnection of severed PRow. The Project is providing a significant enhancement in both connectivity and safety of the WCH routes between the M6 and the A1(M) Scotch Corner. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
143	WCH040			Project-level - Align with guidance or policy/Design	Use the guidance within CD 143 “Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding” shows that a 3m minimum width is required for horse-riding. This should be in	The detailed design of the rights of way provision (whether new or diverted) will comply with applicable standards the details of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					addition to the minimum 3m width for cyclists and walkers as per LTN 1/20, additionally a minimum 0.5 buffer from the carriageway should be provided.	<p>which will be resolved at detailed design .</p> <p>The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11)</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>	
139	WCH040			Project-level - Align with guidance or policy/ Design	National Highways must align with guiding principles within "Gear Change" and "Local Transport Note 1/20".	<p>The detailed design of the rights of way provision (whether new or diverted) will comply with applicable standards the details of which will be resolved at detailed design.</p> <p>The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11)</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
243	WCH044			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Animal safety	Concern about potential impacts to the Free Range Egg laying operation at Coupland Beck Farm including biosecurity and welfare standards.	<p>The concern is noted, however the Project is not changing access arrangements into the egg laying facility. The east-west private means of access/PRoW is to be located on the north side of the A66 running east from Cafe Sixty Six. An underpass is to be constructed to provide access to/from the A66 eastbound carriageway for Far Bank End and New Hall Farms however these accesses are only to reconnect existing stopped up accesses and do not provide new links to the egg laying facility. Any new private means of access will be fenced on both sides. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
24	WCH005			Appleby to Brough - Animal safety WCH	Concern that increased interactions between unfamiliar horses at The Crackenthorpe Stud, and will increase horse anxiety, potentially cause them to bolt leading to an increased risk of injury.	No additional horse riding facilities (Bridleways) are proposed in the vicinity of Crackenthorpe Stud. Bridleway 341/001 is an existing facility along the line of the Old Roman Road and this is not affected by the Project. As the existing bridleway network is to remain largely unchanged, we do not anticipate any significant increase in patronage by horse-riders.	No
20	WCH005			Project-level - Animal safety WCH	Concerns that horses will become startled on shared use paths with cyclists (point raised in relation to bridleway in vicinity of Crackenthorpe Stud).	No additional horse-riding facilities (Bridleways) are proposed in the vicinity of Crackenthorpe Stud. Bridleway 341/001 is an existing facility along the line of the Old Roman Road and this is not affected by the Project. Cyclists are permitted to use these as they do now, so the project is not introducing this potential horse/cycle interaction. Cyclist are required to use these facilities in line with the Highway Code and give way to horse-riders.	No
31	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Animal safety WCH	Concerns that the track by Low Bank End Farm will cause cross contamination of livestock with neighbouring landowners livestock and cause loss of High Health Herd status (point relates to PMA	The solution for the Cafe Sixty Six access is an eastbound diverge in advance of the Cafe Sixty Six with a one-way Private Means of Access (PMA) link road around the back of the cafe joining to an	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					from underpass to south in vicinity of Cafe Sixty Six).	<p>eastbound merge. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development, including the PMA off the Cafe Sixty Six PMA.</p> <p>An underpass is to be constructed to provide access to/from the A66 eastbound carriageway for Far Bank End and New Hall Farms however these accesses are only to reconnect existing stopped up accesses. Any new private means of access will be fenced on both sides. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</p> <p>National Highways are unable to provide individual accesses for every farm as each would require a separate structure to cross the A66.</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>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
21	WCH005			Project-level - Animal safety WCH	Request for provision to keep equestrian traffic and cyclists separate.	The only new equestrian route proposed is to be shared with pedestrians only. This is proposed on Scheme 9. Any existing Public Right of Way Bridleways will be reconnected if severed by the proposed dualling, and cyclists will be permitted to use these as they do now.	No
22	WCH005			Appleby to Brough - Animal safety WCH	Concerned that increasing horse friendly public rights of way will increase contact between horses being kept on separate land, (specifically at The Crackenthorpe Stud at Roger Head, Appleby).	No additional horse-riding facilities (Bridleways) are proposed in the vicinity of Crackenthorpe Stud. Bridleway 341/001 is an existing facility along the line of the Old Roman Road and this is not affected by the Project. As the existing bridleway network is to remain largely unchanged, we do not anticipate any significant increase in patronage by horse-riders.	No
23	WCH005			Appleby to Brough - Animal safety WCH	Concern that Increased contact between horses unfamiliar with each other could increase the risk of contagious diseases through animal to animal contact (specifically at The Crackenthorpe Stud at Roger Head, Appleby).	No additional horse-riding facilities (Bridleways) are proposed in the vicinity of Crackenthorpe Stud. Bridleway 341/001 is an existing facility along the line of the Old Roman Road and this is not affected by the Project. As the existing bridleway network is to remain largely unchanged, we do not anticipate any significant	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						increase in patronage by horse-riders.	
249	WCH045			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - antisocial behaviour/ PRow	Oppose the proposed PRow if it opens up land to public vehicles and access as there are already current issues with anti-social behaviour.	<p>One of the key objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. Over the length of the project, the chosen solution needs to vary to take into account other factors such as private access and reconnection of severed PRow. The intention is not for PRows to open up private land.</p> <p>Any new shared private means of access and PRow will be fenced on both sides. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
216	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Balancing ponds/ Safety	Suggestion that balancing ponds could be fenced off, with access and a small hardstanding area for National Highways vehicle access.	Balancing ponds will be fenced off and the maintenance hardstanding will be located within the fenced off area	No
222	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Boundary features / Security	Request for agreement of boundary features and also if fenced the access arrangements into fields (bell mouth entrances) and the means of access between different fields if a local access road is provided - possible cattle grid and gate arrangement.	<p>The access tracks will be segregated from adjacent surrounding land by suitable boundary treatments. Boundary treatment requirements are set out under the Project</p> <p>The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11). Cattle grid and gates will be considered at detailed design.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
92	WCH025			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Communication / Request for Further Information	Request for evidence that the underpass option at the Grove proposed by the respondent has been considered as an option.	<p>National Highways thank the respondents for reiterating their feedback from the autumn consultation and for raising points about compound location and WCH provision</p> <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>With regard to 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)</p>	No
43	WCH009			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Community impact/ Privacy	Concerns that rerouting of the path through the Greta Bridge entrance to Rokeby Grove and Track room cottage to the south will impact on the privacy to the properties which run adjacent to this – alternative option to the north of the properties raised by the respondent.	The objection to the current proposal is acknowledged. The design team have investigated an alternative route to the north of these properties but it was discounted due to the engineering solution required to overcome the level difference and the loss of a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						significant number of mature trees that would result.	
194	WCH040			Project-level - Compliance with LTN1/20	The Councils also require confirmation of the design for provision along the de-trunked sections of the A66, which on the plans provided in Autumn 2021 and February 2022 appear to be unchanged from the current piecemeal provision and also substandard when applying the latest LTN 1/20 guidance.	<p>Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide the WCH facilities shown in the design which will be a significant enhancement of the current status in terms of connectivity and safety. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with relevant standards current at the time (including LTN 1/20 where appropriate), the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways confirm that we will look at 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>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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
162	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Compliance with LTN1/20	The provision along the proposed de-trunked A66 passing through Crackenthorpe and Kirkby Thore is assumed to be a shared use facility, although carriageway widths appear to mean that widening will be needed in several areas to provide a width of facility (and buffer) that is compliant with LTN 1/20.	Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide the WCH facilities shown in the design (a shared cycleway in this instance between Kirby Thore and Crackenthorpe). The proposed WCH provision will be a significant enhancement of the current status in terms of connectivity and safety. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with relevant standards current at the time (including LTN 1/20 where appropriate), the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. National Highways confirm that we will look at 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. Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
155	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Compliance with LTN1/20	Lack of compliance with LTN 1/20 for proposed PRow between Temple Sowerby and Low Moor Caravan Park.	<p>Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide the WCH facilities shown in the design (a shared cycleway in this instance between Temple Sowerby and Low Moor Caravan Park). The proposed WCH provision will be a significant enhancement of the current status in terms of connectivity and safety. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with relevant standards current at the time (including LTN 1/20 where appropriate), the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways confirm that we will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development to firm up the detailed design of this and other works within the local authority network.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
189	WCH040			Project-level - Connectivity/ Utilities	<p>Concern that without connectivity improvements at the M6 Junction 40 and Kemplay Bank Roundabout at the Penrith end of the route, there is a risk that the utility of the corridor is severely degraded.</p>	<p>The primary objective of the Project at these two junctions is to increase capacity for the benefit of both the strategic and local road network, and to do so within the constraints of the sites. The project does include safe routes across both junctions for both walkers and cyclists which include signalised crossing points which will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process. The Project has taken on board the wider aspirations of Cumbria County Council, including recommendations within the Penrith Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) albeit within the bounds of what can be achieved within the constraints of the sites. The perceived risk of corridor degradation is noted, however, the walking and cycling</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						route improvements across the two junctions combined with the wider east-west connectivity improvements is viewed as a significant enhancement over the existing provision in the area as a whole.	
191	WCH040			Project-level - Connectivity/ Crossing	Opportunity to maintain connectivity for WCH at Kirkby Thore by providing a crossing facility following the alignment of Main Street.	National Highways acknowledge the response. 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 however needs to be balanced with keeping lengths of diverted local roads and PRow to a minimum also to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions. In the case of Main Street, the diversion is minimal an additional WCH specific structure was not warranted. It is also noted that the desire line is Fell Lane which is where the WCH enhancements have been focused. Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
149	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Connectivity/ Cultural Heritage	Proposed PRoW is useful in connecting users to heritage sites and community facilities.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
174	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Connectivity/ Alternative Option	Suggestion for an alternative option for connection would be to continue the route from the local road staying to the north of the A66 and continuing onward to Cafe Sixty Six.	Upgrading of WCH facilities on existing/historic sections of dualling is not included within the project extents however the opportunity is noted. Whilst this link remains out of scope for the Project, the option of providing a route on the north side of the A66 to connect Coupland to Cafe Sixty Six is part of our ongoing considerations and is subject to a separate Designated Funding application.	No
67	WCH018			Project-level - Connectivity/ WCH	Support the connectivity between walking, cycling and horse-riding paths.	National Highways thanks you for your comments supporting the WCH provision.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
197	WCH041			Project-level - Consultation feedback/ Lack of Information	Lack of reply and discussion to their statutory consultation feedback	Responses to the statutory consultation carried out in the autumn are contained within this Consultation Report submitted with the DCO application. A summary consultation report was published in March 2022 which summarised our approach to the statutory consultation, the feedback received and outlined the key themes from this consultation. In addition, the public liaison officers allocated to each section of the route have been in detailed discussions with landowners around the impacts on their properties.	No
147	WCH040			Project-level - Cost/ Active Travel	Active travel provision can be delivered at a lower cost as the width of provision reduces with speeds and volumes of traffic.	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for (approximately) 3m wide shared use WCH infrastructure where shown in the design. They are primarily for walking and cycling only other than the section of new east-west bridleway where in scheme 9. The (approximately) 3m width is proposed due to the low user flows expected on the route, and is shared use to minimise impact on adjacent land. Detailed information on classification of facilities can be found in the Rights of Way and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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> <p>Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. 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>	
304	WCH049			M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank - Crossing Facilities/ Compliance with LTN 1/20	<p>Alternative crossing points on the M6 are available using the B5288 and B5320 as shown in figure 3. The on-road environment on both these roads are currently not compliant with LTN 1/20 guidance and therefore either new protected space for active travel users will need to be created or motorised</p>	<p>The primary objective of the Project at M6 Junction is to increase capacity for the benefit of both the strategic and local road network, and to do so within the constraints of the sites. The project does include safe routes across both junctions for both walkers and cyclists which include</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					traffic using these roads need to be displaced on to higher category roads.	signalised crossing points. All of the proposals are subject to the full Road Safety Audit process through the current and subsequent stages of development. The Local Authorities aspirations for active travel routes out with the Project scope are noted (including potential upgraded WCH crossings of the M6 at the B5288 and B5320) however delivery of this wider plan remains a matter for the local authority	
163	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Crossing Facilities	Concern about lack of crossing facilities at the proposed de-trunked route near Kirkby Thore.	The final detail of all WCH provision (including crossing points) will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. National Highways confirm that we will look at 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..	No
132	WCH037			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing	Concern that new PRoW do not provide sufficient crossing points	One of the key objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Facilities/ PRow	within close distances of each other.	<p>cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. The Project is providing a significant enhancement in both connectivity and safety of the WCH routes between the M6 and the A1(M) Scotch Corner, and is adding a significant number of safe grade separated crossings, in the case of Rokeby, this directs users to a grade separated junction immediately west of Rokeby, from which point there are options for users to continue west along new cycle track toward Cross Lanes & Barnard Castle, or to travel to Barnard Castle via Rokeby Park</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>	
131	WCH037			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing	Concern that the new PRow are limited in providing safe crossing points.	All proposed or reconnected PRow are connected to safe grade-separated crossing points.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Facilities/ Safety		<p>This may be at a new grade-separated junction, an accommodation underpass or overbridge, or designated WCH underpass or bridge. The design of new PRow and re-connection of existing PRow has considered minimising diversion lengths and distance to the nearest safe grade separated crossing point.</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>	
54	WCH014			project-level - Crossing Facilities/ Oppose	Opposition to reduced or changed crossing points.	<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. The design of new PRow and re-connection of existing PRow has</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						considered minimising diversion lengths and distance to the nearest safe grade separated crossing point.	
13	WCH003			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing Facilities/ Safety	Previous A66 dualling schemes provided no safe north/south crossing points	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. The scope of the current Project does not extend to retrospective improvements to historic dualling.	No
184	WCH040			Project-level - Crossing Facilities/ Request for Further Information	Request for the proposals for crossing types for non-motorised users is required, especially where the route uses the de-trunked A66 and crosses this road on numerous occasions.	The final detail of all WCH provision (including crossing points) will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. National Highways confirm that we will look at 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						part of the wider de-trunking processes..	
303	WCH049			M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank - Crossing Facilities/ Design	Suggestion about the M6 / A66 interchange that the junction should be designed as grade-separated crossing facilities for active travel, however it is noted this is high cost.	The primary objective of the Project at this junctions is to increase capacity for the benefit of both the strategic and local road network, and to do so within the constraints of the sites. The project does include safe routes across both junctions for both walkers and cyclists which include signalised crossing points. The facilities will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process. At the M6, the Project has taken on board recommendations within the Penrith Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) albeit within the bounds of what can be achieved within the constraints of the sites. National Highways are unable to deliver full grade separation of WCH facilities within the project constraints.	No
171	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Crossing Facilities/ Safety	Suggestion to provide a safe crossing of the scheme near Walk Mill Barn to join the two footpaths (FP 372021 and FP 372031).	A crossing point is to be provided at the new grade-separated junction at Warcop which will allow WCH users to safely cross the A66.	No
17	WCH003			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing	The route from Greta Bridge to the Thorpe Farm needs to be	Within the limits of the Project, the proposed design ensures all existing walking and cycling routes	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Facilities/ Safety	maintained to provide a safe walking and cycling crossing point	<p>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>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). The eastern end of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby PRow ties into the existing route which continues to Thorpe Farm.</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>	
16	WCH003			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing Facilities/ WCH	Sustrans are planning an extension to the National Cycling Route from Richmond to Barnard Castle and the Crossing point	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					(Thorpe Farm underpass) is essential to safety	<p>safe route off the A66 to promote active travel.</p> <p>Upgrading of WCH facilities on existing/historic sections of dualling is not included within the project extents however the eastern end of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby PRoW ties into the existing route which continues to Thorpe Farm.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
18	WCH003			Project-level - Crossing Facilities/ Safety	The current crossing point at Smallways is regarded as unsafe for the average cyclist.	<p>One of the principle aims of the Project is to remove locations where pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders and farm vehicles cross the existing A66 using at-grade uncontrolled crossings. These improvements are however only within the defined extents of the Project, of which the Smallways junction sits outside of as it is on an existing dualled section of the A66.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>It is acknowledged that the A66 Project will attract more traffic to the route however the speed of traffic on the existing dualled sections is not expected to increase. The east-west walking and cycling enhancements (as summarised in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals Application Document 2.4) give details of how the project ties into existing WCH infrastructure. Beyond the eastern extents of the Cross lanes to Rokeby scheme, the intention is for walkers and cyclists to use the Thorpe Farm underpass to cross the A66 rather than the Smallways junction. This aligns with Sustran's aspiration to utilise this underpass as part of their Richmond to Barnard Castle route</p> <p>The current design has been through a road safety audit which did not flag safety concerns relating to Smallways junction. National Highways Operations team that operates this section of the network have also been consulted throughout the preliminary design development and again no existing or</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						anticipated safety issues with this junction have been raised.	
14	WCH003			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing Facilities/ Safety	The only safe walking point for walkers and cyclists between Rokeby and East Layton is the farm tunnel at Thorpe Farm.	<p>One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel.</p> <p>Upgrading of WCH facilities on existing/historic sections of dualling is not included within the project extents however the eastern end of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby PRow ties into the existing route which continues to Thorpe Farm.</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>	No
45	WCH009			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Crossing Facilities/ Support	Support for the current section of surface path between Greta Bridge and routes to the east with the C165 into Barnard Castle which allow users to cross over the A66.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
170	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Crossing Facilities/ Request for Further Information	Require further confirmation as to whether crossing facilities have been provided at Wildboar Hill to Wheat Sheaf Farm, so suggested crossing facility between FP 372014 and connection to the new walking/cycling route.	An underpass is proposed in this location to allow footpath 372014 to cross under the A66. The route will remain along its existing alignment, no diversion is required.	No
4	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ WCH	An individual cycle path with a speed limit of 30km/h is more attractive to cyclists than a slower speed shared use path.	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for an (approximately) 3m wide WCH route where shown in the design. The route is primarily for walking and cycling only other than the new section of bridleway where shown. Due to the low anticipate flows, shared use is proposed to open the route up to wider users. The 30km/h cycle path point is noted however the horizontal and vertical alignment required to achieve that standard would require significantly more land (and associated environmental mitigation land), something which the Project is aiming to minimise and is in this case is not deemed reasonable due to the flows expected on the route.	No
234	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby -	Access road for multi-purpose carriageway uses up too much agricultural land.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Design/ Land Take		<p>project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access (PMA) and PRow to minimise the land required for both the additional asset as well as for any required environmental mitigation. It is acknowledged that this requires agricultural land to deliver but the benefits to the wider community through active travel opportunities are deemed to outweigh this.</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>	
7	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ LTN 1/20	LTN1/20 lays out criteria for shared paths to be appropriate Shared use routes away from such [busy] streets may be appropriate in locations such as canal towpaths, paths through	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for an (approximately) 3m wide WCH route where shown in the design. LTN 1/20 is not deemed applicable in the most	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					housing estates, parks and other green spaces, including in cities	part due to the rural nature of the project and the need to balance WCH enhancements and private access arrangements.	
8	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ Cultural Heritage	An LTN1/20 is not suitable along the old Roman Road	<p>LTN 1/20 is not deemed applicable in the most part due to the rural nature of the project and the need to balance WCH enhancements and private access arrangements. National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for an (approximately) 3m wide shared-use track where shown in the design. The track is primarily for walking and cycling only other than the discrete sections of bridleway where shown. The (approximately) 3m width is proposed due to the low user flows expected on the route, and is shared-use to minimise impact on adjacent land. The use of this would be restricted to the navigation of the new junction at Long Marton where the old Roman Road is severed by the design, and would not extend beyond this limit in order to minimise the impact of the Project on this route.</p> <p>We have engaged with all affected County Councils throughout the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						development of the design, as well as other stakeholder including Walking, Cycling & Horse-riding groups.	
237	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Security	Carriageway must be fenced off from remaining agricultural land to avoid trespass	<p>Appropriate boundary treatments will be installed at the interface of the highway and private land. The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11)</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p>	No
87	WCH024			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Additional PRoW	Concern about additional PRoW being created	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. National Highways has made the decision to combine	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>certain private means of access (PMA) and PRoW to minimise the land required for both the additional asset as well as for any required environmental mitigation. It is acknowledged that this requires agricultural land to deliver as well as introducing some new PRoW. The benefits to the wider community through active travel opportunities are deemed to justify the interventions.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
231	WCH042			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Public Access	Concern about conflict in users between the public and the private landowners and National Highways,	The default ownership, maintenance and liabilities associated with all-purpose tracks (shared PMA and PRoW) will be with either National Highways or the local highway authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						assets and to take over any liabilities. The shared access arrangement is not dissimilar to other public rights of way over agricultural land where agricultural vehicles are permitted and which make use of such arrangements.	
100	WCH027			Bowes - Design/ Security	Concern about whether the Blacklodge Farm underpass or its immediate approaches will be able to be fenced off considering the proposed footpath diversion through the underpass.	The diversion route of Bowes Footpath 6 has been considered against the alternative suggested by the landowner as raised during previous discussions, along with an option for a dedicated footbridge. It is considered that diverting the footpath via their existing underpass is the best solution; as a dedicated footbridge would be very costly, require further land take and have a visual impact on the local setting. The alternative to divert walkers west to the Bowes Junction was discounted due to the diversion length. Therefore, we consider the existing crossing of the underpass to be an acceptable solution, given its proximity to the existing at grade crossing location and the cost savings against a dedicated footbridge; it is also believed that the underpass is currently used by walkers rather than crossing the A66.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>During detailed design consultation will continue to confirm a fencing and gate design that is suitable for all parties and to ensure the impact on the movement of livestock is minimal.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p>	
3	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ LTN 1/20	Concern that path will not be wide enough to comply with LTN1/20 and CD 195.	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for an (approximately) 3m wide shared-use track where shown in the design. The track is primarily for walking and cycling only other than the discrete sections of bridleway where shown. The (approximately) 3m width is proposed due to the low user flows expected on the route and is shared-use to minimise impact on adjacent land. LTN 1/20	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						is not deemed applicable in the most part due to the rural nature of the project and the need to balance WCH enhancements and private access arrangements	
44	WCH009			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ WCH	Concern that rerouted right of way will become a bridleway (between Greta Bridge and new Rokeby junction)	The concern is noted however, this PRoW is to be a cycle track (walkers permitted to use it but horses prohibited). Detailed information on proposals including classification of individual routes can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
32	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Security/ Animal Safety	Concern that the new track would allow neighbouring landowners a throughfare from one side of the A66 to the other and access to the farmer's land and livestock.	The proposed shared private means of access and will be fenced along both sides with gates to be provide secure access to only those who require access. The proposed access arrangement is in place to provide both farms with direct access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66. One of the project objectives is to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>minimise direct accesses to/from the A66 on safety grounds, as well as there being a need to minimise the number of new structures crossing the A66. The access to the two farms therefore needs to be combined to avoid multiple accesses and multiple structures in close proximity (reducing road user safety and increasing project cost and construction complexity).</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals including classification of individual routes 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>	
153	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ LTN 1/20	Crossing for the local access road at Lane End and the B6262/Moor Lane should comply with LTN1/20 guidance on type of control necessary to allow the route to be useable by all users.	Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide the WCH facilities shown in the design which will be a significant enhancement of the current status in terms of connectivity and safety. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with relevant standards current at the time (including LTN 1/20 where appropriate), the finer details of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. National Highways confirm that we will look at all crossing points on a case-by-case basis and will continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development.</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>	
6	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ WCH	Design and layout of the shared use path is not attractive to road cyclists.	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for a (approximately) 3m wide WCH route where shown in the design. The route is primarily for walking and cycling only other than the new section of bridleway where shown. Due to the low anticipate flows, shared use is proposed to open the route up to wider users. A higher standard cycle only route is not deemed to be justified due to the expected low flows. The horizontal and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						vertical alignment required to achieve that standard would require significantly more land (and associated environmental mitigation land), something which the Project is aiming to minimise.	
27	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Unsuitable use	Due to the proposed track being 3m in diameter It will be attractive to road users even though it is not for their use.	A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	No
161	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Accessibility	Ensure that the new PRoW on sheet 7 is designated as a bridleway so no reduction in accessibility is created.	All existing PRoW will be reconnected. Therefore if the existing PRoW is a bridleway, it will be reconnected as such.	No
40	WCH008			Project-level - Design/ Support	If perceived error is a mistake in consultation materials, British Horse Society provides support for the new plans and provisions.	The key on the plans was amended. Further, additional engagement has been carried out with the BHS to explain the maps/key subsequent to the targeted consultation being issued.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
165	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Alternative Route	It would be preferable for the provision to stay on the northern side of the road rather than switching sides several times.	The proposed shared path is proposed in the verge of the de-trunked A66. The path needs appropriate width. This is not always achievable on one side of the road. Appropriate crossing facilities will be provided should the proposed shared path need to cross over the de-trunked A66.	No
154	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Lack of Information	Lack of information provided for proposed PRoW between Winderwath Farm and Temple Sowerby.	<p>Upgrading of WCH facilities on existing/historic sections of dualling (including between Winderwath and Temple Sowerby) is not included within the project extents however the opportunity is noted. Any infrastructure along this route i.e. B6412 and through Temple Sowerby is not within the scope of the Project and is within Cumbria County Councils (CCC) jurisdiction. CCC have a vision for improving cycling infrastructure in this area in the future.</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 the in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
102	WCH028			Bowes - Design/ Lack of Information	Location of proposed public right of way (east of High Broats Farm) is not clear and assumptions made that this PRoW is adjacent to the client's boundary, not within.	<p>The proposed PRoW is to be a footway in this area and as such is wholly within highway land and will be segregated from the private land by a fence or other suitable boundary treatment.</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>	No
98	WCH027			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Safety	New public right of way proposed provides potential interactions with dog walkers causing issues with livestock	Much of this route is a footway and therefore on highway land and fenced off. Some crossing of private land will be required to reconnect the severed foot path but the intension also to fence this off to avoid issues with dog/livestock conflicts. Detailed information on private and public access proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Final form and finishes of fences, gates and track surfacing will be undertaken during detailed design and will include further engagement with affected landowners.</p>	
99	WCH027			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Safety	New public right of way proposed provides potential interactions with dog walkers causing issues with livestock	<p>Much of this route is a footway and therefore on highway land and fenced off. Some crossing of private land will be required to reconnect the severed foot path but the intension also to fence this off to avoid issues with dog/livestock conflicts. Detailed information on private and public access 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>Final form and finishes of fences, gates and track surfacing will be undertaken during detailed design and will include further engagement with affected landowners.</p>	No
42	WCH009			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/	Objects to re-routing the existing surfaced path through the Greta	The objection to the current proposal is acknowledged. The design team have investigated an	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Alternative Route	Bridge entrance to Rokeby Grove and Tack Room Cottage.	alternative route to the north of these properties, but it was discounted due to the engineering solution required to overcome the level difference and the loss of a significant number of mature trees that would result.	
41	WCH009			Project-level - Design/ Oppose	Objects to the proposals, particularly in light of these WCH proposals	The general objection is acknowledged. Responses to specific points in feedback comments are addressed separately in other 'WCH009' items elsewhere in this Annex P.	No
230	WCH042			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Public Access	Oppose the proposals in their current form if public access must be provided	General opposition to public access to private land is acknowledged. Responses to specific points are made separately in other 'WCH042' items elsewhere in this Annex P.	No
160	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Request for Further Information	Request for clarity on new footway on the realigned Long Marton Road and whether it will be connected to the bridleway BW341001 running along the Roman Road as this is needed for connectivity of network.	The footway will be reinstated along Long Marton Road and will be connected into the existing bridleway along the alignment of the Old Roman Road.	No
152	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/	Request for further information about the crossing for the local access road at Lane End and the B6262/Moor Lane.	This section of track will be designed to National Highways standards but will also take cognisance of LTN 1/20, Cycle	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Request for Further Information		infrastructure design. The exact layout of this section will be established at detailed design.	
106	WCH029			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design/ Security/ Safety	Request for the public right of way to be fenced away from livestock to reduce risk of conflicts with dogs.	<p>The intension is to fence off the new footpath on the field side with the footpath located between that fence and the highway fence.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p> <p>Detailed information on private and public access 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>	No
108	WCH030			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Land Take	Request that proposed PRow is not implemented on client's land (Street Side Farm) noting there is	One of the principle aims of the Project, within its defined extents, is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers, cyclists	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					no route there in current situation so question need for it.	and horse riders. The section of the route highlighted in this feedback is to be provided to avoid a gap over this section between Rokeby and Cross Lanes from which point the route continues west. With this improved connectivity in place, the demand for the route is expected to increase. National Highways are committed to working with impacted landowners & other stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into the detailed design stage. This process will be carried out by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
120	WCH033			Bowes Bypass - Design/ Access	Request that the width of Clint Lane Bridge be increased in size to accommodate larger modern machinery.	Clint Lane bridge will be designed to cater for the appropriate size of modern agricultural vehicle as well as other uses such as the PRoW which crosses the bridge.	No
293	WCH049			Project-level - Design/ Active Travel	Suggested separation between carriageway and active travel route where adjacent to the old de-trunked A66.	Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide an (approximately) 3m wide shared cycleway along the de-trunked sections of the old A66 where shown in the design, these	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						include segregation from the old A66 carriageway. National Highways confirm that we will look at 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..	
101	WCH027			Bowes - Design/ Alternative Route	Suggestion for public right of way to be taken in a westerly direction along the joint access path to the Bowes junction and thereafter by public footpaths reconnect with the original footpath in Bowes to the immediate east of Bowes Hall	The diversion route of Bowes Footpath 6 has been considered against the alternative suggested by the landowner as raised during previous discussions, along with an option for a dedicated footbridge. It is considered that diverting the footpath via their existing underpass is the best solution; as a dedicated footbridge would be very costly, require further land take and have a visual impact on the local setting. The alternative to divert walkers west to the Bowes Junction was discounted due to the diversion length. Therefore, we consider the existing crossing of the underpass to be an acceptable solution, given its proximity to the existing at grade crossing location and the cost savings against a dedicated footbridge; it is also believed that	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the underpass is currently used by walkers rather than crossing the A66.</p> <p>Engagement with affected landowners will continue at the next stage of design development. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project.</p>	
226	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Suggestion	Suggestion that if there were to be a single multi use access track (contrary to the points made above) then it should follow the current provision rather than extending into additional land.	<p>One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. Some of this route, including this section on the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme, needs to be via new additional infrastructure which doesn't exist currently.</p> <p>National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access and PRow. To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						as and for any required environmental mitigation. Detailed information on private and public access 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).	
52	WCH012			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Suggestion	Suggestion that it would make more sense for the public right of way to run tight alongside the A66 rather than the middle of served and retained land (local to Moor Beck).	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. These additional PRow form part of these enhancements. National Highways acknowledge your comments regarding the location of the proposed shared cycleway in the vicinity of not being tight to the A66. The shared cycleway is to be inside the highway boundary and will be segregated from private land with a suitable boundary treatment. The alignment of cycleway needs to deviate away from the new A66 around Moor Beck and Cringle Beck due to the topography of the surrounding land and the fact the A66 is on a structures over the watercourses, whereas the shared	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						cycleway is to follow the existing ground levels.	
235	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Land Take	Suggestion that the access road to the south should be tight to the boundary of the A66 to avoid land unworkable.	National Highways thank you for your comments in relation to the positioning of the access road. The road has been designed to take account of the land form in the area and the need to ensure that there is a level difference to prevent any dazzle between vehicles on the access road and the new A66.	No
126	WCH035			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Safety	Suggestion that users can walk along the A66 on the North side and cross at the proposed junctions as this would be safer for both pedestrians and livestock	The new shared cycleway (for cyclists and pedestrians) is located in the southern verge of the de-trunked A66. the footway on the south of the existing A66 is on the highway side and will therefore be fenced off from the PMA track also removes the safety concerns regarding interaction with livestock. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
224	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Suggestion	Suggestion that walking, cycling track would only need to be 2m wide max	Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide a (approximately) 3m wide shared-use walking and cycling track. The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project.	No
241	WCH044			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Cost	Suggestion to continue the public access road along the North side of the A66 to connect into existing public footpaths on Kittling Common. This route is shorter and therefore more cost efficient for the A66 Project.	The design has been revised with the public access (via a combination of shared cycleway and combined shared cycleway and Private Means of Access) now located on the north side of the A66 and connecting into Kittling Common. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4)	No
129	WCH037			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Support	Support east-west proposed PRow between Cross Lanes and Greta Bridge	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
9	WCH002			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design/ Support	Supports the proposed additional walking, cycling and horse-riding provision alongside the de-trunked A66 on the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor.	National Highways appreciated the support for the proposed WCH infrastructure.	No
35	WCH008			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design/ User Separation	The changes proposed appear to have taken into account the concerns raised by providing separation of users from the MPV on the local access road.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
244	WCH044			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Animal Safety	The current design to the East of the 'attached plan' shows the proposed public access road over the top of our clients Livestock Handling Pens, these must be replaced as part of the accommodation works to full specification.	Where any of our proposed works have an affect on landowners then our specialist lands team together with the District Valuer will discuss these with the landowner and or their agent to agree any required accommodation works and or compensation payments. These discussions have already started and will continue as the Project progresses.	No
242	WCH044			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Animal Safety	The proposed access track to the South of the A66 must be removed from client's land due to the detrimental impacts to the current extensive free range egg laying unit.	The concern is noted, however the Project is not changing access arrangements into the egg laying facility. The east-west private means of access/PRoW is to be located on the north side of the A66 running east from Cafe Sixty Six. An underpass is to be constructed to provide access to/from the A66 eastbound carriageway for Far Bank End and	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>New Hall Farms however these accesses are only to reconnect existing stopped up accesses and do not provide new links to the egg laying facility. Any new private means of access will be fenced on both sides. Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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>	
37	WCH008			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design/ Safety	The proposed PRow arrangements near Moor Lane are improved and safer for horse riders.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
26	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Design/ Public Access	The proposed track by Low Bank End Farm will have unintended consequences for public vehicular access.	The proposed private means of access arrangement is in place to provide both farms with direct access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66. One of the project objectives is to minimise direct accesses to/from the A66 on safety grounds, as well as there being a need to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>minimise the number of new structures crossing the A66. The access to the two farms therefore needs to be combined to avoid multiple accesses and multiple structures in close proximity (reducing road user safety and increasing project cost and construction complexity).</p> <p>Final boundary treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development to deter public use of the private access.</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>	
239	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Design/ Farm Access	The specification of the overpass must be large enough to facilitate access for large farm machinery.	National Highways note your comments with regard to the provision of an overpass on your client's land. The overbridge will be designed to applicable design standards current at the time of design and will be suitable for use by standard agricultural machinery.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
2	WCH001			Project-level - Design/ Lack of Information	Width of path not made clear in the materials	National Highways have made an allowance within the DCO order limits for a (approximately) 3m wide shared-use track where shown in the design. The track is primarily for walking and cycling only other than the discrete sections of bridleway where shown. The (approximately) 3m width is proposed due to the low user flows expected on the route, and is shared-use to minimise impact on adjacent land.	No
46	WCH009			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Route Demand	Particular concerns arise from the demand generated from the Thorpe Farm Caravan Park, visitors to which have no other option but to use this section of path (from Greta Bridge) to access Barnard Castle either by foot or via the bus stop	One of the key objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. The Project is providing a significant enhancement in both connectivity and safety of the WCH routes between the M6 and the A1(M) Scotch Corner, and is adding a significant number of safe grade separated crossings, in the case of Rokeby, this directs users to a grade separated junction immediately west of Rokeby, from which point there are options for users to continue west along new cycle track toward Cross Lanes & Barnard Castle, or	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>to travel to Barnard Castle via Rokeby Park</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> <p>.</p>	
151	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Design/ Suggestion	Users will find the indirect proposed PRow more pleasant as it is located away from A66 traffic.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
187	WCH040			M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank - Design/ LTN 1/20	Suggested grade separated facility at M6 J40 and through Kemplay Bank roundabouts to align with LTN 1/20 guidance for facilities.	The primary objective of the Project at these two junctions is to increase capacity for the benefit of both the strategic and local road network, and to do so within the constraints of the sites. The project does include safe routes across both junctions for both walkers and cyclists which include signalised crossing points. The facilities will all be subject to the Road Safety Audit process. The Project has taken on board recommendations within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Penrith Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) albeit within the bounds of what can be achieved within the constraints of the sites. National Highways are unable to deliver full grade separation of WCH facilities within the project constraints.	

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to ‘Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
291	WCH049			Project-level - Design/ Traffic	Provide frequent junctions on to the Major Road Network and Strategic Road Network to facilitate the displacement of traffic from cities, towns and villages that allow these communities to develop active travel cultures. Junction layout should allow free-flow for PRow traffic movements and slower speed limits imposed to discourage through-traffic B6412.	Junctions, including associated structures under and over the new A66, are provided at regular intervals to enable safe crossing of the dual carriageway for both motorised and non-motorised users. Where possible we have ensured that junctions serve multiple purposes and collect PRow together, to minimise the number of new structures. This however needs to be balanced with keeping lengths of diverted local roads and PRow to a minimum also to ensure the Project does not introduce excessive diversions. The junction positions have been established based on a range of considerations including engineering, environmental, traffic modelling and extensive engagement with affected stakeholders (including WCH focus groups). The B6412 sits outside of the scheme limits and as such any consideration of reduction in speed limits on that road would be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>a matter for the local highway authority.</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> <p>.</p>	
36	WCH008			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design / Connectivity	Concern that there is no link between east Layton Moor Bridleway east to Carkin Moor Farm Bridleway, but instead the East Layton Moor Bridleway is diverted west to Moor Lane forcing users to use Moor Lane.	<p>Any inclusion of a link between east Layton Moor Bridleway east to Carkin Moor Farm Bridleway could result in further incursion into Carkin Moor scheduled ancient monument which the design sought to avoid/limit.</p> <p>A segregated bridleway has however been provided adjacent to Moor Lane and beneath the Mains Gill junction, allowing horse-riders to safely access Carkin Moor Farm bridleway from East Layton Moor bridleway</p>	No
307	WCH051			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design of	Concern about design of underpass to the south of Carkin Moor Farm for the use of horses.	The final cross-sectional details of the underpass will be finalised at detailed design and will be in line with relevant standard current at	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				underpass/ Access	Requests dimensions of this underpass to be confirmed.	the time of design (which will cater for horses and riders).	
309	WCH051			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design of underpass/ Route type	Concern the design of underpass to the south of Carkin Moor Farm resembles a road rather than a bridleway.	Underpasses have been positioned to serve multiple purposes to minimise the number of new structures the Project introduces; therefore, they are generally larger than they would be if they were only serving a bridleway. Details of surface finishes of the underpass will be finalised at detailed design and will be in line with relevant standard current at the time of design. The underpass will include suitable bridleway facilities.	No
310	WCH051			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Design of underpass/ Security	Concern the design of underpass to the south of Carkin Moor Farm will create a security issue and requests locked gates suitable for horse access to prevent vehicles using this route.	A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	No
144	WCH040			Project-level - Detail of	Lack of detail provided for PRoW provision in terms of widths,	The detailed design of the ProW will be bound by the principles set	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				provision/consultation	surfaces, design of crossing, accessibility.	<p>out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11) which are to be secured through the DCO and need to be complied with during subsequent stages of design development.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p>	
76	WCH020			Appleby to Brough - Disruption/ Construction	Construction of proposed PRow will cause disruption and impact upon residents' enjoyment of existing PRow facilities	ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of impacts and effects on PRows and users during construction of the Project and assumes that all permanently impacted PRows would have appropriate diversion routes in place during the works if closures were required. The assessment is compliant with DMRB LA112 and engagement has been with key	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 that will be further developed and implemented at construction stage.</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>	
167	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - East	Concern that crossing at Coupland is not shown as a WCH route. Without this crossing there is a severance of the east-west route and threatens the viability of the intention of this strategic provision.	<p>One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. These additional PRow form part of these enhancements the Project is to include</p> <p>The crossing of the A66 at Coupland is outside of the western limits of the Appleby to Brough scheme, however 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>existing Farm underpass to the east of Coupland Beck which provides safe crossing of the A66. Any improvements to WCH infrastructure outside of the Project is a matter for the Local Authority.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
186	WCH040			Project-level - East	Concern that there is a gap in connectivity at Coupland for east-west connectivity.	Whist this link remains out of scope for the 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. If that application were to be successful it would be delivered separately to the Project for which development consent is sought.	No
305	WCH050			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor	The primary concerns of our client are linked to the design criterion of	Detailed information on private and public access proposals can	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				- Gateway reinstatement/Maintenance	both the road, the fencing at Greystones field, and the liability for maintenance at a later date. Our only concern is that a small additional piece has been removed from the southwest corner of Greystones field to improve access over the new bridge to Collier Lane, this is acceptable as far as our client is concerned so long as the gateway is reinstated at the corner of the field.	<p>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>The detailed design of the ProW will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11) which are to be secured through the DCO and need to be complied with during subsequent stages of design development.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p> <p>The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/ProW will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	
80	WCH022			Appleby to Brough - General environment comments WCH/landscape	The respondents view is that it would become far less burdensome and obstructive (to the landscape) if the road went to the north of the current road and therefore support the new dual carriageway going north of the current A66 for the entire length of the Appleby-Brough section	The call for an alternative route for the A66 section is not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. National Highways consulted on the route choice as part of the Statutory Consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of this Consultation Report. 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. The proposed route has an incursion into the AONB for the construction of a new local road to the north of the old A66 and the design considers the impact on stakeholders and landowners. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						in arriving at the final solution taken forward to DCO.	
158	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby – Horse-riding	Clarity required on whether the new PRoW will be suitable for horse-riders to use and whether it is an official diversion of existing bridleway (BW 336018).	<p>Bridleway 336018 is severed by the proposed design of the A66. A bridge is proposed to redirect the route. The Bridleway diversion is around 250m.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	No
150	WCH040			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Impact on heritage site/ Mitigation	Concern about proposed PRoW impacting on Brougham Roman Fort Scheduled Monument and request for mitigation set out within the Environmental Statement.	<p>Chapter 8 of the ES (Application Document 3.2) sets out the details of the cultural heritage assessment.</p> <p>The Brougham Roman Fort Scheduled Monument is partially located within the Order Limits. The resource is divided into three parts consisting of the area of the Roman fort and medieval castle, the buried remains of the vicus in one field to the south of the fort and castle, and the buried remains of the vicus in two fields to the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>south-east of the fort and castle; the northern edge of these two fields are located within the Order Limits. Proposed works in the area include the creation of a hardstanding cycle path. The ES identifies that any below ground works will result in the loss of associated physical evidence in the area within the Order Limits and a moderate adverse impact to the overall Scheduled Monument resulting in a large adverse effect, resulting in a moderate adverse effect following essential mitigation. Mitigation of direct impacts on archaeological remains takes the form of 'preservation by record', that is, the investigation of archaeological remains prior to construction, and the analysis of artefacts and publication of results following the construction of the project. The type and location of mitigation required has been detailed within the Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy with the EMP (Application Document 2.7) (including an Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)).</p>	
58	WCH016			Appleby to Brough -	Proposed new road will be close to private property negatively	The call for an alternative route for the A66 section is not associated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Community impact WCH	impacting on quality of life for residents. Respondent suggesting A66 and associated WCH route should be further north.	with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. National Highways consulted on the route choice as part of the Statutory Consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of this Consultation Report. 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. The proposed route has an incursion into the AONB for the construction of a new local road to the north of the old A66 and the design considers the impact on stakeholders and landowners. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out in arriving at the final solution taken forward to DCO. We are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the old A66.	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
19	WCH003			Project-level - Increase in traffic/ Safety	Regarding cycle crossing at Smallways – it is anticipated that once the A66 is dualled traffic levels will be higher, and speed faster, reducing gaps between traffic to cross, making existing crossing points even more dangerous.	<p>One of the principle aims of the Project is to remove locations where pedestrians, cyclists, horse-riders and farm vehicles cross the existing A66 using at-grade uncontrolled crossings. These improvements are however only within the defined extents of the Project, of which the Smallways junction sits outside of as it is on an existing dualled section of the A66.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the A66 Project will attract more traffic to the route however the speed of traffic on the existing dualled sections is not expected to increase. The east-west walking and cycling enhancements (as summarised in the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals Application Document 2.4) give details of how the project ties into existing WCH infrastructure. Beyond the eastern extents of the Cross lanes to Rokeby scheme, the intention is for walkers and cyclists to use the Thorpe Farm underpass to cross the A66 rather than the Smallways junction. This aligns with Sustran's aspiration to utilise this underpass</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>as part of their Richmond to Barnard Castle route</p> <p>The current design has been through a road safety audit which did not flag safety concerns relating to Smallways junction. National Highways Operations team that operates this section of the network have also been consulted throughout the preliminary design development and again no existing or anticipated safety issues with this junction have been raised.</p>	
195	WCH040			Project-level - Increase in traffic	Suggestion that the de-trunked sections should be brought up to current standards taking into account the predicted levels of traffic – specific comment on Kirkby Thore to Appleby section.	National Highways confirm that we will look at 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. This will include reviewing traffic volumes however it is noted that traffic volumes on the de-trunked sections will be significantly less than is the case on the existing A66, so final design standards agreed with the local authorities will need to be commensurate with the new reduced traffic volumes.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
53	WCH013			Project-level - Information and materials/ Utilities	Objection to proposal until further detail is available for the engineers at Northern Powergrid. Further detail is needed to ensure Northern Powergrid's statutory duty is not compromised and that all costs associated with the Project are met	National Highways is engaging with the relevant statutory undertaker with a view to reaching agreement on terms that would appropriately protect/divert their apparatus and ensure continuity of supply.	No
121	WCH033			Bowes Bypass - Infrastructure/ Utilities	Request that private water supply always remains uninterrupted and is replaced when the new Clint Lane bridge is installed.	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). The ES identifies that cuttings in the area have the potential to reduce baseflow to springs, resulting in a reduction in spring flow rates or alteration of flow paths. Due to uncertainty in the exact location and nature of the springs, there is the potential for a significant impact without appropriate mitigation measures. Surveying of areas at risk in the area prior to commencement of construction will assist in the identification of spring locations and enable a further assessment of risk to be undertaken. If required following further	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						assessment, appropriate mitigation and/or compensation measures (e.g., lining of cuttings or replacement mains supply etc) will need to be implemented to ensure continued supply, 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.	
308	WCH051			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Lack of meeting Accommodation works	Concern that no meeting was held to discuss the dimensions of underpass at Carkin Moor Farm.	The final cross-sectional details of the underpass will be finalised at detailed design and will be in line with relevant standard current at the time of design while also taking into account any specific requirements of adjacent landowners.	No
166	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Lack of use/ PRow	Concern that users will use the local road via Crackenthorpe Hall instead of the proposed PRow in this area	The scope and objective of the Project is to provide a safe alternative path for walking and cycling and in this area, which is primarily in the verge along the de-trunked A66. It is acknowledged that some users may decide to opt for an alternative route.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
97	WCH026			Project-level - Consultation/ Lack of wider engagement	Respondent express concern about lack of wider engagement with walking and cycling groups and the tourism and leisure industry on the new proposals for walking, cycling and horse-riding.	As the proposed design changes relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. In accordance with government guidance (Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process, DCLG, March 2015). Paragraph 76 of this Guidance states that "In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the preapplication consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, targeted consultation." In addition, a statutory consultation was not required as there were no new land interests affected by the WCH design proposals. A slightly shorter time period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation. National Highways have engaged with walking, cycling and horse-riding groups throughout preliminary design and consultation and engagement on the Project, particularly through	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the walking, cycling and horse-riding focus group, which includes invited representatives from Sustrans, Cycling UK, the British Horse Society and local and regional walking, cycling and horse-riding organisations along the route. This group has met every 2-3 months during 2021 and 2022 to receive updates on the project and for the Project team to obtain feedback on the design and specific aspects of the project relating to WCH proposals. The project has also engaged regional tourism bodies and the local authorities throughout this process.</p> <p>From a WCH perspective, the scope of the Project has expanded significantly since Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021 and has into account both feedback from bodies mentioned above both from the focus group process and the formal Consultation feedback. The main enhancement is the additional east-west WCH connectivity provided across the Project.</p> <p>Summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
78	WCH021 WCH017			Appleby to Brough - Landscape and visual effects	Proposed walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions negatively impacts the landscape.	Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) details the assessment of visual effects of the scheme. Within this scheme it is identified that there are likely significant adverse effects to the Landscape Character Areas of Intermediate Foothills and Broad Valleys and to users of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity in year one of operation of the Project. However, by year 15 of operation of the Project, it is likely there will only be a significant adverse effect to users of the Warcop Railway Station.	No
55	WCH014			Project-level - Length of Journey/ Crossings	Opposition to walkers having to use longer routes to cross the new carriageway due to reduced crossing points.	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 and this in some cases does require diversions of existing direct ProW	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>via longer routes to a safe grade separated crossing. These diversions have been minimised and whether they would be excessive, additional crossing facilities such as underpasses or overbridges (typically combined with other private means of access function's) have been positioned to minimise the PRow diversions.</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.</p> <p>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>	
66	WCH017			Project-level - Listen to Locals/consultation	Disappointed that there has been no reference to discussions at the consultations about potential changes to bring the access road at the Langrigg junction closer to the dual carriageway or to remove	Changes are not proposed to this access road and the design in this location has no implications for WCH provision, which was the subject of this supplementary consultation. Please refer to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					it altogether, to reduce the impacts on Broomrigg residents.	Annex N of the consultation report where we have responded to issues raised on Langrigg junction at statutory consultation. Refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) for further information on the work carried out to confirm a preferred route in this area.	
217	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Maintenance/ Responsibility	Concerns regarding who is responsible for maintenance of multi-use track (combined cycle track and PMA on Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme)	<p>National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access (PMA) and PRoW (in this case a combined cycle track and PMA). To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/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, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.</p>	No
218	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby -	Difficulty in getting local Highways Authority to undertake any repairs on existing highways	The comment relates to perceived historic performance of the local highway authority which is outside	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Maintenance/Responsibility		of National Highways control. It is however noted that the ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/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, maintain the infrastructure.	
196	WCH040			Project-level - Maintenance/ Request for Further Information	Request for further information to clarify the status of the new segregated WCH routes that run alongside the new road and request for confirmation that National Highways will be responsible for their ongoing maintenance	<p>The status of WCH 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> <p>The default ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared east-west PRoW will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.</p> <p>With regards to proposed new PRoW alongside de-trunked</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						sections of the existing A66, National Highways confirm that we will look at these 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 which will include particulars of maintenance agreements.	
246	WCH044			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Modified design/ PRow	Keep design of PRow as close to field boundaries as possible.	The design has typically kept PRow as close to field boundaries as practicable. Engagement with affected landowners will continue at the next stage of design development. A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project.	No
192	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Modified design/ Alternative Route	Suggestion that the provision planned between Warcop and Brough would be better positioned to the north of the de-trunked A66 to give a more pleasant journey environment	With regard to 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>We 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compromising this purpose when designing schemes which are outside of the designation, but which could lead to adverse effects within them.</p> <p>We are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the old A66.</p>	
301	WCH049			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Modified design/ Traffic	Suggestion to use free-flow design principles (free-flow links on terminal junctions) to maximise traffic capacity and minimise journey times facilitating the concentration of traffic on to the Major Road Network and Strategic Road Network.	<p>The level of performance achieved within the design year with the proposed design shows that spending significantly more public money on introducing free-flow links to the terminal junctions (M6 and A1(M)) would not be economically viable.</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 (Application Document 3.7)..</p>	No
302	WCH049			Project-level - Modified design/ Connectivity	Supports the proposal to create a new route from Brough to Bowes to connect these villages.	<p>National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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>	
122	WCH034			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Modified design/ Alternative Route	Request for the footpath to be moved to follow the hedge line in order to keep pedestrians safely away from construction traffic.	The bridleway highlighted within the response is an existing bridleway which is unaffected by the proposed scheme, it has therefore been retained on its current alignment across the field.	No
89	WCH025			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Modified design/ Alternative Route	Suggestion for underpass to be located at the Grove which would provide access to the Pond and the Grove	<p>This area is constrained by the Grade II* Registered Park and Gardens of Rokeby Park, and the two properties of Tack Room Cottage and The Grove.</p> <p>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>The proposed shared private means of access and cycle track between the Rokeby Junction and Greta Bridge will be fenced along both sides with gates to be provide secure access to only those who require access</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
79	WCH021			Appleby to Brough - Modified design/ Alternative Route	Support for an alternative route for the A66 section between Appleby and Brough to go north of the current road.	The support for an alternative route for the A66 section between Appleby and Brough to go north of the current road, is not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. National Highways consulted on the route choice as part of the Statutory Consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of this Consultation Report. 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. The proposed route has an incursion into the AONB for the construction of a new local road to the north of the old A66 and the design considers the impact on stakeholders and landowners.	No
86	WCH024			Appleby to Brough - Modified design/ Lack of Information	Unsure as to why PRow has been extended up the carriage drive	Bridleway 309/031 is diverted from the new junction, along the south side of the A66 to Musgrave Lane where it joins an existing Bridleway. An existing section of Bridleway 309/031 between the A66 and Cherry Tree House is to be stopped up. A new footway is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						to be included on the new bridge to link the severed footpaths to the north and south sides of the A66. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
84	WCH023			Appleby to Brough - Modified design/ Suggestion	Use de-trunked road for local travel	It is the intention of the Project to use the de-trunked sections of the A66 as local roads, which will be operated and maintained by the local authority. Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19), the De-trunking Plans (Application Document 5.21), and the Engineering Section Drawings (Application Document 5.17 & 5.18)	No
113	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Money better spent elsewhere/Needs case	If the public right of way is not used, suggestion to not install an expensive underpass. Money is better spent on fixing local accident spots.	As part of the scheme proposals, National Highways has a duty to consider the impact on a number of different user groups and offer improvements where practicable. The existing bridleway in this	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						location crosses the A66 at grade, meaning that there is potential for conflicts to occur between vehicles and non-motorised users. By providing a grade separated solution in this location, the safety of users both on the bridleway and the highway is improved.	
114	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Modified Design/ Move underpass request	Would like further explanation about whether moving this underpass (near Dick Scot Lane) further west has been considered, and if it has what the reasons it was disregarded as an option.	The location of the underpass was discussed with the landowner during the preliminary design period. Its initial location was further to the west of its proposed location and the landowner highlighted that they would prefer to have it relocated to prevent pedestrians crossing their field and to keep the proposed alignment if possible. The design was revisited and updates were made to reflect these landowner discussions.	Yes
73	WCH020, WCH017			Appleby to Brough - Access/ Negative impact on landscape/noise	Respondent raises concerns in regard to the visual impact of the Project and potential increase in noise pollution.	The potential landscape and visual and noise impacts of the scheme was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. National Highways consulted on these topics as part of the Statutory Consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						this matter are set out in Annex N. The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration and landscape and visual during construction and operation, are reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration and ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2).	
93	WCH026			Project-level - Non	Concern that a statutory consultation should've been held due to significance of changes.	As the proposed design changes relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier statutory consultation on the Project) as the walking, cycling and horse-riding design proposals were not regarded to be substantial changes to the Project, which would result in a design for the project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. For this reason, we concluded that a statutory consultation was not required, in accordance with government	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>guidance (Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process, DCLG, March 2015). Paragraph 76 of this Guidance states that “In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the preapplication consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, targeted consultation.” In addition, a statutory consultation was not required as there were no new land interests affected by the WCH design proposals. A slightly shorter time period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation (6 weeks) was also considered appropriate given the targeted nature of the WCH consultation proposed.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in DCLG’s Guidance on the Pre-Application Process (March 2015). This states: “In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, supplementary</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consultation.” (Paragraph 76)To accord with this Guidance we applied three tests (as set out in paragraph 73 of the guidance) to judge whether supplementary consultation on a particular issue or within a local area was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of sufficient scale (the physical nature of the change). • It introduces material change to the environmental impacts of the Project. • The level of public interest in the change as expressed during consultation. <p>A decision was made on holding a non-statutory consultation if the changes proposed met one or more of these tests. The change proposed was both local in nature and/or related to a particular issues and did not impact the overall Project in a manner that would make it fundamentally different to that which was presented at statutory consultation between 24 September 2021 to 6 November 2021 so it was concluded that further statutory consultation on the entire Project was not required.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
173	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Ownership/ Road Maintenance	Concern about potential ownership issues related to the existing road outside New Hall Farm and lack of ability for WCH to use this road and continue eastwards to the new provision proposed that runs to the north of the A66.	<p>The proposed access to New Hall Farm is to be a private means of access (PMA) only. The WCH facilities will all be on the north of the A66 via a shared cycleway and PMA in this location, other than the diverted existing Bridleway 372/024 which extends as far as the Far bank End underpass.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	No
223	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Passing places	Concern about the lack of passing places proposed along shared public/private tracks	<p>The accommodation tracks requirements will be subject to detailed design consideration. An initial swept path analysis has been carried to ensure larger vehicles can use the route. This will be further refined at detailed design with further localised widening of the tracks incorporated as necessary.</p> <p>National Highways will also look at opportunities to incorporate</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						passing bays at the detailed design phase of the Project.	
290	WCH049			Project-level - Traffic/ Prioritise active travel	Concentrate traffic on to the Major Road Network and Strategic Road Network (and other key roads) to allow the remaining roads to be prioritised for active travel and public transport	The comment is noted and it aligns with National Highways aims for the Project. The dualling of the remaining sections of A66 (which will include safer grade separated junctions and removal of central reserve crossings) will make access and egress from the A66 safer and reduce journey times. The local road network and WCH links are also to be improved to provide increased connectivity and safety for local traffic and WCH users.	No
96	WCH026			Project-level - Lack of Information/ Produce updated PEI Report	An updated PEI Report should have been produced to reflect the new changes.	The material published for statutory 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. The Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.1 to 3.4) sets out the potential impacts of the Project on sensitive receptors and where required proposed mitigation measures.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The proposed design changes identified since Statutory Consultation were reviewed to determine whether they would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of the changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>Due to their relatively small-scale, none of the changes presented at the supplementary consultation were considered to materially affect the environmental effects at the Project-wide level nor significantly alter in-combination effects as set out in the PEI report. The Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative effects (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of the cumulative effects of the Project</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.	
118	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Proposed Maps and Plans/consultation	Current Bridleway missing from Maps and plans, request this is mapped correctly to show the bridleway to continue North only.	National Highways acknowledges this point. A correction has been made now to the relevant plans for the DCO to reflect the current arrangement of the bridleway. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
115	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Proposed Maps and Plans/consultation	Bridleway shown on map is not a bridleway and needs to be removed to avoid causing error and confusion.	National Highways acknowledges this point. A correction has been made to the relevant plans for the DCO to reflect the proposed use (walking and cycling only). 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).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
38	WCH008			Project-level - Proposed Maps and Plans/ Lack of Information	Lack of detail provided for type of provision for new proposed PRow - are horse-riders included?	Existing PRow have been reconnected where they have been severed by the proposed dualling, this includes any affected brideways. The majority of the new east-west PRow is for cyclists and walkers only other than the length of east-west brideway on the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme Detailed information on proposals including type/classification can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
240	WCH044			Appleby to Brough - Proposed Maps and Plans/ Lack of Information	Questioning where the PRow on the North side of the A66 will continue beyond the scheme limits and opposing any new access to land to the south of A66 in this location.	National Highways can confirm that all of the new PRow in this area are to the North of the A66 and no new access to land to the south of the A66 is proposed (other than the diverted existing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Bridleway 372/024 which extends as far as the Far Bank End underpass). The new WCH upgrades end at the western extent of the scheme where they link into existing common land.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals including type/classification 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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
119	WCH032			Bowes Bypass - Proposed Maps and Plans/ Request for Further Information	Request for confirmation that (to the east of Stone Bridge Farm) PRow will go over the proposed bridge and along the North side of the A66 heading East, avoiding client's property.	<p>National Highways can confirm that bridge has moved further east by around 100m. A proposed footway will cross the bridge and continue along the North side of the A66 heading East. The proposed private means of access along the south side of the A66 will also be a footpath which is required to reconnect existing footpaths severed by the Project.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals including type/classification can be found in the Scheme 7 Bowes Bypass Rights of Way and Access</p>	Yes No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
39	WCH008			Project-level - Proposed Maps and Plans/ Lack of Information	Concerned that the key to the plans must have an error, because it lists the new routes as only "New Proposed walking and cycling route (additional provision February 2022)" to replace the "Proposed Walking/cycling/horse-riding route (as consulted autumn 2021)". If the intention is to exclude horse-riders from this "New Proposed" provision, then the British Horse Society OBJECTS to the exclusion on the grounds of discrimination and the safety risk to horse-riders not allowed to use the provision.	The key on the plans was amended prior to the supplementary consultation in February 2022. Further, additional engagement has been carried out with the BHS to explain the maps/key subsequent to the targeted consultation being issued. The enhanced east-west WCH facilities are typically to be for walking and cycling use only, however various horse-riding facility enhancements have been made along the route in addition to ensuring any severed bridledways are reconnected via safer grade separated crossing points. Detailed information on proposals including type/classification can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
127	WCH036			Appleby to Brough - Proposed PRoW/ Necessity	There is already an existing footpath (on client's located near Long Marton Road) that runs alongside the field. Therefore, there is no reason for an additional public right of way path to be built across a field to finish at the same location as the existing path.	The existing direct route is a bridleway and is to be maintained on its current alignment. The route that deviates from this is the diverted footpath and private means of access (PMA) which utilises an existing farm track as well as a new section to be constructed around the pond. 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)..	No
145	WCH040			Project-level - Provision/ Necessity	Lack of WCH provision between M6 Junction 40 and Brougham Castle which limits users from Penrith area.	There is an existing signed cycle route and footway along Carleton Road from Penrith which utilises an existing underpass to access Brougham. This will be retained.	No
133	WCH037			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - PRoW/ Support	No objection to the additional 250m shared-use PRoW parallel to the A66 in County Durham.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
202	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Public access/	Oppose plans if public access to private land is proposed due to concerns about illegal poaching,	General opposition to public access to private land is acknowledged. Responses to specific points raised by	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Antisocial Behaviour/ Animal Safety	hare coursing and livestock worrying.	respondent (ID WCH041) are made separately within Annex P where WCH041 is denoted in 'Local Communities and General Public' column.	
200	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Public access/ Oppose	Opposed to creation of additional PRow on the estate where there is limited access currently.	General opposition to PRow creation is acknowledged. Responses to specific points raised by respondent (ID WCH041) are made separately within Annex P where WCH041 is denoted in 'Local Communities and General Public' column.	No
219	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Public liability/ WCH	Concern as to how public liability on an all-purpose track would be dealt with in terms of claims by particularly cyclists and pedestrians	The default ownership, maintenance and liabilities associated with all-purpose tracks (shared PMA and PRow) will be with either National Highways or the local highway authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	No
220	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Public liability/ Suggestion	Suggestion to separate Local access road and public access routes to simplify liability and maintenance issues.	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private and public access routes. To separate them out would require additional land for the routes themselves as well as for further environmental mitigation.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The ownership, maintenance and associated liabilities for any access routes which include PRow, will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.	
94	WCH026			Project-level - Consultation/ Poor Quality	Concern that consultation was poorly advertised.	The approach to publicity was appropriate given the targeted issues and local nature of the changes proposed and that the consultation was undertaken with specific individuals and groups who were communicated with directly to inform them of the consultation and explain how they could respond. As such, we haven't done a press release or published content on social media. We updated our National Highways platforms for the Winter update alongside the consultation summary (in March 2022). All of the information regarding the supplementary consultations is held within our Citizenspace web site and is available for those who are affected. The approach to publicising the supplementary consultations (and associated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						events where it was found that these were needed) had been discussed with the host local authorities before commencing the consultation.	
198	WCH041			Project-level - Receipt of more information/ Lack of Information	Lack of detailed information received from National Highways on environmental mitigation previously proposed.	Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to walking, cycling and horse-riding. We consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. We have also engaged extensively with landowners where their land is required for environmental mitigation. We will continue to engage with landowners on environmental mitigation and other issues that impacts on land and property throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and the environmental mitigation proposed at our autumn 2021 Statutory Consultation has been substantially reduced from that	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						shown within the PEI Report. The requirement for land has therefore also been reduced. Further information on the how mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented in the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Mitigation is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 2.7). This includes details of the management regimes associated with these proposed land uses.	
104	WCH028			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Request for further engagement/ Crossings	Request for further confirmation that the new access and crossing bridge east of Stonebridge Farm will allow for articulated wagons to access the farm.	All accommodation structures will be designed to the appropriate standards to allow for standard farm vehicles and standard articulated wagons.	No
103	WCH028			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Request for further engagement/ Boundary	Request from landowner (High Broats Farm) for further confirmation that the PRoW located adjacent to their boundary is on the carriageway side and that a new drystone wall will be provided.	The proposed footway in this location will be located within the highway boundary and will be segregated from the private land with a suitable boundary treatment. 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)..	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Any details in relation to boundary fences and segregation features (such as drystone wall) 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.	
105	WCH029			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Request for further engagement/ PRow	Request to be consulted on the diversion of the public right of way at West Layton Nurseries.	The diversion of public rights of way is shown on the Rights of Way Access Plans (Application Document 5.19), which are part of the DCO application. Any interested party can make representations on these plans as part of the Examination of the DCO Application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRowS affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project.	No
287	WCH049			Project-level - Request for further	Request as to whether Active Travel England will review the proposed Project and whether	The final detail of all WCH provision will be designed in accordance with current relevant	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				information/ Active Travel	they will have access to comments made by consultees.	standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. There will be an opportunity to review our proposals once the DCO application has been accepted and the DCO regime gives opportunities for interested parties to make representations during the Examination process.	
204	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Request for more information/ PRoW Usage	Request for confirmation that proposed PRoW for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby Scheme are for walkers and cyclists only	This is correct. No additional horse-riding provision is proposed for the Scheme between Penrith to Temple Sowerby and the proposed shared use track is for pedestrians and cyclists only. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
169	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Request further information/ Crossings	It is unclear whether provisions for WCH have been included on the routes crossing the scheme from near Wildboar Hill to Wheat Sheaf Farm.	The routes crossing the scheme in this area are combined footways and Private Means of Access with the same provision on both the western and eastern sides of Cringle Beck. The eastern footway	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>includes the diversion of existing footpath 372/014. The north-south routes intersect the proposed shared east-west cycleway thus opening up additional connectivity in this area.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
238	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Request further information/ Design	Respondent requests that the specification of the overpass (at western end of scheme) must be large enough to facilitate access for large farm machinery.	The overbridge will be designed to applicable design standards current at the time of design and will be suitable for use by standard agricultural machinery.	No
233	WCH043			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Request further information/ PRow usage	Request for further information regarding if horse-riders will or will not be using the path on client's land (Low Moor, western end of Kirby Thore scheme).	<p>The proposed provision in this location is for is for walkers and cyclists only on a shared cycleway so not for horse-riding.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
252	WCH045			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Request to meet/ Antisocial Behaviour	The respondent would be happy to meet National Highways and discuss the points raised in further detail and to show evidence of previous issues (anti-social behaviour, poaching, safety to pedestrians)	The diversion of public rights of way is shown on the Rights of Way Access Plans (Application Document 5.19), which are part of the DCO application. Any interested party can make representations on these plans as part of the Examination of the DCO Application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoWs affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project.	No
182	WCH040			Project-level - Route design/request for further information	National Highways require details regarding the form of the new route (as proposed February 2022) where it sits by the side of the de-trunked carriageway sections (scheme wide – Cumbria).	Adequate land has been allowed within the order limits to provide an approximately 3m wide shared cycleway along the de-trunked sections of the old A66 where shown in the design. National Highways confirm that we will look at all de-trunked lengths on a case by case basis and will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>continue to engage with the relevant local authorities during the next stage of development as part of the wider de-trunking processes.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
185	WCH040			Project-level - Route design/ Route Usage	General support for the proposals as they allow non-motorised users to follow the A66 route without needing to use the road.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
57	WCH016			Appleby to Brough - Route design/ Oppose	Opposition to the position of the proposed new dual carriageway south of the current A66.		No
178	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Route design/ Request for Further Information	Request for confirmation about the intended status of the parallel route and usage as a route for walking, cycling and horse-riding, south of the current A66, between Musgrave Lane and Mains House near Brough.	<p>A shared cycleway (for walkers and cyclists) is proposed parallel to the A66 dual carriageway between Musgrave Lane and Mains House.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
172	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Route design/ Request for Further Information	Request to confirm whether provision will be made for the bridleway (BW 350021) to connect into the proposed new walking/cycling route near Flitholme Bridge, and whether this route will be suitable to accommodate horse-riders in the area.	Whist the bridleway will connect to the proposed walking/cycling track to allow walkers and cyclists to continue, the track is not proposed for equestrian use as there are no other existing bridleways to connect to.	No
68	WCH018			Appleby to Brough - Route design/alternatives	Suggestion that it would be cheaper to build the new dual carriageway slightly further north of the current road and use the old A66 as a cycle, walking and horse-riding route which would also avoid decimating the historical cultural site for Brough Hill Fair.	National Highways acknowledge the consultees suggestion 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. 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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> <p>National Highways are therefore promoting a route with a minimal incursion into the AONB and MoD</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						land to the north of the existing A66. The east-west walking and cycling route within the Appleby to Brough scheme is located in the verge of the de-trunked sections of old A66 over significant lengths of the scheme, these are however segregated from the carriageway to provide a safer route for users. The location of the replacement site for the Brough Hill Fair and any access requirements was part of a separate Spring 2022 Supplementary Consultation and the outcome of that consultation is also contained in Chapter 7 and Annex P of this Consultation Report.	
175	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Route design/ Traffic	The provision of segregated facilities is welcomed for the de-trunked A66 between Warcop and Brough given the likely volume and speed of traffic on this route.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
168	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Route design/ Crossings	This route crossing should be suitable for horse-riders to provide continuity for users of the bridleway (BW 372024).	The bridleway does not continue on the northern side of the A66, and therefore the crossing is only for walkers to access the public footpaths on the northern side of the dualling.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
5	WCH001			Project-level - PRow/Safety	An individual pedestrian footpath is more attractive to walkers than a shared use path.	National Highways have made the decision to provide shared walking and cycling facilities due to the rural nature of the routes and the low walking and cycling flows expected. Separate walking and cycling facilities are more suited to urban areas with higher flows. The additional land required to provide separate walking and cycling facilities is not justified by the expected patronage.	No
263	WCH047			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - PRow/ Traffic/ Safety	Concerned that proposed shared PRow and PMA tracks within the Penrith to Temple Sowerby section, pose a health and safety risk to users due to farm traffic	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access (PMA) and PRow (in this case a combined cycle track and PMA). To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. The flows of both pedestrians/cyclists and agricultural vehicles will be low and the routes will be designed with suitable horizontal and vertical geometry to ensure good visibility between users so the routes will be suitable from a health and safety risk perspective. Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
207	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - PRow/ Traffic/ Safety	If the proposed track is to be multi use, we consider there is a considerable health and safety risk to the public in using a track which is also to be used by local agricultural and estate traffic and National Highways contracting vehicles.	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access (PMA) and PRow (in this case a combined cycle track and PMA). To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. Adjacent private land will be fenced off. Pedestrians and cyclists will be expected to respect the country code. This type of shared access is not an unusual practice in a rural environment. Access to the balancing ponds by National Highways will be very infrequent (likely to be only once or twice per year for maintenance and inspection purposes). Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
123	WCH035			Appleby to Brough - PRow/ Traffic/ Safety	Concerned that proposed public right of way poses a health and safety risk to users due to the dairy farm traffic	<p>National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access (PMA) and PRow (in this case a combined cycle track and PMA). To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation.</p> <p>Adjacent private land will be fenced off. Pedestrians and cyclists will be expected to respect the country code. This type of shared access is not an unusual practice in a rural environment.</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 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
125	WCH035			Appleby to Brough - PRow/ Safety	Regarding PRow to south side of A66 local to Flitholme - concerns that users could spook livestock on the proposed shared path towards Flitholme, causing them to potentially trample users.	<p>The PRow on the south side of the A66 in this location is to be a footway, separate to the adjacent private means of access which will be fences off from the footpath. The shared cycle facility is to be along the old de-trunked A66 to the north of the new A66.</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</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 Walking, Cycling</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
176	WCH040			Appleby to Brough - Traffic/ Safety	Having the segregated facilities for the de-trunked A66 sandwiched between the new and old roads does not provide a pleasant environment for users and is potentially hazardous for horse-riders given the proximity of traffic.	<p>The preliminary design has considered alternatives for the shared cycleway location but has ruled out any further non-essential incursions into the AONB, north of the A66. Taking into consideration the vertical alignment of the new and old A66 there are significant lengths where visually, users will not actually be sandwiched between the two roads e.g. new route on top of new A66 earthwork cuttings. Landscape planting will further improve the separation. Horse-riders will not be permitted to use this main east-west route as this is a shared cycleway.</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 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
33	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Traffic/ Safety	Neighbours will use the Richardson's farm access track to move livestock and cause safety risks with vehicles travelling on this road (shared access to New Hall Farm and Far Bank End farms).	The proposed access arrangement is in place to provide both farms with direct access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66. One of the project objectives is to minimise direct accesses to/from the A66 on safety grounds, as well as there being a need to minimise the number of new structures crossing the A66. The access to the two farms therefore need to be combined to avoid multiple accesses and multiple structures in close proximity (reducing road user safety and increasing project cost and construction complexity). This is deemed to outweigh the safety concerns raised regarding movement of livestock within the private means of access shared between the two farms. 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).	No
30	WCH006			Appleby to Brough - Road Users/ Safety	Safety concerns regarding multiple users of the Richardson's track potentially interacting	The proposed access arrangement is in place to provide both farms with direct access to both the east and westbound carriageways of the A66. One of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					including livestock, pedestrians and agricultural machinery.	<p>the project objectives is to minimise direct accesses to/from the A66 on safety grounds, as well as there being a need to minimise the number of new structures crossing the A66. The access to the two farms therefore need to be combined to avoid multiple accesses and multiple structures in close proximity (reducing road user safety and increasing project cost and construction complexity). This is deemed to outweigh the safety concerns raised regarding interaction of livestock, pedestrians and agricultural machinery as this is not out of the ordinary in a rural setting such as this.</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>	
297	WCH049			Appleby to Brough - Active Travel/ Safety	Suggestion that protected spaces for active travel users will be necessary along the B6412 road to Appleby due to the speed and volume of traffic on these sections of roads in order to meet the LTN 1/20 guidance.	<p>One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel.</p> <p>Upgrading of WCH facilities on the B6412 is outside 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>extents however the opportunity is noted. Any improvements to WCH infrastructure outside of the Project is a matter for the Local Authority.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
177	WCH041			Appleby to Brough - Safety/ Segregation	Suggestion for segregated WCH facilities at de-trunked A66 between Warcop and Brough to be on the north side of old A66.	<p>The preliminary design has considered alternatives for the shared cycleway location but has ruled out any further non-essential incursions into the AONB, north of the A66 (which a northern WCH alignment would require).</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 Walking, Cycling</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
298	WCH049			Appleby to Brough - Safety/ Active Travel	Support creation of protected spaces for active travel users from Appleby to Warcop.	National Highways welcome the support for the proposals.	No
11	WCH002			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Safety/ WCH	Supports the safer provision for walking, cycling and horse-riding alongside the de-trunked A66 on Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor	National Highways appreciated the continued support for the proposed WCH infrastructure.	No
107	WCH030			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - PRoW/ Safety	Health and safety concerns about proposed public right of way along the location private property (Street Side Farm).	One of the key objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity for walkers and cyclists and to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. Over the length of the project, the chosen solution needs to vary to take into account other factors such as private access and reconnection of severed PRoW. The intention is not for PRoW to open up private land. The health and safety concerns are noted however the shared cycle track and PMA in this particular location is not out of the ordinary in a rural environment and is deemed suitable considering the low flows of vehicles on the PMA. Any new shared private means of access and PRoW will be fenced on both sides. Final boundary	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>treatments and where suitable, gates to secure access to only those who require it, will be considered at the next stage of design development.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p> <p>.</p>	
15	WCH003			Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Design/ Safety	Suggestion that an appropriately surfaced walking and cycle path needs to be provided between Greta Bridge to the Thorpe Farm Tunnel.	<p>One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel.</p> <p>Upgrading of WCH facilities on existing/historic sections of dualling is not included within the project extents however the eastern end of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby PRoW ties into the existing route which continues to Thorpe Farm.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
247	WCH045			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Security/ Public Access	Access roads must remain private and secure and would be compromised by PRow	This relevant point is noted. Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	No
117	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Security/ Public Access	Concern that if locked gates aren't provided then motorised vehicles will use the route, causing huge disruption from Scotch Corner to	This relevant point is noted. Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Rokeby and to other local residents.	design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	
211	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Security/ Poaching	Concerns about trespass and poaching so suggests to ensuring security through measures such as gates, padlocks, fencing and/or hedging.	This relevant point is noted. Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	
116	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Security/ Public Access	Request that locked gates are installed on the underpass bridleway (at Dick Scot Lane), where the bridleway meets the service road. This is to avoid vehicular access by the general public.	This relevant point is noted. Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	No
221	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Segregation/request for further information	Request for detail provided in the proposals for how the access tracks would be segregated from adjoining agricultural land and other uses.	Appropriate boundary treatments will be installed at the interface of the highway and private land. The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11) A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRow affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.	
164	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Segregation/ Road users	The level of segregation between motorised and non-motorised users should be enhanced between the de-trunked section of the A66 route and PRow, prioritising walkers, cyclists and horse-riders	Where WCH routes are proposed along sections of de-trunked A66, they will be positioned in the verge and segregated from the road. The traffic volumes along these de-trunked sections will be significantly reduced once the new A66 is operational and that combined with the segregation will provide a significant enhancement in both connectivity and safety over current provision. National Highways confirm that we will look at 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.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
203	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Shared use path	Concern about proposed PRoW fundamental conflicts between, pedestrians, cyclists, private landowners and National Highways' contractors	<p>The private land will be fenced off. Pedestrians and cyclists will be expected to respect the country code and the property they are walking through. This type of shared access through farms is not an unusual practice in a rural environment. Access to the balancing ponds by National Highways will be very infrequent (likely to be only once or twice per year for maintenance and inspection purposes).</p> <p>The detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11)</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)</p> <p>The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. This will include (amongst other things) consideration of boundary treatments, access restrictions and security measures.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
232	WCH042			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Shared use paths/ Request for Further Information	Request to confirm proposed PRow usage - whether it will be only cyclists and walkers or would this also include horse riders.	No additional equestrian provision is proposed for Scheme 3. The proposed shared use track is for pedestrians and cyclists only.	No
183	WCH040			Project-level - Signage/ WCH	Request for signage to support walkers, cyclists and horse-riders in navigating the network and assist with diversions.	The final detail of all WCH provision (including signage) will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project.	No
299	WCH049			Appleby to Brough - Speed limit/traffic and transport	Speed limits in Appleby should be reduced to 20mph to ensure safety of active travel users.	National Highways thank you for your comments. However, speed limits within Appleby are outside the scope of the A66 Project and are a matter for Cumbria County Council as the highway authority for the area.	No
289	WCH049			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Speed limit/traffic and transport	Protected space for active travel users will be necessary along the B6412 in order to meet the LTN1/20 guidance. West of the B6412 the road will have very low traffic flows given that it primarily serves as an access road to farms. A speed limit reduction to 30mph or 20mph should be	National Highways thank you for your detailed response in relation to the provisions to be made around Temple Sowerby and Appleby for active travel users. National Highways are and will continue to work with Cumbria County Council, as the local highway authority, and their partners to develop proposals for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					achievable along this section of road.	the de-trunking work which will need to take place on the existing A66 before it is handed to the local highway authority. These discussions will take cognisance of LTN1/20 guidance. With regard to proposed speed limits on roads which do not form part of the Strategic Road Network, e.g. In Temple Sowerby village, this is something which sits with the local highway authority and does not fall within the remit of National Highways.	
146	WCH040			Project-level - Speed limit/traffic and transport	Provide a speed limit that reduces the requirements for segregated provision for sections of the route where PRow use current road network or de-trunked network	Local speed limits on the local road network and on the old de-trunked A66 are decided by the Local Authority. The reduction of the speed limits would not significantly reduce the risk to WCH users on the local road network. There are many other considerations including visibility, road condition, presence of accesses, etc.	No
288	WCH049			Project-level - Speed limit/traffic and transport	Suggestion that on rural roads where cyclists share carriageway space the maximum traffic flow should be no greater than 1,000 pcu per day and that the speed limit should be no greater than 30mph in line with LTN 1/20.	The Project is not proposing to introduce any new on-road cycle facilities so the comment is not relevant.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
292	WCH049			Project-level - Speed limit/traffic and transport	Use speed limits to motivate motorists to use the Major Road Network and Strategic Road Network (and other key roads) to allow the remaining roads to be prioritised for active travel and public transport.	The dualling of the remaining sections of A66 (which will include safer grade separated junctions and removal of central reserve crossings) will make access and egress from the A66 safer and reduce journey times, therefore making the strategic route more attractive. Any consideration of reduction in speed limits on the local roads would be a matter for the local highway authority.	No
95	WCH026			Project-level - Statement of Community Consultation/ Communication	Suggestion that a new Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) should've been issued to communicate the changes.	As the proposed design changes, subject to consultation, were firstly local in nature and/or related to particular issues and second would not have resulted in a project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation a supplementary consultation was appropriate. The consultations have been undertaken in line with the principles and methods set out in the Project's SoCC, published prior to the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. Targeted supplementary consultations were anticipated and appropriately	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>addressed in this SoCC (Annex G) at paragraph 5.9, that states: “If as a result of feedback from this statutory consultation or from our pre consultation engagement, the proposals change to the extent that it is necessary to undertake further targeted consultation, this will be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the principles and methods set out in this SoCC, to the extent they are relevant to the targeted consultation.”</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in DCLG’s Guidance on the Pre-Application Process (March 2015). These states: “In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, supplementary consultation.” (Paragraph 76)</p> <p>Therefore, a new SOCC is not required as we were not proposing further statutory consultation on the entire Project (as set out above) and the supplementary consultation has been undertaken in accordance with requirements</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						of the PA2008, Government guidance and the approach and principles set out in the SoCC.	
286	WCH048			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Sufficient consultation	No further comments on walking, cycling and horse-riding provisions for Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor.	National Highways acknowledges your response on this matter.	No
227	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Surface for PRow	Request to understand the type of surfacing provided for proposed PRow.	The build-up and surfacing of the track will be established in the subsequent stages of design development. The design of the track will be in keeping with the rural environment in which it is situated. Further details are set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref 5.11) which are to be secured through the DCO and need to be complied with during subsequent stages of design development.	No
142	WCH040			Project-level - Surface for PRow	Routes intended for use by horses should be an unbound surface, which will need to be separate from a bound surface suitable for walking and cycling.	Proposed bridleways will be constructed using appropriate materials, and in keeping with existing provision and the rural environment. The final specification of the bridleway construction is to be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. Further details are set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref 5.11) which are to be secured through the DCO and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						need to be complied with during subsequent stages of design development.	
156	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Use of new junction	Concern about walkers, cyclists and horse-riders interacting with vehicles at new junction at Kirkby Thore	The final detail of all WCH provision (including crossing points) will be designed in accordance with current relevant standards, the finer details of which will be developed in subsequent stages of the Project. All designs will undergo a Road Safety Audit.	No
112	WCH031			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Use of PRoW/needs case	<p>If the public right of way is not used, suggestion to not install an expensive underpass.</p> <p>The public right of way proposed to accommodate via the proposed underpass currently has limited usage.</p> <p>Request for right of way cameras to be implemented to assess the usage of this PRoW.</p>	<p>If a PRoW is severed by the new dualling scheme, it is to be reconnected via a safe grade-separated crossing, in this case at an underpass which also serves as a private means of access.</p> <p>The perceived low patronage of this route is noted however one of the aims of the project is to enhance east-west WCH routes in the area, promoting greater usage and increasing desire for use of existing PRoW in the process, the requested camera survey in the existing situation would not take into account this future demand so would be of limited value.</p> <p>Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>corresponding Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
159	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - WCHR crossings/request for further information	Request for clarity on WCH crossing of new alignment of A66 near Powis House connecting to existing and new PRoW as it is needed to maintain connectivity of the public footpath (FP 341017)	<p>In this location the new WCH route will cross the new A66 via an underpass at the new Long Martin Junction near Powis House. FP341/017 will be stopped up where intersected by the new A66, with a diversion to the nearest grade separated crossing point at Long Martin junction.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	No
157	WCH040			Temple Sowerby to Appleby - WCHR crossings/ Access	Request for new WCH bridge to maintain the alignment of Main Street to allow access to local roads, PRoW network and NCN68 to the north east.	Suitable WCH provision will be provided at the proposed Kirby Thore junction to allow safe crossing of the A66 by NMU users. NMU users on Main Street	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						will be directed to the new junction.	
206	WCH041			Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Width of track/Traffic	Concern that proposed track is not wide enough (4m) to support two way farm traffic	The accommodation tracks are illustrative at this stage of the Project and will be subject to further detailed design. An initial swept path analysis has been carried out to ensure larger vehicles can use the route. This will be further refined at detailed design with further localised widening of the tracks incorporated as necessary. We will also look at opportunities to incorporate passing bays at the detailed design phase of the Project.	No
199	WCH041			Project-level - Working with each other/consultation	Difficult to work with National Highways when information is not easily available	We believe the information provided was suitably clear and detailed enough to understand the changes proposed and easily available to consultees. For consultees a dedicated project website was available, which provided an overview of the Project and information on the walking, cycling and horse-riding proposals, including detailed maps, which showed what locations would be impacted by the proposals.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>A supplementary consultation brochure, available online or could be requested in a printed form, provided consultees with an introduction to the A66 project and details of what has been progressed since the autumn 2021 Statutory Consultation. It provided consultees with detailed information on the revised proposals for WCH and other matters we put forward for supplementary consultation.</p> <p>A notification letter was sent to 233 landowners and land interests and those in the immediate area directly impacted by the changes proposed informing them of the date of the consultation and how to access the information online. Information was also provided to landowners and land interests on compulsory acquisition and compensation and the planning process. The host authorities were contacted by email and were informed at meetings on the timescales and how to access the information available for the consultation.</p> <p>We also provided contact details for consultees to contact us if printed information was needed or</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>further clarification or explanation was needed for any aspect of our consultation material.</p> <p>We have therefore made available to the consultees a range of information on the proposals and publicised how this information could be accessed. We do acknowledge that as we are currently at a preliminary design stage the level of detail being sought by some stakeholders, including landowners, is not always available. We will continue to work with all impacted landowners and share further details of the design as we move into the detailed design phase for the Project.</p>	
188	WCH040			M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank - Workshop request/consultation	Request for workshop with National Highways to discuss attractiveness of route for cyclists and pedestrians.	National Highways have continued to engage with the local authorities and all landowners impacted by the design including WCH routes following the supplementary consultations. This has included a walkthrough of the WCH report with the LAs that requested further engagement on the 5 May.	No

Consultee comments raised in response to supplementary Consultation ‘Landform and noise bunds’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
3			TR0200141	Bowes Bypass - Access - traffic and transport	Respondents representing Mid Lowfield arm, Bowes express concern for the proposed access past Stonebridge Farm and again, past the crossing bridge to Low Broats, asking if it will be to highway standards and if the road will be suitable for both tractors and trailers.	While the overbridge to the east of Bowes was not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation, National Highways consulted on this overbridge as part of the statutory consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).. The proposed road passing to the north of Stonebridge Farm, over the East Bowes Accommodation overbridge to Low Broats Farm is an extension to The Street/Low Road, and is classed as a local road. It will be designed to current local authority adoptable highway design standards for use by all traffic including tractors and trailers, and heavy goods vehicles.	No
4			TR0200141	Bowes Bypass - Access - traffic and transport	Respondents representing Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes express concern and request information regarding accesses provided for emergency services and general service wagons including bin collection vehicles.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles and other large vehicles. While the access arrangements in this location were not the subject matter for this supplementary	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consultation, National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>Access will be maintained for emergency services and general service wagons throughout the construction works and following construction. Temporary works may need to be implemented at specific times during construction to guarantee this. For further information, refer to Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 2 The Project (Application Document 3.2) and the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7).</p> <p>Proposed side roads and Accommodation tracks will be of standard suitable for vehicles that currently access the property to continue to do so in the future.</p>	
14			TR0200143	Bowes Bypass – Access / Traffic and transport	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm, Bowes express concern that access is not	Existing field accesses have been maintained in the same locations or proposed replacement accesses have been identified as part of the preliminary design. A new Accommodation overbridge	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					provided to fields within their ownership at Low Broats.	has been provided to access fields north of the A66, at Low Broats Farm. Throughout the preliminary design, we have worked with landowners and user groups to understand their needs and have implemented solutions to resolve access issues. Engagement with affected landowners will continue throughout the DCO process and detailed design of the Project.	
18			TR0200143	Bowes Bypass - Access / Support	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm, Bowes require further information that the current proposal allows for access of articulated wagons, dustbin wagons and emergency vehicles etc. at Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm and is adequate for accessing particularly at specific turning points.	While the overbridge to the east of Bowes was not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation, National Highways consulted on this overbridge as part of the statutory consultation of autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). The proposed road passing to the north of Stonebridge Farm, over the East Bowes Accommodation overbridge to Low Broats Farm is an effective extension to The Street/Low Road, will be classed as a local road. It will be designed to current highway design standards for use by all traffic including tractors and trailers, and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						heavy goods vehicles. The outline design of the Project is shown on the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5) and within the Environment Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8).	
131			TR0200168	Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Access track / Suitability	Respondents representing Skylin, Temple Sowerby express concern over the proposed access road adjacent to the new balancing pond at the west end of the scheme, south of the Temple Sowerby link road. They believe that it leads to nowhere so is not of benefit.	The access road located in the field south of the A66 and at the very western extents of the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme provides access to the proposed attenuation drainage pond for maintenance purposes. In addition, the track has been extended to potentially provide access to the existing farm building in the north east corner of the field and which is impacted by the works.	No
123			TR0200164	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access track / Traffic	Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham oppose tarmacking of the access track for vehicular access between the former Llama Karma Kafe car park and the road to the overpass which currently contains cycling and walking provisions.	During the preliminary design stage and following consultations with landowners/tenants, the provision of access tracks was identified to enable access to all plots of land and other features affected by the Projects proposals. Construction details such as proposed surfacing materials of the access tracks will be confirmed through detailed design. Vehicular access will be required for many of these tracks for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>maintenance and farming reasons and therefore the surfacing material chosen needs to be appropriate for all the intended users.</p> <p>Any materials used on the Project will need to conform to the requirements of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 11, Materials and Waste (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
110			TR0200164	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access track / Design	<p>Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham oppose the current proposed access track arrangement at Brougham Castle Farm, stating that the 90° bends will prove too difficult for agricultural traffic to navigate, and the track would get damaged.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the recommendation regarding the access track location.</p> <p>The new access track alignments have been defined by a number of design considerations including the proposed pond locations. Taking into consideration the various constraints, it has been decided that the better option was to route the shared access track around the ponds rather than between the pond and the A66. The track crosses the existing section of the Whinfell sewage works access road where better visibility is available at the crossing point. The shared use tracks have also been positioned on the outside to allow them to be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>easily transferred to the local authority or a third party without disruption to the A66 assets. The point regarding the bends on the access track is noted The tracks will be suitable for use by the vehicles that are intended to use them and can be designed accordingly.</p> <p>Any materials used on the Project for the access tracks will need to conform to the requirements of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 11, Materials and Waste (Application Document 3.2) and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
114			TR0200164	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access track / Request for information	Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham express concern for the specifications of access route near Castle Farm adding they would require it to be tarmacked.	Construction details such as proposed surfacing materials of the access tracks will be confirmed through detailed design, and landowners engaged as appropriate. Vehicular access will be required for many of these tracks for maintenance and farming reasons and the surfacing material chosen needs to be appropriate for the intended use. Any materials used on the Project will need to conform to the requirements of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 11, Materials and Waste (Application	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Document 3.2) and the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).	
107			TR0200164	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access track / Request for information / WCH	Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham express concern over a single access-track proposal at Castle Farm and its use, and request information on if the access route will be used by only walkers and cyclists and not horse-riders.	National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access and PRowS. To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. The proposed access at this location is a combined cycle track and private means of access designed for use by walkers, cyclists, National Highways maintenance vehicles and local farm traffic. It is not permitted to be used by horse-riders. 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).	No
120			TR0200165	Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Access track / Retain existing route / WCH	Respondents from New Bungalow, Low Moor, Kirkby Thore suggest the access road to the west of the pond at Temple Sowerby to Appleby, shown on the Sheet 1 of 9 maps provided at supplementary consultation, be	The new access track referred to provides a dedicated access to and from the field to the south to the public highway. It is not intended to upgrade the length of existing public footway to be used as a shared use facility.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					removed and that the existing access route is used.		
134			TR0200168	Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Accommodation Works / Property	Respondents representing Skylin, Temple Sowerby state that further discussions on Accommodation works and the specification of the replacement agricultural building located to the south of the new Temple Sowerby Link Road will be required.	Any Accommodation works required including the potential replacement of your agricultural building, 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. Further discussions on any identified Accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
100			TR0200161	Appleby to Brough - Accommodation Works / Mitigation	Respondents representing West View Farm, Brough suggest Accommodation work that would be required on their land in the vicinity of Flitholme, Low Broomrigg and around the access	National Highways notes the list of suggested Accommodation works provided. Any Accommodation works agreed will be discussed with the individual landowners, and where appropriate occupiers, concerned	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					provision proposed to the west of Brough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cattle grid at Low Broomrigg to prevent livestock getting onto the A66 • Sound reduction measures • Fencing around junction and along access track to Musgrave Lane. • Noise mitigation measures. 	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 works.	
77	TR0200157			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Accommodation Works	Respondents representing (Hutton Fields, Hutton Magna, Richmond) suggest Accommodation works that would be required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A larger concrete area to accommodate slurry store and tipping area than currently proposed, adjacent to the A66 mainline • The access track proposed to be of tarmac construction • Gates which can be locked on the underpass which allows only horses to pass due to safety concerns raised. 	National Highways notes the list of suggested Accommodation works provided. 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						works. It should be noted that an area has been included within the red line boundary to accommodate the slurry tank, refer to the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5). The identified area has been sized to allow inclusion of a vehicle turning head and set down area.	
24			TR0200144	Accommodation Works / Replacements	Respondents representing High Broats Farm, Bowes suggest works to replace the stonewall and gate near High Broats Farm as a like for like as part of the construction of the scheme.	Consultee comment about the entry to the farm and boundary walls is noted. Boundary treatments were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. Boundary treat Any Accommodation works required 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Accommodation works can be progress via this mechanism.	
72	TR0200155			Accommodation works / Request further Information	Respondent representing land at Stonebridge Farm, Bowes suggests that until the final design is received, it is difficult to comment on Accommodation works to the south of Low Broats.	Required Any Accommodation works 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.	No
150			TR0200173	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Artificial lighting	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate, Penrith oppose any proposed artificial lighting around the proposed junction at Center Parcs as this would have a detrimental effect in the local area.	National Highways are not proposing to provide any lighting at the new junction at Center Parcs.	No
23			TR0200144, TR0200143	Bowes Bypass - Detailed design / Access	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm, Bowes representing High Broats Farm, Bowes express support for the crossing over the A66 to the east of Stonebridge,	The proposed road passing to the north of Stonebridge Farm, over the East Bowes Accommodation overbridge to Low Broats Farm is an extension to The Street/Low Road and classed as a local road.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					but require confirmation that the roads and bridge design layout allows for HGVs and wagons to access the farm. Respondents would like more information to inform liability for maintenance of Stonebridge with design specifications.	It is designed to adopted design standards. It will be suitable for use to all traffic, including tractors and trailers, and heavy goods vehicles. In relation to maintenance, article 9 of the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) sets out the persons that will be responsible for maintaining any new, altered or diverted streets and other structures.	
59			TR0200190	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Detailed design / Request further information	Respondent representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham suggest it would be useful to see a 3D plan of the landform changes and ask if this is possible.	The changes to landform will be further developed as part of the detailed design stage of the Project following consideration of further information in relation to earthworks. A 3D model of the landform is not being prepared as part of the application. We would however direct those interested to the Engineering Section Drawings (Cross Sections) and the Engineering Section Drawings (Plan and Profiles) (Application Documents 5.17 and 5.18 respectively) which together with the provisions of article 7 (limits of deviation) of the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) set out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the vertical envelope within which the Project must be developed.	
125			TR0200167	Temple Sowerby to Appleby - Detailed design / Request further information	Respondent representing the Rivercroft Farm, Kirkby Thore wants to know the surface type of the road (to north of Kirkby Thore) and states that it must be a tarmacked road in order to mitigate the road from washing away and filling drains with stones.	The new local road to the north of Kirkby Thore which connects between the new junction at British Gypsum and Main Street will be tarmacked and will be constructed to latest adopted highway standards as required by Cumbria County Council, as they will ultimately have responsibility for the road as the local highways authority. . .	No
82			TR0200159	Bowes Bypass - Detailed design / Request further information	Respondents representing the Bowes and Romalldkirk Estate express concern over the detailed design of the access road to the south of Hulands Quarry and the A66 and requests details on the width and who will own the access road and who will be liable to maintain the access road.	The design of the proposed access road will be finalised at the detailed design stage of the Project. National Highways will own and maintained the access road unless agreement is reached with the local authority or landowner. In relation to maintenance, article 9 of the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) sets out the persons that will be responsible for maintaining any new, altered or diverted streets and other structures	No
58			TR0200152	Bowes Bypass - Detailed design /	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes request volumes and dimensions	The current proposals shown on the drawings are the preliminary design only. The design will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Request further information	of the proposed bunds shown on the Old Armoury Campsite so respondents can obtain a quote from building contractors. Respondent would like to apply for planning permission and construct bunds ahead of construction of the Project.	require further review and refinement at detailed design stage considering any further information procured before the final works can be confirmed. Any works undertaken privately for the scheme will likely only be considered after the detailed design is completed and the DCO is in place, a binding legal agreement is signed setting out both parties' obligations and if the costs are acceptable to National Highways.	
8			TR0200142	Bowes Bypass – Drainage / Flooding	Respondents representing Blacklodge Farm, Bowes express concern as the issue of the balancing pond position at Blacklodge Farm has not been altered following discussions and are concerned there will be further drainage issues in the fields.	Ponds and drainage were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. National Highways consulted on this ponds and drainage as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). A number of factors have been considered during the design process for the attenuation pond including ground levels, proposed road levels, and the location of the proposed outfalls in order to provide the most appropriate effective solution. The proposed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>pond adjacent to the Blacklodge Farm underpass has been located at a topographical low point relative to the outfall from the new proposed A66 carriageway.</p> <p>Overland flows from fields are considered as part of the design, and so, drainage ditches and filter drains are proposed where existing overland flows will be disrupted by the proposals. Ditches are proposed around the proposed balancing pond at Blacklodge Farm to carry flows into the nearest watercourse.</p> <p>Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
93			TR0200158	Drainage / Flooding	<p>Respondents representing Redlands Bank, Crackenthorpe express concern in respect to their field drains close to the Long Marton Junction, highlighting that their land currently does not flood and would expect it not to after construction.</p>	<p>Accommodation works and drains were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>We acknowledge your concerns about existing field drainage. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall and will consult with affected landowners or tenants accordingly. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been carried out the scheme and the findings have been considered as part of the drainage design and where necessary flood compensation measures have been included. Details of the FRA and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
15			TR0200111	Drainage / Flooding	<p>Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough, located to the north east of the access arrangement west of Brough, express concern regarding drainage. Some of the fields have shallow land drains. Respondents note the field does not flood at</p>	<p>Drains were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>The presence of field drains is noted. Field drains are private drains and are not National Highways responsibility to maintain. Works required to them</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					present therefore they would expect that the land would not flood during and after construction.	will form part of the Accommodation works package which will be discussed at the detailed design stage or during land purchase negotiations. Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	
2			TR0200141	Bowes Bypass – Drainage / Flooding	Respondents representing Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes express concern regarding drainage from the balancing pond which crosses the northern section of their farm tenancy stating it will not work satisfactorily. The current drain is at full capacity and if the balancing pond overflows, there will be a significant flood risk problem and requests more detail on what is proposed.	Ponds and drainage were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. National Highways consulted on ponds and drainage as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). The capacity of the attenuation pond will be designed in line with relevant design standards to ensure it does not overflow. The proposed ponds will attenuate water during periods of rain and will slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and watercourses. The ponds must also comply with the Project Design Principles (PDP) report (Application Document 5.11). Landscape integration design principle L117 restricts the depths of ponds to between 0.5 and 2m.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken for the Bowes Bypass scheme and the findings have been considered as part of the drainage design. Details of the FRA and the scheme drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
30			TR0200146	Drainage / Lack of Information	Respondent West Layton Nurseries, West Layton express concern regarding drainage, stating they are unsure of the proposed solution for draining the A66 carriageway and the fields at Ewe Bank Farm. They are concerned that any additional flows into the nearby Tutta Beck will cause flooding.	<p>A number of factors have been considered during the design process including ground levels, proposed road levels, the location of the proposed outfalls in order to provide an appropriate solution.</p> <p>The proposed ponds south of the Old Rectory and to the west of Tack Room Cottage have been located at a topographical low</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>point relative to the outfall from the new proposed A66 carriageway. Balancing ponds have been located up against the improved A66 to reduce land take and severance where practicable.</p> <p>In this location it is not practicable to drain the A66 to the north and directly into the River Tees due to distance and topography. This would result in deep pipework to convey the water, whereby Tutta Beck provides a closer solution.</p> <p>Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
32			TR0200147	Drainage / Request for Further Information	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Bowes express concern regarding the route of the outfall from the balancing pond at Bowes Junction, stating it unnecessarily goes through a neighbour's land, asking why the outflow is not more direct.	Following the supplementary consultation, the route of the outfall was refined to avoid unnecessary land take and take a shorter route to the proposed outfall location.	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
38			TR0200149	Drainage / Lack of Information	Respondents representing East Byre, Bowes express concern regarding the route and type of the outfall from the balancing pond at Bowes Junction, stating concern about potential flooding resulting from a ditch. They state the drawings provided are not detailed enough to give full details of the proposal however, it is noted that the drain now stands off the outbuildings of East Byre.	Following the supplementary consultation, the route of the outfall was refined to avoid unnecessary land take and take a shorter route to the proposed outfall location. Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	No
50	TR0200151			Drainage / Flooding	Respondent from Street Side farm, Cross Lanes express concern relating to the drains and their connectivity. Respondent does not want flooding to become an issue due to the improper installation of the fields' shallow ceramic drains.	The drainage design is in compliance with the standards set out by the Environment Agency and with the relevant design standards in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges,. The proposed attenuation ponds will attenuate water during periods of rain and will slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses to avoid overloading the system and causing flooding downstream.This discharge rate has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Therefore, there will be no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme, including in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>respect of drains linked to Street Side Farm.</p> <p>Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the existing network. Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of drainage issues and has informed the Project design.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken for the scheme and the findings have been considered as part of the drainage design. Details of the FRA and the scheme drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>With regard to existing field drainage. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						drainage to a new or existing outfall and will consult with affected landowners or tenants accordingly. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project.	
86			TR0200159	Drainage / Flooding	Respondents representing the Bowes and Romaldkirk Estate raise concern about the drainage of fields at Mid Lowfield Farm and East Lowfield Farm post works and following the construction of the scheme and the connection of the balancing pond outfalls adding extra stress to the existing old pipework.	The proposed balancing ponds will attenuate water during a storm event and slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses. Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	No
140			TR0200170	Drainage / Further Consultation	Respondents representing Beckstone, Newbiggin-on-Lune, Kirkby Stephen suggest a drainage consultation with landowners on the re-configuration of current drainage networks across the entire scheme.	Further discussions on drainage will continue into the detailed design stage and relevant stakeholders groups will be brought into the discussions. Details of the flood risk assessment and the current project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	
42			TR0200150	Drainage / Request further information	Respondents representing Ryedale House, Bowes express concern related to the impact the scheme will have on existing flooding issues along the north of the existing A66 at the culvert to the west of Stonebridge Farm; stating the existing issues were caused by the last construction works to build the Bowes Bypass in the 1980s. Respondents request further consultation.	<p>The drainage design has been designed to accommodate flows from the proposed balancing pond adjacent to Blacklodge Farm underpass and the overland flows from the fields north of the A66 via ditches.</p> <p>The ditches carry water east to the approximate location of the existing culvert that passes under the A66 west of Stonebridge Farm. Subject to further surveys, this is expected to require complete reconstruction as a result of the planned works.</p> <p>Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the scheme and the drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Furthermore, National Highways are committed to working with impacted stakeholders and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	
21			TR0200143, TR0200144, TR0200145, TR0200146, TR0200147, TR0200148, TR0200149	Engagement process/ consultation	Land Agent representing Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm, Bowes/High Broats Farm, Bowes/ Tree House Farm, Brignall/West Layton Nurseries, West Layton/Streatlam Grove Farm, Streatlam/ East Byre, Bowes expresses concern that they did not receive details from their clients until after the closure of the consultation and request documents be sent directly to them for future consultations.	<p>The comments about receiving the consultation material are noted however we have followed the necessary guidance and process for consultation directly with landowners or other interested parties. National Highways must follow the formal process and cannot be responsible for forwarding information to third parties.</p> <p>Any consultation required will be with the individual landowners, and where appropriate occupiers concerned, this applies to negotiations to acquire the interests in land that we require to deliver the Project. Please note 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						landowners concern in relation to Accommodation works can be progressed via this mechanism.	
6			TR0200ble, TR0200142	Engagement process/consultation	Land Agents representing Mid Lowfield farm, Bowes/Blacklodge Farm, Bowes express concern that they were not notified by their client until after the deadline and require notification at the same time as their client.	The comments about receiving the consultation material are noted however we have followed the necessary guidance and process for consultation directly with landowners or other interested parties. National Highways must follow the formal process and cannot be responsible for forwarding information to third parties.	No
29			TR0200146	Engagement process/WCH	Respondents representing West Layton Nurseries, West Layton suggest that they be consulted on the design of the diverted footpath to ensure it is fenced away from livestock to prevent any conflict between dogs and livestock as an example.	If the proposed works affect your property interest then at the next stage of detailed design you will be contacted to discuss the proposed design in relation to the impact on your property.	No
20			TR0200143	Bowes Bypass - Engagement process/access	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm and Low Broats Farm suggest they would appreciate further detail on the adoption of the track to the north of Stonebridge Farm, and to the east, asking who will be liable to maintain each part of the route. Additionally, they would like to	The road to the north of Stonebridge Farm, over the A66 via the East Bowes Accommodation Bridge, turning south at Low Broats Farm will be classified as a local road, an extension to The Street/Low Road. In relation to maintenance, article 9 of the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) sets out the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					understand the access arrangements to each holding.	persons that will be responsible for maintaining any new, altered or diverted streets and other structures	
108			TR0200164	Access	Respondents representing Brougham Castle farm, Brougham express concern that the proposed parallel access track (on the north side of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby Scheme) of 4m wide would be too narrow to allow agricultural vehicles to pass each other. Feel there should be private access so both blocks of land, either side of the A66, can be accessed.	The standard requirement for shared use access tracks across the Project is for a 4m width to be adopted which should allow ample room for the majority of vehicle movements expected along them. We note your comments about two-way movement and whilst this will be explored further at detailed design stage to determine what passing places could be provided at likely pinch points - it would also be anticipated that farmers/landowners will work together to ensure the efficient and safe use of the tracks. The access tracks included in the preliminary design layout will allow you access to land either side of the carriageway.	No
113			TR0200164	Access	Respondents representing Brougham Castle farm, Brougham suggest by separating Private Access Routes and public access routes it would reduce maintenance issues.	Your comments are duly noted in respect of the liability if separate access tracks were to be considered. However, it is felt that by creating additional access routes this could significantly increase the environmental impact of the Scheme/Project and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						consequently by combining access routes and making them multi-functional it is more efficient and the potential maintenance issues could be accommodated.	
166			TR0200111, TR0200112, TR0200142, TR0200154, TR0200158, TR0200159, TR0200185, TR0200186, TR0200167, TR0200168	Environmental mitigation /land take	Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough/ Blacklodge Farm Bowes/West End Farm, Bowes/ Redlands Bank, Crackenthorpe/ Bowes and Romaldkirk Estate/ West View Farm, Brough/ West End Farm, Bowes/ Rivercroft Farm, Kirkby Thore express concern stating there is no mention of environmental mitigation and that they are not getting the whole picture on how they will be affected.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project from what was presented at the Autumn 2021 statutory consultation. Information on these changes was provided in consultation brochures or the webpage for each set of changes consulted upon. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at the autumn 2021 consultation and made available as part of the supplementary consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment identifying refinements to mitigation proposals was not provided. Information was provided comparing the environmental impacts and effects	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the public interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the supplementary consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>Environmental mitigation is set out in the 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>Since our autumn 2021 consultation, National Highways has refined the mitigation plans. Several factors have influenced these changes. At our autumn 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is a reduction in area of the mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>As part of the winter update, an updated mapbook was published, which included the proposed environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The response to previous representations is provided within</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). Our response in relation to feedback received concerning environmental mitigation during our autumn 2021 consultation can be found in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).	
167			TR0200111,	Environment/land take	Respondent representing Helbeck Hall, Brough (located to the north east of the access arrangement west of Brough) suggest that any environmental mitigation which is required is located on less productive agricultural land.	National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take. As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation. The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the impacts to agricultural land holdings (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)).</p>	
53	TR0200140			Environment/consultation	<p>Respondents representing Transport Action Network express concern referring to the Planning Act 2008 stating that more people should be advised/ informed on the Project and its impacts. Further stating that the PEI Report has not been updated with the new impacts, and so consultees are unable to develop an informed view of the Project and its</p>	<p>The size and approach to the supplementary consultation on landform and noise bunds was tailored to the subject matter and the areas within which they were located. As the proposed design changes for landform and noise bunds were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>impacts, nor the cumulative impact of these changes across eight sections of route.</p>	<p>landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier Statutory Consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project, which would result in a design for the Project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative effects (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of the Project with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.</p> <p>An update or addendum to the PEI Report was therefore not required, as no changes would be reported. This information was</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						available to consultees as part of the consultation materials.	
171	ANON-N6YD-XGQE-P			Environment/pollution	Respondents representing Kirkby Stephen and District Walkers express concern regarding pollution of run-off in ponds and rivers.	The ponds have been designed to current design standards with due consideration of the water quality for any runoff that leaves the ponds and enters watercourses. The Environmental Statement, Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) assesses the potential effects of the drainage strategy and finds no significant effects as a result of the Project. Annex B7 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out a Ground and Surface Water management plan. This includes best practice measures water pollution preventions measures to be applied during construction. The Principal Contractor is required to update this plan in consultation with the relevant authorities.	No
51	TR0200140			Environment/consultation	Respondents representing Transport Action Network express concern regarding the Project stating it involves changes within an AONB and therefore significant to national importance. Further stating the same principle applies to internationally important	The proposed noise bunds and landform do not significantly impact on the designated areas referred to by the respondent. The Project team has engaged with Statutory Environmental Bodies throughout the design of the Project, including changes to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					habitats and species protected under the Habitats Directive, such as Special Conservation Areas (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Local, regional and national environmental organisations should be given the opportunity to respond, if the consultation is to be considered adequate.	the design following Statutory Consultation. In addition the feedback from Statutory Consultation in relation to potential for impact on designated areas (such as AONB and SAC) has been taken into account, as reported in ES chapter 6 Biodiversity and Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual and Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).	
31			TR0200112, TR0200158	Environment/land take	Respondents representing Redlands Bank, Crackenthorpe express concern regarding the potential impact from land take for species rich grassland and woodland creation near Rokeby and Long Marton junction respectively, stating it will widely impact their business' profitability.	Since the autumn consultation, we have undertaken further surveys to inform the mitigation required. Updated map books were also published in March 2022 as part of our winter update. 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is a reduction in area of the mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<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 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. Refer to ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>National Highways will discuss with 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 compensation can progress via this mechanism.	
137			TR0200168 TR0200167 TR0200164	Environmental Mitigation	Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham/ Skylin, Temple Sowerby/ Rivercroft farm, Kirkby Thore express concern over a future need for landowners to undertake a 'natural capital assessment', and that the Project is using land which owners would require to use in offsetting carbon from agricultural enterprises.	National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme including required mitigation measures, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take. 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 Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>by detailed assessments within separate appendices to ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 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 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) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>National Highways cannot comment on any possible future</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						requirements for carbon offsetting or natural capital.	
101	TR0200155		TR0200163, TR0200173, TR0200161, TR0200170	Environmental Mitigation/consultation	Respondents representing Stonebridge Farm, Bowes/Beckstone, Newbiggin-on-Lune, Kirkby Stephen/Winderwath, Penrith/West View Farm, Brough express concern relating to the lack of information provided on environmental mitigation, as it means they do not have all the information on how the proposals will impact their land/operations.	<p>The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are of relevance to.</p> <p>Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment identifying refinements to mitigation</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposals was not provided. However, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The PEI Report stated mitigation measures that might be required to reduce the effects of the construction and operation of the upgraded road are being developed. The topic chapters within the PEI Report gave an indication of the sorts of mitigation measures that could be used.</p> <p>At the statutory consultation stage, potential mitigation such as replacement habitats and landscape planting, had been identified through surveys, assessment and consultation. At this stage surveys were ongoing and the design was continuing to be developed. The mapbooks provided an overview of mitigation that was being considered based on a number of assumptions.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary Consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 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) 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>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>The response to previous representations is provided within the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). Our response in relation to feedback received concerning environmental mitigation during our Autumn 2021 consultation can be found in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p>	
116			TR0200164	Environmental Mitigation/ Oppose	<p>Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham oppose the proposals on the basis that the environmental mitigation has not been justified.</p>	<p>The environmental mitigation design for the Project has been undertaken in accordance with government guidance and requirements which sets out the obligations of projects such as this in terms of effects on the environment.</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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to consult with affected landowners through detailed design regarding mitigation proposals.</p>	
139			TR0200170	Environmental Mitigation/land take	<p>Respondents representing Beckstone, Newbiggin-on-Lune, Kirkby Stephen oppose the proposals, referring to the western corner of land between the A66 and the Railway Line on the map provided with the supplementary consultation materials:</p> <p>Supplementary consultation Temple Sowerby to Appleby Sheet 7 of 9. This land is vital to the continuation of a productive and efficient farming business and</p>	<p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>should not be considered for environmental mitigation.</p>	<p>As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the impacts to agricultural land (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
69			TR0200155	Environmental Mitigation/land take	<p>Respondents representing the Stonebridge Farm, Bowes suggest that any environmental mitigation taking place at land around Stonebridge Farm should happen on less productive land.</p>	<p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the impacts to agricultural land (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)).</p>	
81			TR0200159	Environmental Mitigation Request further information	<p>Respondents representing the Bowes and Romaldkirk Estate express concern for the mitigation of noise and light pollution and request information on the height of the embankment to west of Bowes Cross Farm from its existing level.</p>	<p>The embankment servicing the Accommodation overbridge in this area will be approximately 7m in height to ensure the required clearance over the A66 main line is achieved. The structure will not be lit. Environmental Statement, Chapter 12 Landscape and Visual considers the impact of light pollution and identifies that within this scheme the glare and light spillage from vehicle headlights would be substantially softened by the proposed planting. Therefore, there would be no significant effects from lighting during the operational phases of the scheme.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) does not record a significant noise effect as a result of the structure</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and no additional noise mitigation (noise barrier) is required.	
61	TR0200155			Financial / Land	Respondents representing the Stonebridge Farm, Bowes express concern over the bridge having a negative effect on the respondent's property value (at land at Stonebridge Farm).	National Highways acknowledges the response. We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. The preliminary design has indicated that the bridge location is the most suitable location after consideration of a number of design factors and constraints.	No
54	TR0200151			Financial / Land take	Respondent representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby expressing concern relating to the profitability of his business being impacted due to the scheme proposing to take considerable part of the land for environmental mitigation purposes (land at Street Side Farm).	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. Impacts and proposed mitigation are detailed within Environmental Statement (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).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>We have refined our mitigation plans since Statutory Consultation in the Autumn of 2021. Several factors have influenced these changes. At the time of Statutory 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) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The Project will purchase the land identified permanently, in order to meet targets in current guidance for mitigation unless agreements</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						are reached with landowners to take the land temporarily and for them to maintain any mitigation provided for a set period of time.	
64	TR0200155			Flooding/ Drainage	Respondents representing the Stonebridge Farm, Bowes express concern over the drainage plans and potential of flooding around Stonebridge.	<p>The proposed drainage design for the Project will address the increased run off created by the new infrastructure as well as capturing the runoff from the existing retained areas of highway within the Project limits.</p> <p>The new facilities are expected to improve upon the existing provision for the existing highway layout but will not address, in a lot of cases, any existing flooding issues that are not related to the Project or existing highway layout. Flood modelling has been carried out and assessments have been carried out for the specified design years in accordance with design guidance to identify the increased flood risk locations.</p> <p>Changes to potential flood risk has been modelled and assessed, showing that there is no significant change to flood risk as a result of the Project as shown in Appendix 14.2 Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.4).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
162			TR0200143	Bowes Bypass - Footpath/WCH	Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Boldron and Low Broats Farm, Bowes express concern regarding the footpath at the current crossing of the A66, stating as it is being redirected, they would like assurance in writing that this remains a footpath only and it will not be used either as a bridleway or cycleway.	The footways are designed to allow use by pedestrians. It is unlikely to be used as a bridleway or for use by cyclists under current proposals.	No
22			TR0200144	Footpath/WCH	Respondents representing High Broats Farm, Bowes express concern about details the location of the footpath in relation to the verge (which is not clear on the map) around High Broats Farm. If it falls within their ownership they wish for further consultation. Respondents concerned about livestock interacting with dog walkers.	Public footpaths will normally be segregated from private land. Any land required to segregate the footway will be identified within the proposed design and included in the order limits for purchase by National Highways. Throughout the rural environment in the UK there are many examples of where motorised vehicles share the same road space with walkers, cyclists, horse riders or livestock whether this be rural roads or Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT's). With carefully management, the shared use routes we are proposing can be sustained by responsible use and management. The Highway Code and countryside Code apply to users of the shared tracks.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
7			TR0200142	Bowes Bypass – Footpath / WCH	<p>Respondents representing Blacklodge Farm, Bowes oppose the current re-direction of their footpath at Blacklodge Farm stating it is now in an eastward direction through the underpass and then along the southern side of the carriageway until it reconnects with the second part of the footpath in a south westerly direction. This footpath proposal gives potential for conflict with livestock that are penned or are being forced through the underpass at the same time as parties wish to pass and repass under the underpass. Respondents suggest directing the footpath in a westerly direction instead.</p>	<p>The redirection of the existing public footpath has been designed to utilise the existing underpass to the east which will be extended. To go to the west would require either the provision of an extended underpass, beneath the A66 and the slip lanes from the junction, or you would direct users through the existing A67 underpass which would be a significant diversion for walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Throughout the rural environment in the UK there are many examples of where motorised vehicles share the same road space with walkers, cyclists, horse riders or livestock whether this be rural roads or Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT's). With carefully management, the shared use routes we are proposing can be sustained by responsible use and management. The Highway Code and countryside Code apply to users of the shared tracks.</p>	No
16			TR0200143	Bowes Bypass - Footpath/WCH	<p>Respondent representing Bowes Cross Farm and Low Broats Farm support the provision of the access track to the south of the A66 from the Accommodation</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your support for the provision of the access track.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					bridge. The respondent would like to see further detail of track to avoid potential future problems.		
163			TR0200111,	General Support	Respondent representing Helbeck Hall, Brough expressing support for the dualling of the A66 as a whole and the proposed route (Black-Blue-Black) for the Appleby to Brough section.	National Highways thanks you for your support of for the proposed route option for Appleby to Brough as well as the Project as a whole.	No
26			TR0200112	General Alternatives	Respondents representing Ewebank Farm, Kirkby Thore express concern as to why The Rectory is not being used as an option for A66 route suggesting that the route could go through the Rectory.	Changes to the route at Rokeby was not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. NH consulted on the dualling of the A66 at Rokeby as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).. The route alternative through the Rectory has been considered and has been discounted as the Rectory is a valuable local asset, forming part of the historic landscape of the area. Historic England and other stakeholders would object to any demolition works. The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) sets out the history and development of the Project,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						with ES Chapter 3 Assessment of Alternatives (Application Document 3.2) setting out the environmental context of that in further detail. The preferred option does not impact the Rectory.	
39	TR0200140			General Consultation	Respondent stating the design changes should have been included in Statutory Consultation, the consultation has been inadequate, a new Statement of Community Consultation should have been issued and an updated Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEI Report) should have been produced.	As the proposed design changes subject to consultation were local in nature and/or related to particular issues and would not have resulted in a project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. The consultations have been undertaken in line with the principles and methods set out in the Project's SoCC, published prior to the Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021. Supplementary consultations were anticipated and appropriately addressed in this SoCC (Annex G) at paragraph 5.9, that states: "If as a result of feedback from this statutory consultation or from our pre consultation engagement, the proposals change to the extent that it is necessary to undertake further targeted consultation, this will be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the principles and methods set out in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>this SoCC, to the extent they are relevant to the targeted consultation.”</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in DCLG’s Guidance on the Pre-Application Process (March 2015). This states: “In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, supplementary consultation.” (Paragraph 76)</p> <p>As the supplementary consultation was not statutory consultation under s47, a new Statement of Community Consultation was not required. The supplementary consultation has been undertaken in accordance with requirements of Government guidance and the approach and principles set out in the SoCC (as relevant).</p> <p>Regarding the point about the PEI Report, proposed design changes were reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>Due to their relatively small-scale, none of the changes presented at the supplementary consultation were considered to materially affect the environmental effects at the Project-wide level nor significantly alter in-combination effects as set out in the PEI report. The Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative effects (Application document 3.2) sets out the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of the Project with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The PEI Report document was a preliminary assessment of environmental impacts. The information detailed in the PEI Report has been developed and built upon and is now set out in the Environment Statement (ES) which is submitted as part of the DCO application	
175	TR0200140			General Consultation	Respondent express concern that there has been no publicity about this consultation on the National Highways' social media, including the specific A66 Twitter account, nor on National Highways' A66 Facebook page. National Highways have been posting about unrelated issues (such as women's rights), but there has been no attempt to notify the public about the consultation through their social media channels. Respondent also states the only place where this significant, route-long consultation has been publicised in a National Highways page that is not specific to the A66: their national consultation hub.	The approach to publicity was appropriate given the targeted issues and local nature of the changes proposed and that the consultation was undertaken with specific individuals and groups who were communicated with directly to inform them of the consultation and explain how they could respond. As such, we haven't done a press release or published content on social media. We updated our National Highways platforms for the Winter update alongside the consultation summary (in March 2022). All of the information regarding the supplementary consultations is held within National Highways' Citizenspace website, and is available for those who are affected. The approach to publicising the supplementary consultations (and associated	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						events where it was found that these were needed) had been discussed with the host local authorities before commencing the consultation.	
45	TR0200140			General/consultation	Respondent expresses concern stating there was a lack of public events and the consultation brochure and website do not include any details of organised in-person public events, despite it being a major consultation into significant changes along the entire 50 mile route, which will have a huge impact on the environment, on local, regional and cross-country traffic, and on the tourist and leisure industry.	Following the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021, further work has been undertaken to improve the Project design in certain locations and changes have been made to the proposals. These changes have been made primarily to reduce the impacts on the environment and local communities. The supplementary consultations has been held directly with landowners, stakeholders and statutory organisations on the changes to the design. The intention has been to seek feedback from these specific consultees on the changes as they related to their property interests or responsibilities. In-person events for supplementary consultation matters were held in spring 2022 for those supplementary consultations where we communicated the consultation to people living and working in the vicinity of the proposed design change to give them the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						opportunity to ask us questions. Where there were not in-person events, those receiving notification letters were offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests. The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting.	
17			TR0200111	General/ Land/ Environmental Mitigation/ Drainage/ PRow/ Liability of Infrastructure	<p>Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express support for the proposed route at Appleby to Brough subject to the following concerns (relating to land to the north east of the access arrangement west of Brough):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land taken is reduced 2. Environmental mitigation is reduced 3. Drainage is properly assessed and connected 4. No further rights of way are connected 5. No liability of infrastructure 	<p>National Highways would make the following comments against each of the subjects you are concerned with:</p> <p>Land taken is reduced - the Project will only take land permanently where it is required for the construction of the works. Environmental mitigation - the Project is providing mitigation in accordance with current legislation and will try and keep it to the minimum required.</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. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>Drainage properly assessed and connected - preliminary drainage design has been carried out to assess the Project requirements. Details of the flood risk assessment and the project drainage design can be found in Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy which forms part of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The intention of the Project is not to create new rights of way but to re-connect existing rights of way severed by the proposed works. A new parallel cycling and walking route running between Brough, and Appleby is to be created to the north of the new A66.</p> <p>No liability of infrastructure - the majority of the infrastructure created will be owned and maintained by National Highways or the local authority. There may be elements such as private means of access, where the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						persons with the benefit of those means of access would be responsible for their maintenance. Article 9 of the draft Development Consent Order (Application Document 5.1) sets out the arrangements for the maintenance of new or altered streets and structures.	
36		Warcop Parish Council		Appleby to Brough - General/ Land	Warcop Parish Council stating it is unclear from the plans whether the Appleby to Brough section (specifically referring to Appleby to Brough Map Sheet 4 of 5 in the Supplementary Consultation materials) will benefit from any of these man-made hills. Suggestion is that they should be considered where the road passes close to properties around Sandford, the Sandford Junction with the B6259 and where it is being raised due to flooding and protected species.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) sets out the Project design within the Appleby to Brough scheme and an indication of how mitigation measures such as landscape bunds could be implemented within Order Limits is illustrated in Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). Embankments within the offline section of the route are proposed to be planted with species rich grasslands that are suitable for invertebrate habitat. These areas would provide additional ecological benefits and the mixed species woodland would provide seasonal variation, screening, and would break the linearity of the route.	No
33			ANON-N6YD-XGQY-A,	General/ Property	Respondent from County Durham suggesting that further work is required to protect Cross Lanes	The proposed earthworks associated with the junction and side roads at Cross Lanes will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>from the A66 and the new service road which is now running directly adjacent to the shop and cafe. The respondent is concerned that the bunds and landscaping directly impact on their land and that they will lose valuable land adjacent to their business. One section will be completely isolated with no access. The land is organic and if damaged it will take a number of years to get the organic status returned. The land immediately to the West of the shop will be lost. The land to the south west is impacted by temporary occupation and the Amphitheatre events centre and access to it needs to be protected along with solar panels and the reed beds on that land. the existing greenhouse area was in the process of becoming a garden centre and the new plans will stop this.</p>	<p>reviewed and alternative retaining solutions considered during detailed design, with a view to minimise land take and avoid impacting the business of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop and Cafe, within the constraints of what is required in order to deliver this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the potential impact of the Project on local businesses.</p> <p>During construction, at Cross Lane Organic Farm Shop the works within the northern portion of the site will result in the partial loss of parking and approximately 20% of the Farm Shop's land. Following consultation with the landowner, it was identified that the land is utilised as staff parking and the loss would not compromise the viability of the business. During consultation it was noted that by amending the location of the slip road, to its current design, the scheme was able to reduce its land take on the business. This represents a</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>moderate impact due to a partial loss of/damage to key characteristics of the business which will result in a permanent effect that is moderate adverse and significant.</p> <p>It should be noted that access to the Cross Lane Organic Farm Shop and the Smithy on Cross Lanes will be maintained for the duration of the construction works, to prevent significant adverse effects regarding accessibility.</p> <p>During operation, at Cross Lane Organic Farm Shop, a new access will be provided via the realigned Moorhouse Lane. The impact to the business is negligible and not significant as the proposed access is situated close to the existing access.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to consult with affected landowners through detailed design, in relation to Accommodation works. .</p>	
178	TR0200140			General Consultation	Respondent expresses concern regarding paragraphs 75-76 of the pre-application guidance for the Planning Act 2008 and argue that the changes outlined in the supplementary consultations have	Following the Statutory Consultation in the autumn of 2021, further work has been undertaken to improve the project design in certain locations and changes have been made to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>been so substantial that they do materially impact on the scheme, especially its combined environmental impacts.</p>	<p>proposals. These changes have been made primarily to reduce the impacts on the environment and local communities. The Supplementary Consultation has been held directly with landowners, stakeholders and statutory organisations on the changes to the design. The intention was to seek feedback from these specific consultees on the changes as they related to their property interests or responsibilities.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in). These states: "In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, targeted consultation." (Paragraph 76)</p> <p>To accord with this Guidance we applied three tests (as set out in paragraph 73 of the guidance) to judge whether targeted consultation on a particular issue or within a local area was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of sufficient scale (the physical nature of the change). 	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It introduces material change to the environmental impacts of the Project. • The level of public interest in the change as expressed during consultation. <p>A decision was made on holding Supplementary Consultation if the design changes proposed met one or more of these tests. As all the design changes proposed were both local in nature and/or related to a particular issue and did not impact the overall Project in a manner that would make it fundamentally different to that which was presented at Statutory Consultation between 24 September 2021 to 6 November 2021 it was concluded that further statutory consultation on the entire Project was not required.</p> <p>National Highways paid due consideration to the requirements in the PA 2008 as to whether supplementary statutory and non-statutory consultation was needed when assessing the extent of the project changes post Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021. Our decision to undertake the supplementary consultation took cognisance of the PA 2008's</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>requirements and the relevant guidance.</p> <p>Where proposed design changes would directly impact a persons with an interest in the land (PILs), the consultation activity was targeted at the impacted landowners or interests. In these cases, we also involved the relevant host authorities so all changes made in all supplementary consultations could be considered at a more strategic level.</p> <p>Regarding comments about combined environmental impacts, Due to their relatively small-scale, none of the changes presented at the supplementary consultation were considered to materially affect the environmental effects at the Project-wide level - nor significantly alter in-combination effects as set out in the PEI report. The Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative and In-Combination effects (Application document 3.02) set out the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of the Project with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.	
40	TR0200140			General/consultation	Respondent expresses concern regarding the adequacy of the consultations for this scheme. Concern raised that the subsequent supplementary consultations have become worse, with consultations being fragmented, conducted in semi-secrecy, with poor publicity, little or no attempt to inform the public or relevant.	<p>The design of the Project has matured and developed since the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. In some locations the changes required have identified the need for additional supplementary consultation to be carried out. The supplementary consultation, similar to the Statutory Consultation, gives those who may be directly impacted the opportunity to comment on a specific element of the proposed design changes.</p> <p>The size and approach to the supplementary consultation on landform and noise bunds was tailored to the subject matter and the areas within which they were located. As the proposed design changes for landform and noise bunds were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier Statutory Consultation on</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the Project) as the landforms and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project, which would result in a design for the Project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. Refer to Chapter 7 for our approach to this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>The Supplementary Consultation has been held directly with landowners, stakeholders and statutory organisations on the changes to the design. The intention was to seek feedback from these specific consultees on the changes as they related to their property interests or responsibilities.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in the Guidance, which states: "In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, targeted consultation." (Paragraph 76)</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>To accord with this Guidance we applied three tests (as set out in paragraph 73 of the guidance) to judge whether targeted consultation on a particular issue or within a local area was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of sufficient scale (the physical nature of the change). • It introduces material change to the environmental impacts of the Project. • The level of public interest in the change as expressed during consultation. <p>A decision was made on holding Supplementary Consultation if the design changes proposed met one or more of these tests. As all the design changes proposed were both local in nature and/or related to a particular issue and did not impact the overall Project in a manner that would make it fundamentally different to that which was presented at Statutory Consultation between 24 September 2021 to 6 November 2021 it was concluded that further statutory consultation on the entire Project was not required.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						National Highways paid due consideration to the requirements in the PA 2008 as to whether supplementary statutory and non-statutory consultation was needed when assessing the extent of the project changes post Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021. Our decision to undertake the supplementary consultation took cognisance of the PA 2008's requirements and the relevant guidance.	
181	TR0200140			General/consultation	Transport Action Network expresses concern regarding the consultation maps stating there are 29 with no analysis of the environmental impact assessments. And the maps for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section show 17 new compounds or landforms that were not consulted on during the autumn 2021 Statutory Consultation.	The design of the Project has matured and developed since the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. In some locations the changes required have identified the need for additional supplementary consultation to be carried out. The supplementary consultation, similar to the Statutory Consultation, gives those who may be directly impacted the opportunity to comment on a specific element of the proposed design changes. Regarding environmental impacts, each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the supplementary consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment identifying refinements to mitigation proposals was not provided. However, information was provided within each consultation brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>Regarding compounds and landforms, since Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021 the proposed design for the Project has developed on a number of the schemes, this has led to further design refinements including to landforms and noise bunds and a review of the proposed site compounds. The site compound areas are key to the efficient construction of the works and to help reduce construction traffic movements. The landowners impacted by any changed or new compound locations have been</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consulted as part of our supplementary consultations which were targeted to specific issues or locations.</p> <p>It is important to note however that compound locations are not fixed at this time, pending the detailed design The size and number are also subject to final evaluation based on detailed temporary works design.</p>	
172			TR0200147	General/ Lack of Information/ Drainage Design	<p>Respondents representing Bowes Cross Farm, Bowes express concern regarding land immediately to the south east of Bowes regarding the outflow of the pipe stating they do not have any details as to whether this is a ditch or a pipe and how this will be fenced or dealt with, because we have little detail, we would ask to be able to reserve our judgements and further consultations until we have the detail to make decisions on the pipe in question.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your concerns regarding an outflow pipe in land close to Bowes.</p> <p>In the land immediately to the SE of Bowes is an open drainage ditch which connects the proposed attenuation pond, located adjacent the A66 by Bowes junction, to the existing water course which passes under the Street to the east of Bowes. The land for the ditch will be purchased permanently to construct the scheme and the ditch will be fenced off from private land unless agreement is reached with landowners.</p>	No
48	TR0200140			General/consultation	<p>Respondents representing Transport Action Network express concern regarding the status of the consultation stating the</p>	<p>The design of the Project has matured and developed since the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. In some locations the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>position of the compounds and land forming should have been included in the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. The failure to include these crucial elements illustrates the rushed and flawed way that National Highways approached the Statutory Consultation.</p>	<p>changes required have identified the need for additional supplementary consultation to be carried out. The supplementary consultation, similar to the Statutory Consultation, gives those who may be directly impacted the opportunity to comment on a specific element of the proposed design changes.</p> <p>Since Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021 the proposed design for the Project has developed on a number of the schemes, this has led to further design refinements including to landforms and noise bunds and a review of the proposed site compounds. The site compound areas are key to the efficient construction of the works and to help reduce construction traffic movements.</p> <p>The majority of the compounds will be established to temporarily store materials excavated during the works. The compounds will be in place for as long as required or until the works are completed. The site compound areas will either be returned to their former land use or be landscaped as part of the scheme.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Chapter 5 of the Consultation Report (Application document 4.4) provides an overview of our approach to statutory consultation in accordance with sections 42, 46, 47 and 48 of the PA 2008 and the accompanying provisions of the APFP Regulations. Careful consideration was given to ensure there was a full opportunity to engage with the Project and the environmental information, in a way that allowed people to understand, influence and contribute to its development. We discussed with the host local authorities the extension of the consultation period from 30 days to 6 weeks to address the host local authorities' concerns that the period proposed was not long enough for the public to consider the consultation material and respond.</p> <p>While the consultation period is the formal opportunity to respond, it is part of a wider ongoing engagement and consultation ongoing process. The project team have been extensively engaging with a wide range of stakeholder groups in order to share evolving designs, understand feedback and amend</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the emerging design. The designs brought forward at statutory consultation were a cumulation of many months of proactive engagement with landowners, communities and stakeholders who have been actively involved in their development.</p> <p>National Highways paid due consideration to the requirements in the PA 2008 as to whether supplementary statutory and non-statutory consultation was needed when assessing the extent of the project changes post Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021. Our decision to undertake the supplementary consultation took cognisance of the PA 2008's requirements and the relevant guidance.</p>	
27			TR0200112	General/ land take/design	<p>Respondents in the Rokeby area express concern regarding future viability of the current farming operation. Due to proposed junction and the proposed ponds, the layout splits the farm into two and takes a considerable amount of land, meaning the farm will not be commercially viable.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the respondent regarding the future viability of their farm operation at Rokeby.</p> <p>With regards to the attenuation pond that splits the farm into two parts, there is a shared use access track adjacent to the A66 being provided which should allow access to the fields, either side of the pond.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The highway design will be confirmed during detailed design stage and the drainage design will be reviewed and updated following the receipt of more detailed topographical data. At this point the land take of the proposed balancing ponds will be re-evaluated.</p> <p>The design and the District Valuer will continue to liaise with the affected landowner during detailed design to understand the impacts and confirm the design.</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to supplementary Consultation ‘Landform and noise bunds’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
37	ANON-N6YD-XGQB-K			Noise	Respondents express concern relating to lack of landform bunds/noise mitigation at Low Broomrigg stating it therefore seems there will be no attempt to reduce the noise, which will be considerable.	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) undertakes a comprehensive noise assessment of both the construction and operational phases of the Project. The assessment concludes that with the application of the embedded design mitigation which includes low noise road surface, earthwork bunds and road in cutting there are only three locations where additional noise mitigation (noise barriers) is required.	No
155			TR0200158	Land take	Respondents express concern regarding the design of the section around proposed Long Marton Junction. The proposed junction on the will inhibit agricultural production on that block of land. The block of land is in close proximity to the farmstead and is valuable land to the business.	The design of this section of the A66 has considered a number of factors and constraints in determining the preferred design solution. Stakeholder views have been considered as part of the preliminary design process, as outlined in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1). We will continue to work with all impacted landowners throughout detailed design.	No
5			TR0200158	Consultation	Respondents express concern stating that we had not received	It was stated in the consultation documentation that National	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					any feedback on the Statutory Consultation documents of my letter of the 3rd of November 2021 and my client was unaware of any changes to the design around the Long Marton junction until the 15th February, and given that the design was not just a slight amendment it involves a whole new junction being proposed.	Highways' responses to any feedback received from affected parties or stakeholders would be captured and provided via the Project Consultation Report which would be made available following the DCO submission. The supplementary consultation event intended to bring affected parties up to date with Project changes since Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021.	
11			TR0200158	General / Drainage	Respondents express concern questioning the feasibility and ability to install the ponds (in the vicinity of the proposed Long Marton junction) to the south the respondent suggests it drains to the north of the A66.	National Highways consulted on drainage as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). The pond has been located on the southern side of the A66 (in the vicinity of Long Marton junction) to allow maintenance access.	No
41	TR0200140			Consultation	Respondents express the view that the Project is in effect eight or nine separate NSIPs in their own right, along a 50-mile stretch, rolled into one £1 billion mega-scheme. If this rolled-up approach is to be taken, then it is even more important that all the changes are assessed together,	A cumulative impact assessment has been undertaken of the project as whole - taking account the combined impacts from the individual schemes (including the changes to these schemes that have been subject to supplement consultation). This cumulative impact is reported in the ES	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					to enable consultees to form an informed view of the combined and cumulative impacts.	(chapter 15). There is no requirement for a consultation on the cumulative impact assessment that forms part of the Environmental Statement, before submission of our DCO application, although there was an opportunity to consider and feedback on the cumulative impact assessment undertaken and reported in the PEIR (Chapter 15) as part of the Autumn 21 statutory consultation. The proposed design changes identified following responses to the autumn consultation were reviewed to determine whether they would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Due to their relatively small-scale, none of the changes presented at the supplementary consultation were considered to materially affect the environmental effects at the Project-wide level nor significantly alter in-combination effects as set out in the PEI Report. As mentioned above, the Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative effects [Application Document 3.2] sets out the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of the Project with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.	
35			ANON-N6YD-XGQY-A	General/land take	Respondents express concern stating the bunds and landscaping at Cross Lanes directly impact on consultees' land and results in loss of valuable land adjacent to the business. One section will be completely isolated with no access.	National Highways consulted on this junction as part of the statutory consultation in autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). The Project will look to maintain access to all areas of land which are in landowner's ownership or are used as part of their business. Since the autumn 2021 consultation, the proposed Scargill	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Road link from Moorhouse Lane to Rutherford Lane has also been rerouted to the north of Cross Lanes Organic Farm Shop, parallel but separate to the A66 before turning southwest to connect to the B6277 overbridge. This change follows feedback from Statutory Consultation and ongoing stakeholder engagement, which highlighted concerns about the Farm Shop and the practicality of being surrounded by roads on four sides and led to a more optimised solution. The update also allows views to the south from the restaurant to be maintained, minimises disruption to adjacent farming businesses through reducing the amount of productive farmland required for construction and reduces potential negative impacts on Tutta Beck and habitats there.</p> <p>Similarly, any required accommodation works in relation to your property and business will be identified and developed during the detailed design and construction phases of the Project. Discussions with landowners and business owners will continue through later stages of the Project.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
157			TR0200158	General / Design	Respondents express concern stating the Project could impact on the Appleby Horse Fair and the restrictions with regards to design and safety standards. We do not accept this. Our client's proposal will not impact on Appleby Horse Fair, and the slip road can be made to safety standards as [National] Highways will be doing for the rest of the scheme.	Initial assessments indicate the suggested option cannot be progressed as it would not meet design standards and could present a significant hazard to road users. As outlined in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1), access arrangements in this location also need to consider potential impacts on the Appleby Horse Fair site.	No
10			TR0200158	General / WCH	Respondents express concern regarding the proposed Rights of Way arrangements around Long Marton Junction. They do not see the logic in having an additional right of way going up a track and across a field to finish at the same location, taking further agricultural land out of production.	The existing Public Rights of Way highlighted will remain operational under the proposed scheme with the only change being it will be re-directed under the A66 via an underpass to re-connect on the other side. The new access track to the west of the existing track is provided to allow maintenance access to the proposed pond from the public highway.	No
49	TR0200140			General / Consultation	Respondents express concern regarding poor publicity for supplementary consultation. Respondents state that only a handful of local people had leaflets through their doors, otherwise they would never have heard about it. Respondents state people who live slightly	The design of the Project has matured and developed since the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. In some locations the changes required have identified the need for additional supplementary consultation to be carried out. The supplementary consultation, similar to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>further away, but still use the A66, were not informed, nor were national and regional groups.</p>	<p>Statutory Consultation, gives who may be directly impacted the opportunity to comment on a specific element of the proposed design changes.</p> <p>The size and approach to the supplementary consultation on landform and noise bunds was tailored to the subject matter and the areas within which they were located. As the proposed design changes for landform and noise bunds were local in nature and related to a particular issue, they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale supplementary consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier Statutory Consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project which would result in a design for the Project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. As the supplementary consultation was not route wide, notifications were</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						sent to interested stakeholders and landowners. Those receiving notification letters were offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests. The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting and a link to online information and feedback forms.	
55	TR0200140			General/ WCH	Respondents express concern that the new compounds and landforms cross the River Eden Special Conservation Area (SAC) and directly impact on the Chapel Wood County Wildlife Site and the new walking and cycling infrastructure should have been consulted on more widely amongst walking and cycling groups.	There are a number of site compound and landform areas that are located in proximity to the River Eden SAC. These areas are required for the construction of the Project including for the storage of excavated materials. Most site compound areas will be returned to their former use after completion of the main construction works (refer to Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 2 The Project for further information). Landform areas are required to integrate some of the Project features into the landscape and to maximise the re-use of the affected land back to agriculture or farming where practicable. ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) identifies that Chapel Wood (Appleby in Westmorland) CWS,	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and Chapel Wood Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) lie adjacent to the Order Limits south of Temple Sowerby to Appleby. Potential construction impacts identified include habitat degradation through potential dust deposition from dust emitting activities, accidental encroachment onto sensitive habitats and minor temporary habitat loss.</p> <p>Site-specific measures regarding dust emitting activities from construction or haul routes are secured within the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7). Fencing will be used in order to ensure no accidental encroachment on retained habitats. Works adjacent to this site will be 50m away from the boundary of the ancient woodland habitat, avoiding the potential for impacts to trees within the ancient woodland habitat, or for loss of, or damage to ground flora.</p> <p>Following application of the above embedded mitigation, slight adverse (not significant) effects are predicted on Chapel Wood (Appleby in Westmorland) CWS and Chapel Wood ASNW.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						National Highways have engaged with walking, cycling and horse-riding groups throughout preliminary design and consultation and engagement on the Project, particularly through the walking, cycling and horse-riding focus group, which includes invited representatives from Sustrans, Cycling UK, the British Horse Society and local and regional walking, cycling and horse-riding organisations along the route. This group has met every 2-3 months during 2021 and 2022 to receive updates on the project and for the Project team to obtain feedback on the design and specific aspects of the project relating to WCH proposals. The project has also engaged regional tourism bodies and the local authorities throughout this process.	
47	TR0200140			General Consultation	Respondents express concern that there is a lack of adequate and clear information and detail in the consultation documents. The documents comprise only a four-page consultation brochure, a feedback form, and eight maps. The maps are extremely detailed and difficult to read, requiring them to be magnified to 200%.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project from what was presented at the autumn 2021 statutory consultation. Information on these changes was provided in consultation brochures and/or the webpage for each set of changes consulted upon. The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>And that the maps were far too technical.</p>	<p>consultation brochure provided during the consultation, detailed the information on the design changes proposed for walking, cycling and horse riding, landforms and noise bunds and construction compounds. It also informed the reader on how to provide feedback. An email and phone number was provided should anyone have any specific questions they wished to discuss. Those receiving notification letters were offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests. The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting.</p> <p>This was a focused consultation, on the specific design changes proposed, and the approach including those consulted, the material provided, and the duration of the consultation was proportionate to the scale and nature of the changes. A webpage link to the statutory consultation materials was provided to ensure these changes could be understood in the wider context of the overall design.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the public interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process).</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate</p>	
165			TR0200111	General/drainage/land	<p>Respondents express concern with regards to the proposed pond north of West View, asking if it is necessary. They question the reasoning behind this as unsure why it is happening on this specific area of land. They also assume National Highways will purchase that land if it cannot be reduced/improved.</p>	<p>NH consulted on ponds as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>The preliminary drainage design has identified the need for the pond and considered a number of factors when making this decision including levels and outfall locations. The size and location of all ponds will be confirmed during the detailed design stage. Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the drainage network and its capacity. Refinements to the design will then</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						be made where necessary. It should be noted that significant changes are not expected as we will be constrained by the limits of the DCO area and the commitments that are made in the Environmental Management Plan..	
169			TR0200145	General/ Support	Respondents express support for the Project stating they are happy with the proposals.	National Highways acknowledges the comments supporting our proposals.	No
25			TR0200112	General/ land take	Respondents oppose location for current A66 scheme stating the best route is to construct the proposed A66 through the Rectory (Rokeby) meaning less land is taken and a residential property is not left between two roads.	<p>The proposed dualling at Rokeby was not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. National Highways consulted on dualling at Rokeby as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4)..</p> <p>Following Statutory Consultation the decision was made to adopt the black option after due consideration of the constraints and survey information gathered. The preferred route avoids demolition of the Old Rectory whilst providing a compliant standard of dual carriageway.</p> <p>Historic England, a key consultee, have also stated that they would</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						not support demolishing the Old Rectory or moving the alignment as that would impact upon the setting of the nearby Church and the Registered Park and Garden.	
19			TR0200111	General/consultation	Respondents oppose the idea that the consultation regarding the site compound close to West View Farm happened in autumn stating the area was marked as species rich grassland therefore they did not have chance to comment in the autumn consultation.	The area for the site compound was not included in the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021. This is why there has been further consultation. The design for the scheme has developed with the provision of additional information to inform the design and as a result of input from the various design teams involved in the Project. It has been identified that a temporary storage area for materials is required and an area has subsequently been included in the Order limits which is adjacent to the proposed junction. The area for storage is a temporary requirement and once the scheme is constructed the land will be landscaped and become grassland.	No
153			ANON-N6YD-XGQF-Q	General / Traffic and Transport	Respondents suggest an appropriate all-age play area provided for Sandersons Croft as mitigation for the disturbance that is going to be caused by the road being so near. There needs to be strict speed limits along Main	The Project unfortunately cannot provide the public amenities you request as the funding for the Project does not cover these types of works. The scheme proposals will greatly reduce the amount of traffic that	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>Street and Fell Lane because a lot of children live on the Croft. They either walk to the village school or walk down to the village shop to catch the school bus for Appleby Grammar School.</p>	<p>runs through the village of Kirkby Thore, particularly along Main Street. The proposals should ensure that traffic travelling to locations such as British Gypsum and Long Marton will no longer need to travel through the village thus will reduce traffic numbers significantly. National Highways are aware of the current traffic flows and issues through talking and consulting with local businesses and residents.</p> <p>Impacts and proposed mitigation with regard to Air Quality and Noise are detailed within Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2)</p> <p>We will continue to consult with stakeholders during the construction works to reduce traffic speeds and traffic movements whilst the new A66 carriageway and junctions are being constructed.</p> <p>In terms of safety, it should be noted that all designs are carried out to latest standards and are also subject to a Road Safety Audit which is undertaken by independent auditors</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
173	ANON-N6YD-XGQ9-A			General/alternatives/landscaping	Respondents suggest proposed landscaping would be unnecessary if a northern route [understood to refer to proposed dualling around Warcop] is adopted.	The landscaping and bunding has been designed for specific purposes at each location but will be further reviewed and refined at detailed design. Landscape design is provided for a number of reasons including landscape views and habitat for creatures such as birds. National Highways assumes this relates to requests for the route to go further north at Warcop. We acknowledge 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 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 by policies of the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) and by legislation as a nationally designated site.	No
46	TR0200140			General/consultation	Respondents suggest that an in-person event would have been beneficial, people were denied the opportunity to look at maps	Following the Statutory Consultation in the Autumn 2021, further work has been undertaken to improve the Project design in certain locations and changes have	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					and ask questions of NH's professional staff.	<p>been made to the proposals. These changes have been made primarily to reduce the impacts on the environment and local communities. The Supplementary Consultation has been held directly with landowners, stakeholders and statutory organisations on the changes to the design. The intention has been to seek feedback from these specific consultees on the changes as they related to their property interests or responsibilities. In-person events for supplementary consultation matters were held in spring 2022 for those supplementary consultations where we communicated the consultation to a wider community to give them the opportunity to ask us questions.</p> <p>In areas where there were no in-person public events during the supplementary consultation, those receiving notification letters were instead offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests. The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
153			ANON-N6YD-XGQF-Q	General/noise	Respondents support land form and noise bunds stating that landscaped bunds are essential to hide the road and vehicles and to help lessen the noise that is going to be generated from a big road.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the Project. Where appropriate landscaped bunds will be used to lessen the impact of the new road and integrate it into the landscape.	No
169			TR0200145	Information/consultation/Accommodation works	Respondents express concern that given the scheme is at outline stage, the respondent would like to reserve the right to discuss further detail around accommodation works and drainage issues at a later date.	Accommodation works were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. Accommodation works will be progressed in the detailed design stage. Any accommodation works required 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. Further discussions on any identified accommodation works	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.	
149			TR0200173	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Junction Design/ Land	Respondents suggest lowering the proposed junction levels near to Center Parcs in order to reduce area needed for landform.	The design of the proposed junction near to Center Parcs has been carried out in accordance with current design standards. If the junction were to be lowered it will provide concerns in being able to comply with the highways design standards and would impact the scheme extents.	No
88			TR0200159	Land take/ Property	Respondents express concern as a new topsoil / laydown / storage area is proposed on land at Mid Lowfield Farm which would take a building on the outer perimeter of this land, out of operation.	National Highways will continue to engage with impacted landowners in the next phase of scheme development to discuss amongst other things, details of accommodation works and temporary storage areas. In this case, the area shown is indicative and was drawn to match field boundary lines; the intention is not to take the building in question for use as a topsoil storage area.	No
68	TR0200155			Land take/ Environment	Respondents express concern over the amount of productive agricultural land proposed to be taken from respondent for environmental mitigation, as shown in the Autumn 2021 consultation.	National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the land subject to compulsory acquisition	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and ow these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the impacts to agricultural land (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Health (Application Document 3.2)).	
78			TR0200159	Land take/design	Respondents express concern relating to the amount of land that will be acquired as a direct result of revised plans for the A66 (around Mid Lowfield Farm and East Lowfield Farm and land to the east of Stonebridge Farm and west of Bowes Cross Farm).	<p>The area of land proposed to be acquired locally to Mid Lowfield Farm and East Lowfield Farm has been determined following the completion of the Preliminary Design.</p> <p>The land is required to construct the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge, the accommodation track leading to Bowes Cross Farm and two balancing ponds. It is our intention to minimise the amount of land take required as part of the Project.</p> <p>The design will be developed and refined in Detailed Design, where the required areas of land take will be confirmed and alongside land negotiation discussions.</p>	No
147			TR0200173, TR0200163	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Land take/ Design	Respondents express concern relating to the large amount of landform being created north of the proposed junction near to Center Parcs.	<p>The land identified is required for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate adverse effects, as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>The land form proposals are designed to integrate the new A66 alignment, access roads and junctions into the existing landscape whilst allowing land to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>be returned to agriculture or its former use.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to working with landowners to avoid the need to exercise compulsory acquisition powers if appropriate agreements can be entered into. Such agreements could include management agreements or section 253 Highways Act 1980 in appropriate circumstances..</p>	
60			TR0200153, TR0200154	Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and Bowes Bypass - Land take/ Property	Respondents express concern relating to the possibility of much of their land being acquired (West End Farm and land near Street Side Farm).	<p>It is our intention to minimise the amount of land take required as part of the Project and only take what is necessary to construct the Project. During detailed design, the scheme designs will be refined and confirmed with a view to further minimising the land required for the Scheme.</p> <p>The response to previous representations is provided within the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). Our response in relation to feedback received concerning environmental mitigation during our autumn 2021 consultation can be found in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
95			TR0200161	Land take/ Design	Respondents express concern relating to the potential loss of land around Flitholme, Low Broomrigg and around the access provision proposed to the west of Brough as a result of the proposed A66 Project, adding none of the proposals to reduce the impact are included in the new proposals.	National Highways notes your concerns about the loss of your land to the Project. Any land required for the Project will be discussed with the individual landowners, and where appropriate occupiers concerned, as part of 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 concerns in relation to accommodation works can be progress via this mechanism. Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.	Yes
99			TR0200161	Land take/ Property	Respondents express concern relating to the size of the land bund (to the east of Low Broomrigg), as they believe this will negatively affect agricultural production.	The requirement for a new landform and the provision of landscape bunds has been identified as part of the preliminary design and included in the proposed works. The landscape bunds are provided for a number of reasons which can include landscaping, integrating the new road into the landscape and acting	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>as a noise barrier. Where these bunds have been included, the intention is to grade out the embankment slopes to the extent that the land is capable of being returned to agriculture following construction.</p> <p>An assessment of agricultural and soil resource of the Order Limits has been carried out and is detailed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). Temporary and permanent Impacts to soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are considered. 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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the EMP (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The potential for the Project to affect agricultural land holdings is also set out in ES Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
97			TR0200161	Land take/ Property	<p>Respondents express concern that areas of land shown for Environmental Mitigation in the vicinity of Flitholme, Low Broomrigg and around the access provision proposed to the west of Brough which may potentially returned to the landowner could not be adequately farmed. Respondents express concern that this could lead to potential fly-tipping and other issues.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledge concerns about the land between the access road and the new A66 alignment. This area will be fenced and gated as part of the works to prevent illegal access.</p> <p>Options will be considered at the detailed design stage to make the best use of the land.</p>	No
126			TR0200167	Land take/ Property	<p>Respondents from Rivercroft Farm, Kirkby Thore oppose the proposals as they do not wish to relocate the farmstead.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the residents of Rivercroft Farm, Kirkby Thore's view that you do not wish your existing farmstead to be demolished and relocated.</p> <p>The preliminary design for the scheme has identified that this land is required to construct the Project and to provide visibility for road users using the re-aligned A66. Any accommodation works or compensation required will be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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.	
159			TR0200158	Land take/ Request for Further Information	Respondent opposes the requirement for 2 compounds on their land and seeks further clarification on location and number of compounds	The areas labelled 'site compounds' are mainly areas where excavated or imported materials may be stored during the construction. The locations have been identified during a buildability review exercise for each scheme and have been included in the order limits. The Principal Contractor who will construct the works will review the use of these areas when planning the construction works, they will have on site liaison officers who will work with affected landowners. Site compound areas are also required where new junctions or structures are to be constructed to allow the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						storage of construction materials as well as excavated material. Any site compound areas will be used temporarily and will be returned to their original land use or be landscaped once they are no longer required.	
84			TR0200159	Land take/ Property	Respondents raise concern that the size of grassland land take will directly impact their client's property (to the north and east of Stonebridge Farm and west of Bowes Cross Farm).	<p>National Highways acknowledges your comment and advises that you will be compensated for any loss of land as a result of the Project. Land negotiations will take place to review the impact of the works on yourselves.</p> <p>The project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>However we have refined our mitigation plans since the PEI Report was issued. 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 Environmental Statement Biodiversity assessment (Environmental Statement 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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Document 3.2). The ecological mitigation has subsequently been reviewed and updated in line with this assessment. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.	
190	TR0200151			Land take/ Design	Respondents suggest filling the ditch located between the most eastern field to the 2nd eastern field near Street Side Farm to make into one field so to reduce the impact of the field being made smaller by the pond.	The outfall and ditch from the proposed pond will be reviewed further at the detailed design stage.	No
188	TR0200151			Land take/ Design	Respondents suggest having the topsoil storage area in field corner east of pond which is to the east of Street Side Farm to ensure the majority of the field is still farmable.	The topsoil storage areas will be revisited during the detailed design and construction stages of the Project. The extents and access requirements will be better defined once further information becomes available and the design is fully developed. The site compound areas are temporary areas only and the areas will be returned to their former use or be landscaped	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						as part of the works when no longer required for construction. National Highways' lands team will be negotiating with landowners with regards to permanent land take and temporary possession.	
96			TR0200161	Land take/ Design / Mitigation	<p>Respondents suggest multiple ways to reduce the amount of land take in the vicinity of around Flitholme, Low Broomrigg and around the access provision proposed to the west of Brough;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road at either side of Langrigg WB junction be pushed closer to the access road to reduce the central reservation and to reduce encroachment into the productive agricultural land • Moving the access track to the South of the proposed pond to make best use of the land • Similarly bringing the access to Flitholme further south round by pond to make best use of the land • Remove /reduce the environmental mitigation from the most productive agricultural land. 	<p>The options put forward by the landowner are acknowledged. The design has considered many constraints and design factors in completing the design for this section of the Project including further feedback from the Statutory Consultation. Your comments have been considered but to re-align the A66 main line as you suggest would have a knock-on effect on other lengths of the A66 alignment and could impact the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north of the existing A66. In addition, the existing ground levels need careful consideration in terms of the vertical alignment of the new A66.</p> <p>In relation to land required for environmental mitigation National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and ow these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						impacts to agricultural land (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)).	
186			TR0200143	Land take/consultation	Respondents suggest the specifications for the access track are shared, given it is important relative to the remaining width of the yard and farm buildings access immediately to the south of the intended access to the main yard at Bowes Cross Farm.	<p>We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p> <p>During the detail design stage we will work with landowners to ensure the accommodation tracks meet their needs and are designed to required specifications.</p>	No
75	TR0200157			Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Land Take Modified design	Respondent suggest reducing the level of environmental mitigation and re-location of the proposed hedgerow to the field's boundaries rather than splitting one agricultural field into two, so that less land will be taken.	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 Environmental Statement Biodiversity assessment (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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. The hedgerow listed is not presented as required mitigation; the dashed line represents an existing Public Right of Way.</p> <p>Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p>	
145	TR0200171			Landform bunds/ Request for Further Information	Respondents suggest a 3D plan be produced to illustrate and visualize the size of the bunds.	National Highways is committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The DCO application contains the following documents which will be available for review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) • Engineering Section Drawings – Plan and Profiles (Application Document 5.17) • Engineering Section Drawings – Cross Sections (Application Document 5.18) 	
121			TR0200165 TR0200163 TR0200173	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Landforms/ Property	Respondents oppose the landform proposals (around Center Parcs and Temple Sowerby) as it will degrade productivity of agricultural land.	<p>The landform proposal is designed to integrate the new A66 alignment, access roads and junctions into the existing landscape whilst allowing land to be returned to agriculture use. The detailed design will look to ensure the proposals do not degrade the land, so it does not affect the lands usage. We will continue to engage with you in regard to our proposals.</p> <p>An assessment of agricultural and soil resource of the Order Limits has been carried out and is detailed in Environmental Statement Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (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?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Temporary and permanent Impacts to soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are considered. 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 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).	
182			TR0200141	Lay-bys/ Access	Respondent notes that there is landscape bunding proposed along the service road to Bowes Cross. It is suggested that there is a need for passings bays to be established, presumably on the north side of the service road. And state they need details of these passing places within the landscape bunding and further details as to the specification of the road as soon as possible.	The detail of accommodation tracks including passing places will be part of detailed design. We will continue to work with all landowners as we move though the DCO process and into construction.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
168			TR0200111	Liability of Infrastructure/ General	Respondents oppose the idea of accepting any liability whatsoever for any Infrastructure/ embankments/ roads/ bridges/ ponds in connection with the proposed A66.	National Highways will seek to acquire any land required for any required Infrastructure and will take liability unless the land is sold on, or responsibility is passed to a third party such as the local Council. Bridges and ponds will be owned and maintained by National Highways, or the local Council as will all roads constructed as part of the works except for PMA. Article 9 of the DCO (Application Document 5.1) provides more details as to the arrangements for the maintenance of newly constructed or altered streets and structures.	No
111			TR0200164	Maintenance/ Access Track	Respondents express concern over liability for claims in relation to the maintenance of the access track (to the north and south of the Countess Pillar). Respondents express concern for how the access track would be maintained and how any repairs would be carried out.	During the preliminary design stage and following consultations with landowners/tenants, the provision of access tracks was identified to enable access to all plots of land and other features affected by the Projects proposals. The track to the south of Countess Pillar is designated as a Private Means of Access, The track to the north is a combined cycle track and private means of access. Detailed information on proposals can be found in the Rights of Way and Access Plans and the corresponding Rights of Way and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>The majority of the Infrastructure created will be owned and maintained by National Highways or the local authority. There may be elements such as private means of access, where the persons with the benefit of those means of access would be responsible for their maintenance. Article 9 of the draft Development Consent Order (Application Document 5.1) sets out the arrangements for the maintenance of new or altered streets and structures.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in the next phase of scheme development to agree, amongst other things, the specification of access roads and any associated maintenance agreements.</p>	
136			TR0200168	Maintenance/ General	Respondents express concern for the maintenance obligations of the environmental mitigation areas.	The ownership and maintenance of any Infrastructure provision for the Project including environmental mitigation will generally be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the Infrastructure asset	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and to take liability. Further discussions and consultation will be undertaken at the detailed design stage of the Project.	
183			TR0200143	Maintenance/ Access Roads	Respondents express concern regarding liability for maintenance of the bridge east of Stonebridge and subsequent access roads to the north side of the road. Respondents also outlined expectation that the bridge and access roads will be adequate to accommodate large tractors and articulated lorries.	<p>The structure being referred to across the A66 will be maintained by National Highways and/or the local authority. All structures will be designed in accordance with current national design standards to ensure they are capable of accommodating design traffic (which will include HGV & agricultural vehicles). The new side roads will be maintained by the local authority. The design of all side roads/accesses tracks/footways, etc. will be reviewed at detailed design stage with the consideration of any further information provided, an understanding of any vehicles required to use them and the consideration of the existing construction of private roads/accesses affected by the works.</p> <p>In relation to maintenance, article 9 of the draft DCO (Application Document 5.1) sets out the persons that will be responsible for maintaining any new, altered or</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						diverted streets and other structures.	
129			TR0200167	Maintenance / Request further information	Respondents from Rivercraft Farm, Kirkby Thore are concerned about the maintenance obligations of the areas and requests for further information.	The ownership and maintenance of any Infrastructure provision for the Project including environmental mitigation will be with either National Highways or the local highways authority which is normally the council unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the Infrastructure asset and to take liability. Further discussions will be undertaken at the detailed design stage of the Project and, where applicable, as part of negotiations for the acquisition of the land interests required to deliver the Project.	No
34			ANON-N6YD-XGQY-A	Mitigation/ Property	Respondents request mitigation measures for their shop in order to prevent damage. Suggested mitigation includes a stone reinforced boundary. An access point is required to the West of the shop for deliveries as delivery wagons can no longer stop outside the shop as it will be a main adopted highway.	Boundary treatments were not the subject matter for this supplementary consultation. The preliminary design for the scheme has been undertaken in accordance with current design standards. The design will be developed at detailed design and will consider any further concerns or additional information that is provided or becomes available. The layout of the Cross Lanes junction has taken account of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						access to the business and provides suitable access for delivery vehicles. The boundary wall provision will be reviewed at detailed design stage.	
169			TR0200112	Mitigation/ Drainage	<p>Respondents suggest ways to mitigate impact of the ponds on land take stating the drainage ponds furthest east could be located on the north of the proposed A66 and drain straight into the River Tees. The respondent suggests the pond opposite the Rectory could be located between the two roads. Or if the proposed A66 were to go through the Rectory the pond can be moved further north since the proposed A66 would be further north, avoiding taking further productive agricultural land, as currently between the Junction and the pond it cuts part of the farm off from the rest of the farm which will hinder the farms viability and profitability.</p>	<p>The size and location of the proposed pond in the vicinity of the property has been assessed and determined during preliminary design of the scheme. A number of factors have been considered during the design process including ground levels, proposed road levels, the location of the proposed outfalls in order to provide the most appropriate effective solution.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2) and the associated appendices (Application Document 3.4) define the historic significance of the rectory. The Rectory is a non-designated post-medieval building which was associated with the Church of St Mary. The loss of the rectory would not be supported by Historic England. Further information on the appraisal of alternative routes undertaken to date can be found in the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement Chapter 3 Assessment of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Alternatives (Application Document 3.2).	
28			TR0200112	Mitigation/ Land Take	Respondents suggest ways to mitigate land take in changes to construction compounds stating the driveway should run alongside the current woodland (Jack Wood) and join into the junction on the South, like Tutta Beck this is to avoid taking additional good, productive, arable land. It also means that agricultural machinery would not need to access the public highway which only enhances safety.	With regard to the suggestion of an access south off the new junction, this would be regarded as a hazard due to visibility and not in accordance with current highway design guidance. The proposed access track, adjacent to the A66, is designed as a shared use track for use by cyclists/ walkers as well as being a private means of access.	No
187			TR0200150	Design/ Drainage	Respondents express concern related to the impact the scheme will have on existing flooding issues along the north of the existing A66 at the culvert to the west of Stonebridge Farm; stating the existing issues were caused by the last construction works to build the Bowes Bypass in the 1980's. Respondents request further consultation. Respondents suggest improving the ditches running to the culvert will improve the land.	The proposed drainage design has been designed to accommodate flows from the proposed attenuation pond adjacent to Blacklodge Farm underpass and the overland flows from the fields north of the A66 via ditches. The ditches carry water east to the approximate location of the existing culvert that passes under the A66 west of Stonebridge Farm. Subject to further surveys, this is expected to require complete reconstruction as a result of the planned works. Flood modelling analysis has informed the need to safeguard this	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						land, north of the existing culvert, for potential flood mitigation storage. During detailed design, the flood modelling analysis will be completed to confirm the requirement for this land.	
156			TR0200158	Modified Design/ Alternative Alignment	Respondent suggests an alternative alignment that will be cheaper for junction alignment proposing a bridge over proposed A66 onto existing Long Marton Road from the existing A66 be installed.	The suggested alternative alignment option cannot be progressed as it would not meet design standards and could provide a significant hazard to road users. There are significant level differences to address when trying to connect the two roads at the location indicated.	No
177	TR0200151			Modified Design/ Access Track	Respondent suggests that (near Street Side Farm) if the ditch was not able to be filled to create one large field, then the Project would have to provide the respondents with an access track running from farmstead to the most eastern field.	Any accommodation works required 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.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Further discussions on any identified accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.	
184			TR0200150	Modified Design/ Further Consultation	Respondents express concern stating they have severe reservations that the accommodation underpass will work satisfactorily for passing stock. Respondents request to further discuss this matter with National Highways. Respondents suggest an alternative to building the underpass would be to relocate the farm buildings.	The design team have considered the identified constraints and information available at the preliminary design stage and consider the underpass design presented for DCO is the best option to take forward. Further discussion will be held with landowners at detailed design stage to refine the design.	No
89			TR0200158	Modified Design/ Bridge Access Track	Respondents suggest a bridge over the proposed A66 onto the existing Long Marton Road from the A66, adding that visibility issues could be rectified through grading of the road.	Initial assessments by the design team indicate your option cannot be progressed as there is likely to be level differences to address when trying to connect the two roads at the location you indicate. In addition the option requires additional land not previously considered and adds additional costs to the Project.	No
57			TR0200152	Modified Design/ Mitigation	Respondents suggest a bund could be created on the land opposite their campsite as this will mitigate some of the noise.	We have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The area labelled blue as suggested bund is outside of the Order Limits, however there is woodland planting currently proposed on the north side of the junction for visual screening purposes.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) has not returned a likely significant effect at the location indicted and as such no additional mitigation (noise barrier) is proposed.</p>	
160			TR0200143	Modified Design/ Access Track	Respondents suggest an access route to their ownership west of the bridge at Stonebridge.	Any accommodation works required 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>accommodation works can be progress via this mechanism.</p> <p>Further discussions on any identified accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>	
133			TR0200168	Modified Design/ Access Track	<p>Respondents suggest connecting the access road to the pond and the construction of a path to a new building (with water/electricity supply and gate with padlock).</p>	<p>Any accommodation works required 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>Further discussions on any identified accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with you on the relocation of the shed and its access road. Any access provided to the farm shed will be gated and padlocked.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
122			TR0200165	Modified Design – landscape integration	Respondents suggest that the proposed A66 is lowered to avoid the requirement to build the road up to avoid impacting on the quality of the agricultural land.	<p>The horizontal and vertical profile of the proposed road is designed to meet current design standards and takes account of a number of design factors and challenges. Any change to the profile by lowering it could potentially affect a number of the design elements including drainage and noise. Any amendments could mean the profile does not meet the design standards. Additional land and lengths of roads, currently outside of the order limits could be further affected where we would be required to complete further environmental surveys and assessments as well as considering additional land purchase.</p> <p>The detailed design will look to ensure the proposals do not degrade the land so it does not affect the lands usage.</p> <p>An assessment of agricultural and soil resource of the Order Limits has been carried out and is detailed in Environmental Statement Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). Temporary and permanent impacts to soils and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>considered. 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 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. This is secured through implementation of the EMP (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The potential for the Project to affect agricultural land holdings is also set out in Environmental Statement Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
79			TR0200159	Modified Design/ Access Track	<p>Respondents suggest having the access road close and alongside the proposed A66 (to the east of Stonebridge Farm and west of Bowes Cross Farm) to avoid an unnecessary wide verge and using an underpass and T junction from the access road as opposed to an overpass and additional road.</p>	<p>The preliminary design for the Project has now been completed and the land identified to construct the works included within the updated red line order limits boundary. As the Project moves through the DCO process and into detailed design stage the design will be finalised and where practicable land take will be minimised.</p> <p>The levels at this location will not allow for an underpass so an</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>overbridge is the only solution. The underpass would require an excavation of approximately 7m below the A66 road surface level to allow road clearance to be achieved. The underpass would create a major issue with drainage of ground water and run off, requiring a pump to be installed which would be a maintenance risk.</p> <p>We will continue to work with all landowners on accommodation works as we move into detailed design.</p>	
104			TR0200163	Modified Design/Mitigation	Respondents suggest lowering junction levels at Center Parcs in order to reduce the area needed for landform.	The horizontal and vertical profile of the proposed road is designed to meet current design standards and takes account of a number of design factors and challenges. A change to the profile by lowering it could adversely impact on adjacent accesses and junctions as well as potentially affecting a number of the design elements including drainage and noise. Any amendments could mean the profile does not meet the design standards.	No
63	TR0200155			Modified Design/Access Track	Respondents suggest moving the embankment near Stonebridge Farm and building the bridge	The response to previous representations is provided within the Consultation Report	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					further east, adjoining the track instead as suggested in their response to the Autumn 2021 consultation.	(Application Document 4.4). Our response in relation to feedback received concerning environmental mitigation during our autumn 2021 consultation can be found in Annex N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).. The design team have considered a number of design related factors and constraints during the preliminary design process to inform the optimum location for the proposed layout. These include the provision of a westbound lay-by, balancing pond earthwork and connectivity for local accesses.	
179	TR0200151			Modified Design/ Drainage	Respondents suggest moving the westerly pond further North (near Street Side Farm).	The design teams at preliminary design stage have designed the ponds based on existing survey information available and sited the pond at a low point relative to the carriageway outfall. Detailed topographical survey information will be used in detailed design to confirm/update the detailed design as required.	No
164			TR0200143	Modified Design/ Property	Respondents suggest that the road reaches the current boundary of property yard without cutting the highway verge.	Preliminary design has only been undertaken to date; the detailed design will start in the near future. The arrangements at your boundary including any	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						accommodation works will be discussed with you at the detailed design stage.	
174			TR0200149	Modified Design/Biodiversity	Respondents suggest the oak tree present at the junction between her land (located to the south of the new junction at Bowes) should be retained and should be protected.	Under the current design the oak tree located close to the new drainage ditch, which outfalls into Stonebridge culvert, should be unaffected the works and will be retained.	No
141			TR0200170	Modified Design/Access	If a separate underpass for walkers, cyclists and horse riders (north of Roger Head Farm) is not taken forward, respondents suggest the road is split by a fence and hedge to separate public and private access.	We thank you for your proposals but at this location National Highways are not intending segregating farm traffic from walkers or cyclist and will not be providing the underpass you suggest.	No
80			TR0200159	Modified Design/Safety	Respondents suggest using an underpass as opposed to a bridge (east of Stonebridge Farm) to allow a safer passage for livestock and motorists.	The preliminary design has considered an underpass at this location. The existing ground levels at this location would require an excavation approximately 7m below existing ground level along with a substantially larger footprint and associated land take in order to provide an underpass with the required clearance for farm vehicles and other users. The drainage design for an underpass would also be challenging if road level was between 6 and 7m below existing ground level.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The proposed bridge design has taken into account the potential users of the bridge.	
109			TR0200164	Modified Design/ Access/ PRoW	Respondents suggests that a private access route be created for their agricultural and National Highways Maintenance Vehicles, and also a separate walking/cycling route with ownership with National Highways (on land to the north of Countess Pillar and the A66).	Under the preliminary design for this scheme, we have committed to providing a shared use track as it reduces the imprint of the scheme, saves taking additional land and incurring additional costs and reduces the environmental impact of the scheme.	No
132			TR0200168	Modified Design/ Access	Respondents suggests the access road be relocated south to the proposed shed relocation site and be removed post construction as it uses valuable agricultural land.	Any accommodation works required 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. Further discussions on any identified accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						National Highways will continue to engage with you on the relocation of the shed and its access road	
85			TR0200159	Modified Design Environmental mitigation	<p>Respondents (between Stonebridge Farm and Bowes Cross Farm) suggest that environmental mitigation be located on less productive agricultural land.</p>	<p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design for the Project this piece of land has been identified as land required for environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The location of environmental mitigation has been carefully considered, taking into account the suitability of the existing land for mitigation habitat and the value it has from an agricultural point of view. The Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) and Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrate the proposed mitigation for the Project. Annex B1 Landscape and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The ES sets out the methodology undertaken to determine the mitigation as well as assessing the impacts to agricultural land (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity and ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2)).</p>	
158			TR0200158	Noise/ Property	<p>Respondents express concern over potential noise impact this will have on his farmhouse and steading.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The majority of the land adjacent to the proposed Long Marton Lane End junction is predicted to be subject to operational beneficial impacts except for the land closest to the Project dualling alignment. The receptor at Powis Cottage is predicted to be subject to a major beneficial impact from the operational Project.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>No additional noise mitigation (noise barrier), beyond those embedded in the design such as low noise road surface, are required at this location.</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, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	
90			TR0200158	Noise/ Property	<p>Respondents raise concern regarding the noise impact, that raising of the road will have on their farmhouse.</p>	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>The majority of the land adjacent to the proposed Long Marton Lane End junction is predicted to be subject to operational beneficial impacts except for the land closest to the Project dualling alignment.</p> <p>No additional noise mitigation (noise barrier), beyond those</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>embedded in the design such as low noise road surface, are required at this location</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, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	
91			TR0200158	Noise - Request for Further Information	Respondents request further information and evidence how the noise will have an impact and intended mitigation.	<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>During construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant 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 undertaken. Construction and vibration impacts have been assessed as significant</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>effects when construction is at its busiest and closest to receptors. 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> <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. Noise barriers in the form of earth bunds have been implemented as far as it is practicable, to minimise any adverse impacts arising from noise emissions. Additional noise barriers have been proposed, where sustainable, in locations where change in noise levels is expected to be significant in order to lessen impacts. These will be committed to subject to consultation with stakeholders and local landowners given their localised benefits.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
180	TR0200151			Noise/ Traffic	Respondents express concern in relation to the possibility of increased noise due to more traffic passing at higher speeds near where they live (near Street Side Farm).	<p>The effects of the scheme in relation to noise and vibration, during construction and operation, are reported in Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2). The output of the traffic modelling is utilised within the environmental impact assessment of the Project and underpins the modelling used within the noise assessment.</p> <p>No additional noise mitigation (noise barrier), beyond those embedded in the design such as low noise road surface, are required at this location.</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, will be managed. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	No
66	TR0200155			Ponds/drainage	Respondents express concern over the drainage ponds near Stone Bridge Farm, and whether	ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and Appendix 14.2:	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>they have been properly evaluated in terms of the scheme.</p>	<p>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.</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>Proposed drainage ponds have been designed to attenuate and treat the road runoff and climate change uplift values have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>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>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
192	TR0200151			Ponds/drainage	Respondents suggest they will need access to the most eastern field (near Street Side Farm).	<p>During the preliminary design stage and following consultations with landowners/tenants, the provision of access to all plots of land and other features affected by the Projects was identified. Access to the fields to the east of Street Side Farm will be maintained.</p> <p>The Project will maintain access to all areas of land which are in landowner's ownership or are used as part of their business. Further discussions on any identified accommodation works will take place during the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>	No
119			TR0200165	Ponds/drainage	Respondents support the updated position of the balancing pond north of the proposed A66 (in the corner between the new A66 and Priest Lane).	National Highways acknowledges your support with regards to the updated balancing pond location.	No
87			TR0200159	Ponds Request for information/drainage	Respondents express concern for the location of ponds (to the east of Stonebridge Farm) and request further information on the pond on the western boundary and furthest east on their client's property (located to the east of Stonebridge Farm and west of Bowes Cross Farm) for how they will drain to in order to understand the drainage and to	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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					mitigate flooding to client's and neighbouring properties.	<p>water environment for the preferred Project route.</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>Proposed drainage ponds have been designed to attenuate and treat the road runoff and climate change uplift values have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>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>National Highways will continue to engage with landowners as appropriate in the detailed design stage.</p>	
151			TR0200172	Regrading of land/ Property	Respondents express concern about the re-grading of the	The proposed re grading is designed to integrate junction at	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					landscape following construction of junction at Mains Gill, and the impact on this may have on farming operations such as possibly making these areas of land unfarmable.	Mains Gill into the landscape and to return as much land as practicable, back to agricultural use following construction. National Highways will continue to engage with landowners throughout detailed design.	
14			TR0200158	Request further information/consultation/design	Respondents express concern for the significant changes and have requested a meeting with the designer to go through the significant changes on their land, however, this has not been granted, therefore, I request that we have a further meeting with the designer to fully explain our feedback.	<p>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.</p> <p>Any accommodation works required 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.</p> <p>We encourage the respondent to make a further request for a meeting to the email and/or phone number provided on the letter they received.</p>	No
14			TR0200158	Request further information/consultation	Respondents express concern for the location of the landforms on their land around the Long Marton junction and request further information regarding changes on the landform and	The supplementary consultation plans did not show any newly proposed landform features.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					uncertainty if any bunds are included on their land.		
124			TR0200165	Request further information Maintenance Access	Respondents express concern over maintenance obligations for the access track and require further information.	The ownership and maintenance of the proposed access tracks or Infrastructure provision will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is agreed with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the Infrastructure asset and to take liability. The latter would normally be the case if this is a private means of access solely for the use of the landowner. Further discussions and consultation will be undertaken at the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
865		Eden District Council		Request further information/consultation	Eden District Council express concern that the consultation does not provide section or elevation drawings for the landforms between J40 M6 and Brough and therefore does not allow the council to comment and requesting further drawings. f	he DCO application contains the following documents which will be available for review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) • Engineering Section Drawings – Plan and Profiles (Application Document 5.17) • Engineering Section Drawings – Cross Sections (Application Document 5.18) 	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
62	TR0200155			Retain Existing route Request for Information	<p>Respondents oppose the building of the bridge near Stone Bridge Farm, noting there are existing roads that can be used for accessing properties, instead. Respondent suggests alternative access arrangement that they claim would negate the need for a bridge.</p> <p>Respondents would like to know why the bridge is needed.</p>	The junction and overbridge referred to has been provided to connect properties and field accesses to the highway network and ultimately to the A66. The preliminary design has defined the preferred alignment as the best solution at this location by providing a safe route to the junction at Bowes for properties whose existing accesses, directly onto the A66, will be removed.	No
189	TR0200151			Rights of way/ Access/ Farm Traffic	<p>Respondents suggest that access to Street Side Farm for arctic lorries is essential for farming business and that the Project must allow for this access point to remain.</p>	The preliminary design has provided a new access road from the B6277 to the existing lay by area at the front of your property where vehicles currently park to offload. The access road is designed to be used by long based articulated vehicles. In addition, a turning head has been provided at the east end of the existing lay by area to allow vehicles to turn around and exit back to the B6277. Access to all fields will be maintained as part of the works.	No
168			TR0200111	Rights of way/ Lack of Information	<p>Respondents express concern regarding rights of way stating they are unsure as to why they have been extended up the</p>	Bridleway 309/031 is diverted from the new junction, along the south side of the A66 to Musgrave Lane where it joins an existing Bridleway. An existing section of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					carriage drive to the west of Brough.	<p>Bridleway 309/031 between the A66 and Cherry Tree House is to be stopped up. A new footway is to be included on the new bridge to link the severed footpaths to the north and south sides of the A66.</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 Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).</p>	
176	TR0200151			Rights of way/ Oppose	<p>Respondents oppose the proposal for a new cycle track to allow walkers and cyclists to travel east/west alongside the A66 and past Street Side Farm, due to health and safety concerns of those users mixing farm traffic. Respondents ensure why this has been proposed when there is no existing right of way.</p>	<p>The Project is introducing new walking, cycling and horse-riding facilities to increase provisions and encourage more users. This facility will provide a safe and alternative route for cyclists travelling between Greta Bridge and Barnard Castle, and also creating a new link to the popular route to The Stang.</p> <p>The potential health and safety concerns are acknowledged, however, shared routes for cyclists, walkers and vehicles are not uncommon. This route will have sufficient forward visibility to minimise risk. The overall signage</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						design will be completed in detailed design where warning signs could be proposed along this section to warn users of the potential conflicts.	
71	TR0200155			Rights of way Request further information	Respondents express concern over extents of Public Right of Way through land near Stone Bridge Farm.	Under the current proposal the proposed Public Right of Way/Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) route to the east of Stone Bridge Farm will not pass the farm to the north or south.	No
115			TR0200164	Road access/ Oppose/ Land Take	Respondents oppose the proposals stating there is no requirement for an access road between the Llama Karma and The Overpass for vehicles and that it will use vital agricultural land.	During the preliminary design it was identified that an access track was required to provide access from the local highway to fields around the Llama Karma Kafe. Local landowners and other stakeholders were consulted and considered when undertaking the design. The potential for the Project to affect agricultural land holdings is also set out in Environmental Statement Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).	No
144			TR0200190	Safety/ Access	Respondents express concerns relating to safety as the public access roads would need to be used for farm machinery and this could pose a threat to pedestrians and cyclists.	The flows of both pedestrians/cyclists and agricultural vehicles will be low and the routes will be designed with suitable horizontal and vertical geometry to ensure good visibility	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>between users so the routes will be suitable from a health and safety risk perspective.</p> <p>Throughout the rural environment in the UK there are many examples of where motorised vehicles share the same road space with walkers, cyclists and horse riders whether this be rural roads or Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT's). We believe with carefully management the shared use routes we are proposing can be sustained by responsible use and management. The Highway Code and countryside Code apply to users of the shared tracks.</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>	
173			TR0200148	Safety/WCH	Respondent suggest further consultation with regard to the underpass proposed at Bowes and its provision for walkers and farm traffic for the purposes of ensuring safe passage for the public at large and also limiting the amount of additional road	During the preliminary design stage and following consultations with landowners/tenants the provision of access tracks was identified in the design to ensure access to all plots of land and other features affected by the Project. Any refinements and the construction details including proposed surfacing materials of the access tracks will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					length which needs to be used for the footpath diversion.	be reviewed and confirmed at the detailed design stage of the Project, with the affected landowners being consulted. Designs will be subject to a road safety audit which are undertaken by independent auditors.	
185			TR0200148	Safety/WCH	Respondents suggest that a safe way to pass for walkers would be under the current underpass on their land at Bowes which exists under the current carriageway from north to south and vice versa. This would then link with the footpaths and ultimately provide safe passage to reconnect with the footpath nearby.	With regard to the severed public right of way footpath you refer to National Highways propose to divert the footway to the east and through the new underpass as this is the shortest diverted route and exposes users to less of the new A66. The diversion to the west is a longer diversion impacting more land extents. The existing underpass you refer to is to be filled in as part of the works so cannot be used as part of any re-directed footpath route.	No
127			TR0200167	Security/ Animal Welfare/Accommodation works	Respondent from Rivercraft Farm, Kirkby Thore states that they have a concern for animal welfare and security with the proposed road being so close to any proposed alternative site, this will need to be taken into account in any plans for relocation. Respondent states that a suitable relocation plan for the affected Green Barn Steading must be	National Highways note your comments and concerns regarding the location of a potential new site for your barns. Any accommodation works required 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					agreed to reduce the impact on their clients.	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. We will continue to engage with you on this matter.	
143			TR0200190	Security/ Access/ Antisocial Behaviour	Respondents express concern relating to proposed access tracks as this could increase the land issues that already exist with public footpaths nearby, such as anti-social behaviour.	National Highways thanks you for sharing your concerns regarding issues with users of public footpaths. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. Throughout the rural environment in the UK there are many examples of where motorised vehicles share the same road space with walkers, cyclists and horse riders whether this be rural roads or Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT's). We believe with carefully management the shared use routes we are proposing can be sustained by responsible use and management. The Highway Code and countryside Code apply to users of the shared tracks.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The shared use tracks provided are 4m wide which allows for two-way movements, but this also offers the opportunity for safe passing by users including vehicles.</p> <p>To provide segregated facilities for land owners and WCH users would require more land purchase which would increase costs. In addition further environmental mitigation would also need to be considered. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR), section 5.6 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Bowes Bypass scheme.</p>	
106			TR0200164	Security/community impact	<p>Respondents express concern that the creation of public access and vehicles along the north side of the A66 (north of Countess Pillar) would worsen the existing issues of illegal poaching, hare coursing and livestock worrying.</p>	<p>National Highways note your comments and objection to the Walking and Cycling provision that impacts your land. As part of the Project we are committed where possible to providing a safe environment for WCH users and to improve any existing facilities impacted by the Project. The facilities proposed on your land currently will allow better connectivity to Penrith and provide a safe environment away from the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						busy A66 for walkers and cycle users. With regard to concerns about trespassing, the detailed design will be bound by the principles set out in the Project Design Principles (Document ref. 5.11). In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project.	
191	TR0200151			Services/ Utilities	Respondents suggest the water supply (near Street Side Farm) must not be interrupted. The respondents' water meter is located upon the southern side of the A66.	If this supply is affected by the works, the Principal Contractor will be required to ensure this water supply is operational during and after the works. If it is required to be diverted as a result of the main works, then temporary arrangements will be put in place to maintain a water supply. The Principal Contractor will be required to plan and construct the works in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7)	No
193	TR0200151			Signage / Relocation	Respondents express concern relating to the variable message	National Highways notes the comments about the variable	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					sign (digital road sign used for displaying temporary information), proposed to be located outside respondents' residence/business (near Street Side Farm). Respondents suggest this being moved.	message sign location. The preliminary design has identified this location as the most suitable however the exact location will be reviewed and confirmed at the detailed design stage.	
65	TR0200155			Surveys / drainage	Respondents suggest drains around Stone Bridge be surveyed in order to prevent any potential flooding.	Further surveys of the existing drainage assets will be carried out in detailed design to help confirm and/or inform updates to the designs. 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.	No
70	TR0200155			Surveys - design	Respondents support the need for further surveys to ascertain the amount of mitigation works required for the scheme, as outlined in the aF155FFuturnn 2021 consultation.	The response to previous representations is provided within the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). Our response in relation to feedback received concerning environmental mitigation during our autumn 2021 consultation can be found in Annex	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>N of Chapter 6 of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4). 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 Environmental Statement Biodiversity assessment (Environmental Statement 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) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
866		Eden District Council		Surveys / Biodiversity Net Gain	Eden District Council suggest baseline surveys be undertaken at all landform locations prior to the commencement of construction to aid in the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain as part of their operational design.	<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>Baseline ecological surveys have been carried out at all locations within the Order Limits (including areas for landform). The environmental mitigation design has been developed to mitigate 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 Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2) and underpinned by detailed assessments within separate appendices to Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2).</p>	

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to ‘Construction Compounds’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
77			TR0200185, TR0200186	Ponds / Access	Respondents representing West View Farm, Brough and West End Farm, Bowes suggest reviewing the access to ponds to determine if all is necessary.	National Highways acknowledges your comments suggesting the review of access to ponds to be provided within your current property extents. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of this Consultation Report For information National Highway’s can confirm that a permanent access is required to the pond for maintenance purposes. We will purchase the land required for the provision of the pond and associated access requirements. . We will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
123		Cumbria County Council,		Access/ Construction	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council express concern relating to the access to	National Highways acknowledges your comments regarding the proposed access to the proposed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
		Eden District Council			<p>compounds for both equipment and deliveries, adding that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required.</p>	<p>site compound locations. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>For information we have identified, across each of the schemes, proposed locations for a number of site compound areas that are required to construct the works. A number of compound areas will be for site cabins, welfare facilities, car and construction plant parking and new materials storage. The majority of the other compound areas are for the temporary storage of excavated materials. The access requirements for the compounds areas is covered in the Construction Traffic Management Plan. The compound locations, sizes and usage will be reviewed further at the detailed design stage where assessments of the construction logistics will be carried out</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 2 of</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses. . C. We will continue to engage with local authorities as these plans for the site compound proposals are developed throughout the DCO process and detailed design	
196			TR0200192	Access/ Maintenance	Respondent representing Winderwath Settled Estate expresses concern about how maintenance responsibilities would be decided across an all-purpose track with multiple users.	National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the responder regarding the maintenance responsibilities for the all purpose tracks provided under the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. The all-purpose tracks will be publicly maintained and we will seek to reach an agreed position with the local authority in relation to the maintenance requirements. We are, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
30			TR0200192	Access/ Segregation	Respondent representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggests separating the Local Access Route and public access	National Highways have made the decision to combine the local access track and public access routes. To separate them out	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>routes would simplify liability and maintenance issues.</p>	<p>would require additional land for both the additional track as well as and for any required environmental mitigation. The second track on private land would require legal agreements to be put in place and would incur additional costs in terms of land purchase, legal costs and construction.</p> <p>The local access routes and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will be publicly maintained and we will seek to reach an agreed position with the local authority in relation to the maintenance.</p> <p>We are, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
31			TR0200192	Access/ Lack of Information	<p>Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about lack of detail for how the access tracks would be separated from adjoining agricultural land and other uses.</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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						design principle LC08. National Highways will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	
32			TR0200192	Access/ Request for Further Consultation	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the need to agree boundary features, access arrangements into fields and between fields and possible cattle grid and gate arrangements. All depending on the Local Access Route.	Any details in relation to boundary fences or any Accommodation works will be developed at the detailed design stage of the Project. All boundary treatments will comply with the requirements of the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11), with specific reference to landscape character project-wide design principle LC08. National Highways will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
46			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Traffic/ Parking	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the parking area and public access opposite Whinfell Park Farm and do not want the use of the access encouraged to a greater extent than exists at present.	The proposed parking area provided for people who wish to visit St Ninian's church, a local landmark in the care of Church Conservation Trust, is very similar in size the existing provision. Traffic signage can be considered to define the parking area purpose.	No
161			TR0200192	Access/ Suitability/ Traffic	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern for the	National Highways acknowledges your comments regarding the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					impracticality of the access track route at the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme which has a number of 90-degree bends, making it impossible for large farm machinery to navigate and causing significant damage to the track surface where it passes around the ponds.	alignment of the shared use access tracks.. The access track alignments will be reviewed at the detailed design stage of the Project to ensure identified vehicle movements can be tracked and accommodated particularly at corners or bends. Internal corner road widening will be considered as required to aid vehicle movements. The construction details for the private means of access tracks or shared access tracks will take consideration of the likely vehicle usage to ensure they are designed for all the required vehicle movements. National Highways will continue to discuss the design proposals and Accommodation works with affected landowners with a view to reaching an agreed position.	
39			, TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern that the current access track at the eastern end of Winderwath Farm, does not follow the route of the current cycle way and footpath for a short section at the immediate east end of the property.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concerns about the alignment of the proposed access track. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>For information the access track alignment at this location takes into consideration a number of constraints including changes to earthworks as a result of the alignment of the new A66 main line and a proposed lay-by. The existing cycleway is not the required width for two way running, 4m width standard, so would require widening which would impact existing trees. The proposed road alignment and new lay-by impact areas of existing trees which the Project needs to provide environmental mitigation to replace, The new woodland is located between the A66 and new cycleway alignment you refer to and will also provide screening to the nearby property. The location of the proposed landscape mitigation is shown on the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5) and within the Environment Mitigation Plans (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
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report, section 5.5 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Appleby to Brough scheme.	
141			TR0200178	Access/ Design	<p>Respondents representing Street Side farm, Cross Lanes, Barnard Castle express concern that the driveway needs to be made so artic wagons can easily turn onto the driveway to unload and have access to Street Side Farm, Cross Lanes.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondents concerns about the movements of large vehicles accessing the farm. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>For information the preliminary design has taken into account and allowed for the movement of large vehicles accessing your property. Please refer to the Project Development Report, section 5.5 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme.</p> <p>We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. Any Accommodation works required 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 progressed via this mechanism.</p>	
23			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Oppose	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate oppose compound area access on the rest of Winderwath Estates' land. Access should be directed off the acquired areas or existing A66.	This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p> <p>For information National Highways would prefer to use locations for construction or site compounds that are with the area identified for permanent works; that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the 'live' A66 are provided. Access to the compound should be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to the compound will be included within the Order limits.</p>	
20			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Oppose	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate oppose the creation of additional public access on Winderwath Estate stating that there are already issues with illegal poaching, hare coursing and livestock worrying in the area.	National Highways acknowledges the response. and can confirm that the proposals are to construct a new shared private means of access and public rights of way track. The track is to provide a two-way route for cyclists and walkers as well as allowing movements of maintenance vehicles and farm machinery. To prevent the public accessing the estate the track will be provided with a secure boundary treatment, with gates provided at identified locations, to prevent access on to estate land. For further details of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						our proposals please refer to the Rights of Way and Access Plans, (Application Document 5.19).	
144			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Oppose/ Design	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate oppose the route of the access track near Winderwath Estate adding that it needs to be tight to the field boundaries.	National Highways notes your comments. The proposed alignment of the new private means of access and public rights of way track have taken into account a number of design constraints including the topography of the land and the tracking of vehicles who will potentially use the facility. The alignment and extents of the new tracks will be reviewed and refined during the detailed design stage of the Project. We will continue to consult with all impacted landowners through DCO process and detailed design.	No
177			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Suggestion	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest a local access route for Agricultural, Estate and National Highways traffic and a separate route for pedestrians and cyclists with ownership and maintenance responsibilities to be clarified.	One of the objectives of the Project is to improve east-west connectivity within the limits of the project for WCH users to provide a safe route off the A66 to promote active travel. National Highways has made the decision to combine certain private means of access and PRow. To separate them out would require additional land for both the additional asset as well	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>as and for any required environmental mitigation.</p> <p>The ownership and maintenance liability of proposed shared PMA/PRoW will be with either National Highways or the local authority unless a legal agreement is reached with third parties for them to retain the land, maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities.</p> <p>For further details of our proposals please refer to the Rights of Way and Access Plans, (Application Document 5.19).</p>	
162			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	<p>Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest a straighter access route at Winderwath Estate between balancing ponds (straightening the route for both accesses) and making logistics easier.</p>	<p>National Highways notes your comments about consideration of a straighter route for the access track between ponds, proposed to be located on Winderwath Estate land. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information the combined shared use tracks are aligned around the ponds to keep them separate from the A66 and the associated ponds. This then allows third parties, such as the local landowner or the local authority, who may wish to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						acquire the land and take over the ownership and responsibility to do this without impacting the National Highways assets. For further details of these proposals please refer to the Rights of Way and Access Plans, (Application Document 5.19).	
129			TR0200178	Access/ Design	Respondents representing Street Side Farm, Cross Lanes, Barnard Castle suggest an access track will be required to access the farmstead if the fields are left separated. The access track will need to be to the B6277 (Barnard Castle Road) adding it is assumed. that National Highways will be responsible to the maintenance.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents comment about the alignment of the access track through their fields close to the B6277. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information the response to your query can be found within Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4)..The local access routes and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will be publicly maintained and we will seek to reach an agreed position with the local authority in relation to the maintenance. We will continue to work with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
21			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest that if there were to be a single multi use access track near	National Highways notes your comments regarding the proposed access track to be constructed as part of the Penrith to Temple	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>Winderwath Estate then it should follow the current provision rather than extending into additional land.</p>	<p>Sowerby scheme. The preliminary design has identified the route for the access track. It is not possible to follow the existing provision because the proposed route is impacted by other design features of the scheme including the new A66 alignment, the earthwork extents associated with the proposals, the attenuation ponds and the environmental mitigation proposals. In addition the combined shared use tracks are aligned around the ponds to keep them separate from the A66 and the associated ponds. This then allows third parties, such as the local landowner or the local authority, who may wish to acquire the land and take over the ownership and responsibility of the facility, doing so without impacting the National Highways assets. For further details of our proposals please refer to the General Arrangement Drawings, (Application Document 2.5) and (Rights of Way and Access Plans, (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Please also refer to the Project Development Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme.</p> <p>We will continue to consult with affected landowners through DCO process and detailed design.</p>	
174			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Suggestion	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest the need for access along the north of the new A66 to allow access to all adjoining land from Winderwath Estate.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response.</p> <p>This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. For information the scheme will not provide any direct access to fields or land parcels from the A66. Any access will be maintained from the proposed shared access tracks. Please refer to the Project Development Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. We are committed to working with impacted landowners</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	
34			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Passing Places	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest the need for passing places, which will need to be provided at agreed locations for the access tracks near Winderwath Estate.	National Highways notes your comments about the provision of passing places on new access tracks that you will be using to access your land parcels. The provision of passing places on the new access tracks will be considered in the detailed design of the scheme. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. We will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
37			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access/ Design	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest the public access route near Winderwath Estate would not need to be 4m, but instead can be 2m like on similar routes.	National Highways acknowledges your query on the width of the proposed access tracks close to your estate. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information we have designed the shared use tracks for WCH	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						users and farm vehicles so in accordance with current design guidance the track is 4m wide for use by farm vehicles. It should be noted that the track allows for two-way travel and will cater for WCH users travelling both east and west. Please refer to the Project Development Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme.	
112		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Access/Support	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council support the scheme as there are no significant impacts on the operation of the road.	National Highways thanks you for the positive feedback.	No
216		Eden District Council		Access/Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern that soil storage compounds have no access arrangements displayed and would seek to review these prior to adoption.	National Highways notes your concerns about soil storage compounds across the Project. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', details the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>considerations for construction compounds and site accesses. Soil storage areas will be established, and internal haul routes will be provided to allow transfer of material within the scheme extents. Where there is a requirement to transfer material to other work area locations, within the scheme or to other schemes via the local road network or the A66, haul roads will be set up to connect to suitable access points. Further consideration of haul roads will be required at the detailed design stage whilst developing the construction programme. Additionally further information will be considered, including the detailed design requirements, site conditions and additional survey information, before committing to haul road routes and access points.</p>	
233		Eden District Council		Access/ Lack of Information	<p>Eden District Council express concern that construction compound east of Moor Beck Bridge does not show an access route. Adding that the likely access from the south passes residential buildings and is a single lane bounded by fields with stone walls and would be unsuitable as an access route.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your comments about the proposed access to the compound area opposite the Heron business, located within the extents of the Appleby to Brough scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>For information the compound will likely utilise the single lane road to the south of the plot, possibly using the existing field access point. The road to the south links to the existing A66 via the access road to the east boundary.</p> <p>The layouts of the compound areas will be developed and refined during the detailed design stage. National Highways acknowledges your comments about the compound areas within the Trout Beck flood plain.</p>	
175			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access Ponds	<p>Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest there will be a necessity for National Highways to access the balancing ponds in the Penrith to Temple Sowerby area.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response regarding access to the attenuation ponds in the vicinity of your land interests. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information we will need to access the ponds to carry out various maintenance activities. The proposed access arrangements to the ponds and parking areas are indicated on the DCO Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Please also refer to the Project Development Report (Application</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme.	
47			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access Request for Information	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern over the access track proposed from the junction to Center Parcs on the south side of the A66 through the property known as High Barns and on to Whinfell House Farm and want to be provided with detailed specifications proposed. Further stating the access track will need to be tarmacked. The respondent also ask if the ownership will vest back to the estate when complete.	National Highways acknowledges the response regarding the proposed access track to Center Parcs junction. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information the details of the proposed boundary treatments and access tracks will be finalised during the detailed design stage of the Project. 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Accommodation works can be progressed via this mechanism.</p> <p>We will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
40			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Access Request further information	<p>Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern for the detailed specifications to the proposals and requests further information, asking for detailed specifications for the surfacing of any Local Access Route and fencing on field boundaries.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondents request for further information regarding material specifications and boundary treatments in relation to works on your Estate. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Accommodation works can be progressed via this mechanism.</p> <p>We will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
5			TR0200175	Access Requests further information	<p>Respondents from Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes express concern and would like further detail as to the arrangements for emergency services and bin lorries.</p>	<p>National Highways notes your concerns about Accommodation works not being included on the plans provided. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information 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 progressed via this mechanism.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
82			TR0200185, TR0200186	Accommodation work/ Suggestion	Respondent representing West View farm, Brough and West End Farm Bowes, suggest Accommodation works to include cattle grid, sound reduction measures, fencing and noise mitigation measures, should these not be included in the plans.	<p>National Highways notes your list of suggested Accommodation works.</p> <p>This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. For information 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 progressed via this mechanism works.</p>	No
127			TR0200176	Accommodation work/ Replacement	Respondents representing Blacklodge farm at Bowes express concern as they would	National Highways notes your concerns regarding the agreement of Accommodation works on your	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					like to resolve the Accommodation works as soon as possible. They hope all fences, hedges and ditches would be replaced like for like.	<p>property. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information 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 contacted 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 progressed via this mechanism.</p>	
63			TR0200179	Accommodation Works/ Oppose/ Request for Further Information	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes oppose the Accommodation works until the final design is provided relating to whether the campsite can be relocated.	<p>National Highways notes your comments about Accommodation works being agreed until after the final design is provided.</p> <p>This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N.</p> <p>For information 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 progressed via this mechanism.</p>	
64			TR0200179	Accommodation Works/ Suggestion	<p>Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes suggests required Accommodation works to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Replacement of drystone walls and to ensure boundaries are in keeping with dry stone walling. o Screening/bunding o Noise mitigation measures (Bowes camp site). 	<p>National Highways notes your comments about Accommodation works considerations.</p> <p>This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N.</p> <p>For information any Accommodation works agreed will be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 progressed via this mechanism.	
19			TR0200178	Accommodation Works/ Suggestion		<p>National Highways notes your comments and list of potential Accommodation works for consideration. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>for information 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 progressed via this mechanism.	
121		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Cultural Heritage/ Archaeology	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest the temporary compound locations need to be assessed for potential impacts on buried archaeology in the Environmental Statement.	National Highways notes your comments regarding temporary compound areas to be assessed for the presence of archaeology. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For informatin all land plots within the extents of the Project's order limits red line boundary, including temporary compound areas, have been the subject of a desk top based assessment to identify the potential presence of archaeological features. In areas where archaeology was deemed to be a risk site geophysical surveys were undertaken, subject to land access, to identify any areas of particular concern. In addition, in some areas highlighted as having archaeology present, trial trenching works were carried out, again subject to land access approval. The results of these surveys can be found in the trenching reports in the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 8.6: Trenching Reports (Application Document 3.4). The assessment results can be found under the ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Application Document 3.2). The potential impacts of construction compound locations are assessed within the ES and the Chapter identifies those potential impacts will be mitigated by preservation by record.	
110			TR0200187	Appleby to Brough - Property/ Business	Respondents suggest relocating the compound at Eastfield Farm as the field required will cause significant impact to the operation of the farm business.	National Highways notes your comments regarding the relocation of the proposed compound located currently at Eastfield Farm. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways consulted on this matter as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. For information we have identified, across each of the schemes, proposed locations for a number of site compound areas that are required to construct the works. A number of compound areas will be for site cabins, welfare facilities, car and construction plant parking and new materials storage. The	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>majority of the other compound areas are for the temporary storage of excavated materials. The compound on your land has been identified for its close access links to the existing A66 and its location in relation to a number of work areas in the form of new junctions, structures and ponds. The land is also to be used for environmental mitigation, open grassland, once the compound is no longer required.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses. Please refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p>	
12			TR0200177, TR0200175, TR0200176	Communication / Suggestion	Respondents' land agent representing Tree House farm, Brignall/ Blacklodge farm, Bowes/ Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes	National Highways notes your comments about land agents being notified at same time as land owners. This response does	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>suggesting that being notified at the same time as their client would allow them to respond accordingly at the relevant time.</p>	<p>not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information with regards to the point about not receiving the consultation material at the same time as clients, National Highways consult directly with land owners or interested parties on any of the A66 NTP Project proposals that impact their land or property. Landowners can instruct their land agents at their own discretion. If requested by landowners National Highways has shared the consultation information with land agents.</p>	
4			TR0200175	Construction/ Access	<p>Respondents from Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes express concern as to whether the proposed access past Stonebridge and the crossing bridge to Low Broates will be to Highway standards, maintained by Council and suitable for tractors, trailers and articulated lorries.</p>	<p>National Highways notes your concerns with regarding the design of access points.</p> <p>The design of the Project has been undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). The access tracks referred to will be designed to allow use by a variety of vehicles including tractors and trailers. Further consultation will be carried out at the detailed design stage to ensure the tracks are designed to accommodate any vehicles required to use these tracks.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The maintenance and ownership of the tracks will be will National Highways unless agreement is reached with the local authority.	
222		Eden District Council		Soil storage/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern that two soil storage compounds north of Skirsgill Lane, overlap agricultural buildings to the south and seek clarification that the buildings will not be impacted on the final design. There are two soil storage compounds north of Skirsgill Lane, both of which overlap agricultural buildings to the south. Respondent requests clarification on the impact on these structures prior to the finalisation of design.	National Highways notes your concerns regarding the proposed excavated materials storage areas potentially overlapping existing structures. The layouts of the compound areas will be developed and refined during the detailed design stage including a site review of the area. Any impact on existing structures/ buildings will be considered with changes made to the layout of the compound area. We will continue to work and consult with all impacted stakeholders through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
223		Eden District Council		Soil storage/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern that the soil storage area at Penrith to Temple Sowerby overlaps the proposed routes and seeks confirmation that a phased construction process would be used. The soil storage area overlaps the proposed route, junction, earthworks and attenuation pond	National Highways acknowledges your comments regarding the compound area at the Center Parcs junction potentially impacting on or two design features. The layout and intended use of the compound area will be further reviewed and refined during the detailed design stage. Where the proposed compound area impacts the new alignment of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					east of Lane End School House (Figure 3). A phasing plan of the construction process would be required to confirm the approach and evolution of the large storage area.	the A66 the compound area follows the boundary of the existing land plot with the highway boundary. We have included this area to allow the option of creating an initial temporary access, off the A66, at this point to allow the establishment of the compound area. As the works progress the compound area will be amended to allow construction of the new alignment. Similarly with the new access tracks and pond, the area may be considered for storage initially with the compound area boundary amended when the new features are to be constructed.	
224		Eden District Council		Soil storage	Eden District Council express concern that the soil storage area at Penrith to Temple Sowerby overlaps the proposed Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) route west of Winderwath. Eden District Council states that there is a temporary soil storage site that overlaps the proposed WCH route west of Winderwath Farm. A programme of works is necessary to understand the impact on the WCH route becoming operational.	National Highways acknowledges your comments regarding the storage area west of Winderwath Farm. The layout and intended use of the compound area will be further reviewed and refined during the detailed design stage. The temporary compound area will be used for storage of excavated materials and is likely to not be needed or its extents amended to allow the construction of the WCH route. National Highways will continue to work and consult with all impacted stakeholders through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
108			TR0200187	Detailed design/ Consultation	Respondents suggest that they should be consulted in regard to any further design works.	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 undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	No
98			TR0200182	Drainage/ Design	Respondent representing Redland Bank, Crackenthorpe expresses concern over how the fields will be drained properly to prevent a flood.	We acknowledge your concerns about existing field drainage. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall and will consult with affected landowners or tenants accordingly. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project. The location of the proposed landscape bunds is shown on the DCO General Arrangement Drawings (Application document 2.5) and within the Environment Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8).	No
81			TR0200185, TR0200186, TR0200187	Drainage/ Construction	Respondents representing West View Farm, Eastfield Farm and West End Farm expresses	National Highways acknowledges your concerns about existing field drainage.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					concern over the shallow drains on their land which need to be properly connected when the scheme is constructed.	The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall and will consult with affected landowners or tenants accordingly. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project.	
62			TR0200179	Drainage/ Request for Further Information	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern over drainage at the camp site and would like to be sure that pipes are connected correctly.	We acknowledge your response and request to see more detailed plans of the proposed drainage. the response. The drainage design for the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, design directives including CG 501 Design of highway drainage systems and CD 529 Design of outfall and culverts. The design process considers a number of factors. The topography of the land is considered as well as the make up of the ground in terms of its geology. Information has been	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>sourced from a number of sources to understand the existing drainage across the scheme, both in terms of the highway drainage and the field drainage in the form of pipes, ditches or water courses. Meetings have also been held with local authorities, Environment Agency to consult on their concerns and requirements. The drainage design also considers the flood risk assessment which has been carried out on the scheme and which will impact the final drainage design. The above information is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established alongside the drainage design. The design strategy and design are checked by a number of the design team to ensure it is compliant.</p> <p>Outline details of the current proposed drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement Drawings, (Application document 2.5). The above information is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The drainage must also take into account a number of landscape intergration design principles which restrict the depth of attenuation ponds to between 0.5 and 2.0m,with the maximum permanant depth to be 0.5m or less. The design and form of the ponds must allow integration into the local landscape. For further details and for more constraints refer tp the Project Design Principles (PDP) (Application Document 5.11)	
74			TR0200180	Drainage/ Design/ Request for Further Information	Respondents representing High Grange farm, Melsonby express concern over the drainage being properly connected and would like to see the design first.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	No
61			TR0200179	Drainage/ Design	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern over the	National Highways acknowledges your concerns about existing field drainage.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					drainage of respondents' field which are currently shallow land drains, water and sewerage pipes. Adding that the pipes will need to be properly connected once the scheme is constructed to ensure the land is not flooded during or after construction.	The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall and will consult with affected landowners or tenants accordingly. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project.	
57			TR0200179	Drainage/ Flooding	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern over the proper drainage of the field via the main culvert on the land.	National Highways acknowledges your concerns about existing field drainage. Currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						caused as a result of the Project.	
139			TR0200175	Drainage/ Flooding	Respondents from Mid Lowfield Farm, Bowes express concern that the balancing pond will not work and that the current drain is at full capacity already so there will be significant flooding.	<p>A preliminary drainage design has been carried out for the Project, based on the preferred alignment, and has identified the need for attenuation ponds to store water following periods of rain. The proposed pond design must also 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.</p> <p>The drainage design for the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, design directives including CG 501 Design of highway drainage systems and CD 529 Design of outfall and culverts.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The design process considers a number of factors. The topography of the land is considered as well as the make up of the ground in terms of its geology. Information has been sourced from a number of sources to understand the existing drainage across the scheme, both in terms of the highway drainage and the field drainage in the form of pipes, ditches or water courses. Meetings have also been held with local authorities, Environment Agency to consult on their concerns and requirements. The drainage design also considers the flood risk assesment which has been carried out on the scheme and which will impact the final drainage design. The above infomation is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established alongside the drainage deisgn. The design strategy and design are checked by a number of the design team to ensure it is compliant.</p> <p>Outline details of the current proposed drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement Drawings,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application document 2.5). The above information is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established.	
14			TR0200178	Drainage/ Flooding	<p>Respondents representing Street Side farm, Cross Lanes, Barnard Castle express concern related to the drainage adding that their land currently does not flood, and it is expected that this will still be the same after the works are completed. Further adding recent costly instalments of drains near the eastern ponds need to be avoided.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your concerns about existing field drainage. Currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5). As the Project moves into the detailed design stage further consultation will be carried out</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						with landowners to discuss existing and proposed drainage details. The pond locations have been established as part of the preliminary design and have taken consideration a number of design constraints. If any of your new drainage is impacted by our drainage proposals, it will be reviewed and amended as part of the Project works.	
241			TR0200108	Drainage/ Construction	Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express concern stating some of the fields have shallow land drains which have raised concerns over throughout the scheme, but more importantly when the road is constructed. The drains need to be properly connected when the construction compounds are built.	National Highways acknowledges your concerns about existing field drainage. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For informatin currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>caused as a result of the Project.</p> <p>In terms of the construction compounds provision any field drainage impacted will be addressed during the establishment works.</p>	
87			TR0200181	Drainage/ Flooding	<p>Respondents representing Stonebridge Farm, Bowes express concern that the proposed drainage provided for the Bowes Bypass scheme could result in flooding at the holiday cottages.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondents' concerns about potential flooding of holiday homes as a result of the Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information the drainage design for the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, design directives including CG 501 Design of highway drainage systems and CD 529 Design of outfall and culverts.</p> <p>The design process considers a number of factors. The topography of the land is considered as well as the make up of the ground in terms of its geology. Information has been sourced from a number of sources to understand the existing drainage across the scheme, both in terms of the highway drainage</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and the field drainage in the form of pipes, ditches or water courses. Meetings have also been held with local authorities, Environment Agency to consult on their concerns and requirements. The drainage design also considers the flood risk assesment which has been carried out on the scheme and which will impact the final drainage design. The above infomation is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established alongside the drainage deisgn. The design strategy and design are checked by a number of the design team to ensure it is compliant.</p> <p>Outline details of the current proposed drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement Drawings, (Application document 2.5). The above infomation is then collated and considered and a drainage strategy for the scheme is established.</p> <p>In regard to flooding risk please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Application Document 3.4) which is included as an 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. We	
73			TR0200180	Drainage/ Design	Respondents representing High Grange farm, Melsonby suggest 12-inch field drain which interjects the A66 needs to be included in designs to ensure it can cope with the amount of water coming from a 200+ acre of land, adding that they will not accept liability for any flooding of the underpass.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concern about an existing field drain at your property, located within the Stephen Moor to Carkin Bank scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project. Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5). 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). In regard to flooding risk please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4) which is included as an 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.	
59			TR0200179	Drainage/ Design	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes suggest a full survey of the drains and sewerage pipes be undertaken as they link into a	National Highways acknowledges the response regarding the existing drainage in the vicinity of the camp site at Bowes. This response does not apply to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					culvert under the existing A66, and it is important that these pipes are not damaged as the landowner is currently developing a shower and toilet block which use these pipes.	<p>supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For informaton currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a result of the Project. Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5). 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(ES) Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2).	
48			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Drainage/ Design/ Maintenance	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest that culverts and drainage be properly maintained as currently three culverts under the A66 have been inadequately maintained and drainage more generally, which has seen woodland to the south of the A66 permanently submerged.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response regarding the maintenance of existing drainage in the vicinity of your property within the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information we will only make changes to existing drainage infrastructure if it is impacted by the Projects proposals.</p> <p>Any culverts that pass under the existing A66 will be inspected and assessed as part of the detailed design. Where necessary as part of the Project, works will be carried out to the existing culverts to extend them under the new A66 extents and to ensure they are operational. The proposed works will only address flooding issues that are created by the construction of the works and will not necessarily address pre-existing flooding issues. Outline details of the current drainage</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement Drawings (Application document 2.5). 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). In regard to flooding risk please refer to Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (ES Volume 3, Application Document 3.4) which is included as an 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>Following completion of the Project the maintenance of the culverts, under the A66, will be the responsibility of the National Highways Area team.</p>	
58			TR0200179	Drainage/ Design	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes	National Highways acknowledges the response regarding the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>suggest that the field drains are properly connected into the culvert/new highways drainage.</p>	<p>maintenance of existing drainage in the vicinity of your property within the Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a direct result of the Project.</p> <p>Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5). In addition the effects of the Project in relation to road drainage and the water environment, including groundwater and surface</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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). We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	
72			TR0200180	Drainage/ Design	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby suggests that the current drainage needs surveying and designing into the scheme and a cover installed to prevent further blockages and flooding of the existing A66.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response regarding the maintenance of existing drainage in the vicinity of your property within the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For informatin currently we have little information about the existing field drainage, any information you can provide would be welcomed. The existing drainage within fields will be considered further at the detailed design stage, or if no further information can be sourced to inform the design, during the construction phase of the Project. We will look to reconnect any</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>impacted field drainage to a new or existing outfall. We however will not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing private drainage and will not address any flooding that is not caused as a direct result of the Project.</p> <p>Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5). 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>We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
7			TR0200176	Drainage / Request further information	Respondents from Blacklodge farm, Bowes request more detail regarding balancing ponds and its datum relative to the field and whether it could cause further	National Highways acknowledges the response requesting further information about the attenuation ponds and drainage for the works impacting their property within the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>issues to the field in terms of drainage.</p>	<p>Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information 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).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.</p> <p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>response to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation whilst minimising the risk of flooding. Outline details of the current drainage design can be found in the DCO General Arrangement drawings (Application document 2.5).</p> <p>Where land drainage from agriculture is encountered during construction, actions will be taken to divert the flow to an appropriate location, such as the 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).</p>	
160			TR0200192	Engagement process/ Lack of Communication	<p>Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about lack of substantive communication or opportunity to discuss previous comments from the autumn consultation.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondents concerns about lack of communication or further opportunity to discuss comments made previously. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information since the statutory consultation, we have continued to engage regularly with</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>stakeholders, landowners and those with interest(s) in the land to keep them updated on the progress of the Project and discuss any technical matters relevant to the preparation of the Project design and environmental assessment prior to submission of the DCO application.</p> <p>Responses to previous comments from the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 are set out in Annex N of the Consultation Report (Application Document 4.4).</p>	
27			TR0200192	Engagement process/ Short Consultation Time	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about lack of time within the consultation to allow for them to consult with their trustees.	The supplementary consultations were conducted in line with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the PA 2008 and principles and methods in the Project's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the extent they were relevant for these supplementary consultations. As the proposed design changes subject to consultation were local in nature and/or related to particular issues and would not have resulted in a project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation we	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						believe that a slightly shorter time period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation (6 weeks) was appropriate.	
132	TR0200174			Engagement process/ Lack of Information	Respondent expresses concern over the lack of adequate and clear information available. Adding there was no definitions for technical terms used on the plans and that the maps were extremely detailed and difficult to read.	<p>The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project from what was presented at the Autumn 2021 statutory consultation.</p> <p>Information on these changes was provided in consultation brochures and/or the webpage for each set of changes consulted upon. The consultation brochure provided during the consultation, detailed the information on the design changes proposed for walking, cycling and horse riding, landforms and noise bunds and construction compounds. It also informed the reader on how to provide feedback. An email and phone number was provided should anyone have any specific questions they wished to discuss. Those receiving notification letters were offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting.</p> <p>The information and materials were provided in all cases to enable impacted parties to understand the scale and impacts of the proposed design changes. We also provided a webpage link to the statutory consultation materials to ensure these changes could be understood in the wider context of the overall design.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the public interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the supplementary consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</p>	
101			TR0200183	Engagement process/ Lack of Information	Respondents representing Bowes and Romaldkirk Estate express concern relating to the lack of information on environmental	Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					mitigation provided during the consultation meetings and therefore a lack of effective consultation.	consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of autumn 2021 and has engaged extensively with landowners where their land is required for environmental mitigation. We will continue to engage with landowners on environmental mitigation and other issues that impacts on land and property throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. . The detail of environmental mitigation can be found in the Environmental Mitigation Plans (Application Document 2.8) and more information about the management regimes is outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) which will be part of the DCO application.	
134	TR0200174			Engagement process/ Wider Consultation Programme	Respondent expresses concern that the consultation does not match the size of the Project.	The size and approach to the supplementary consultation was tailored to the subject matter and the areas within which they were located. As the proposed design changes for construction compounds were local in nature and related to a particular issue	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier statutory consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project, that would result in a design for the project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. A slightly shorter time period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation (6 weeks) was also appropriate given the targeted issues and local nature of the changes proposed. The approach taken to the consultation also accords with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the PA 2008 and principles and methods in the Project's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the extent they were relevant for these supplementary consultations.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
135	TR0200174			Engagement process/ Wider Consultation Programme	Respondent expresses concern that the consultation has not been adequate as local, regional and national environmental organisations have not had the chance to respond and this Project is of significant and national importance. Respondent states that more time and publicity was needed for the consultation. Respondent further states concern that the consultation has not been made readily available in a public manner.	The size and approach to the supplementary consultation was tailored to the subject matter and the areas within which they were located. As the proposed design changes for construction compounds were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier statutory consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project, that would result in a design for the project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. A slightly shorter time period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation (6 weeks). The approach to publicity was also appropriate given the targeted issues and local nature of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>changes proposed. The approach to publicising the supplementary consultations (and associated events etc) has been discussed with the host local authorities. The approach taken to the consultation also accords with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the PA 2008 and principles and methods in the Project's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the extent they were relevant for these supplementary consultations. In addition, outside of the formal consultation process the Project team has frequently engaged with a range of bodies and organisations, including the statutory environmental bodies (SEBs) throughout the design of the Project, including engagement on the changes to the design following Statutory Consultation. The feedback from this engagement, which has been ongoing for more than a year (before and after our statutory consultation and supplementary consultation) has been incorporated, where appropriate, in to the design and assessment of the Project. The extent and scope of this engagement, with</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the SEBs and other stakeholders and the period within which it was undertaken is described in full in this Consultation Report (chapter 3 and 7).	
137	TR0200174			Engagement process/Wider Consultation Programme	Respondents express concern that the engagement process was not thorough enough and more groups should have been consulted.	As the proposed design changes for construction compounds, land and noise bunds were local in nature and related to a particular issue they were targeted to specific groups and individuals, in this case landowners and the local authorities. A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier statutory consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds, land and noise bunds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary consultation were not substantial changes to the Project, that would result in a design for the project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation. A slightly shorter time-period (4 weeks) for the consultation compared with the period for statutory consultation (6 weeks) and the approach to publicity was also appropriate given the targeted issues and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>local nature of the changes proposed.</p> <p>Since the statutory consultation, we have continued to engage regularly with stakeholders, landowners and those with interest(s) in the land to keep them updated on the progress of the Project and discuss any technical matters relevant to the preparation of the Project design and environmental assessment prior to submission of the DCO application. This has included ongoing regular meetings with focus groups, community liaison groups, and the strategic environmental bodies (SEBs).</p>	
133	TR0200174			Engagement process/Wider Consultation Programme	<p>Respondent expresses concern that the position of the compounds should have been included in the stat consultation in Autumn 21 as per other NSIP such as A27 Arundel. Adding that the consultation process is prioritising speed over democracy, transparency.</p>	<p>The proposed construction compounds were shown in our autumn 21 statutory consultation (as orange cross hatched areas in the Map books). Since the Statutory Consultation in Autumn 2021 the preliminary design of the Project has developed in a number of locations, taking into account the feedback and additional design related information procured. As a result, the location and areas proposed for the compounds has changed</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and it is this change which was the subject of the supplementary consultation in spring 2022 The approach taken to the consultation also accords with the principles of pre-application statutory consultation set out in the PA 2008 and principles and methods in the Project's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to the extent they were relevant for these supplementary consultations and has also been discussed with the host local authorities.	
131	TR0200174			Engagement process/Wider Consultation Programme	Respondents express concern that there has been a lack of public consultation events for the size of the Project.	Following the Sstatutory eConsultation in the Aautumn-of 2021, further work has been undertaken to improve the Project design in certain locations and changes have been made to the proposals. These changes have been made primarily to reduce the impacts on the environment and local communities. The supplementary consultations have been held directly with affected landowners, stakeholders and statutory organisations on the changes to the scheme design. The intention was-has been to seek feedback from these specific	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>consultees on the changes as they related to their property interests or responsibilities. -In-person events for targeted supplementary consultation matters were held in Spring Spring 2022 for those supplementary consultations where we communicated the consultation to people living and working in the vicinity of the proposed design change to give them the opportunity to ask us questions. and advertised to affected parties beforehand Where there were not in-person events, those receiving notification letters were offered a meeting to discuss the plans and the potential impacts on their land interests. The letter included a phone number and email address to request a meeting.</p> <p>A smaller scale targeted consultation was appropriate (compared with our earlier statutory consultation on the Project) as the construction compounds, land and noise bunds and others changes that were the subject to supplementary and targeted consultation were not substantial changes to the Project,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						that would result in a design for the project that was fundamentally different to that which had already been consulted on at Statutory Consultation.	
201			TR0200179	Environmental/ Noise/ Pollution	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern over the increased noise/pollution/disturbance to the Old Armoury camp site which may result due to the proposed revised access layout to and from the A66 from the A67.	National Highways acknowledges the concerns of the responder regarding potential increased noise/ pollution/ disturbance as a result of the works impacting their camp site within the Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. For information 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) and takes into account the revised Project design. The Old Armoury campsite is not identified as being subject to a significant adverse noise impact during operation. During construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant temporary noise and vibration impacts at the Old Armoury Campsite during the compound phase, road construction phase and demolition	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>phase. The potential for temporary construction noise and vibration impacts is dependent on the construction activities being undertaken. Construction and vibration impacts have been assessed as significant effects when construction is at its busiest and closest to receptors. 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> <p>With the use of BPM, as per the EMP and NVMP (Application Document 2.7), it remains possible that construction noise levels will exceed the SOAEL during each of the construction phases at a number of receptors, however, the total number of receptors likely to experience noise levels greater than the SOAEL has reduced. Where the construction noise level is predicted to be greater than the SOAEL, further mitigation measures will be utilised (where</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>practicable) in the form of the construction program to minimise the possibility that receptors are not exposed to noise levels greater than the SOAEL for ten or more days and/or nights in any 15 consecutive days and/or nights or if the noise level is above the SOAEL for a total number of 40 or more days in any six consecutive months.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential quantitative impacts of construction-related vehicle emissions on air quality. Potential impacts on sensitive human and ecological receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network are identified and no likely significant effects are concluded.</p>	
8			TR0200108	Environmental/ Mitigation	<p>Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough, express concern that no detail on required mitigation has been provided and whether mitigation would impact their farm.</p> <p>Noting the matter is of concern to them as the effects of the use of their land is material given the size of their farm.</p>	<p>The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposed changes are of relevance to.</p> <p>Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report at the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. It was concluded that none of these design changes would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment identifying refinements to mitigation proposals was not provided. However, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The Project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.	
138	TR0200174			Environmental/ Wildlife	Respondents express concern that the new compounds are located within the River Eden Special Conservation Area (SAC) and directly impact on the Chapel Wood Country Wildlife Site which the respondent understands to be ancient woodland.	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 River Eden SAC and River Eden and Tributaries SSSI have the same boundary and are located within 2km of the Order Limits of the Project. The Project lies adjacent to these designated sites and will cross the designated sites and its associated tributaries within Temple Sowerby to Appleby and Appleby to Brough schemes. Potential construction impacts identified include minor habitat loss of the riparian habitat in relation to the proposed attenuation basin discharges to the river and the construction of the Trout Beck viaduct, habitat fragmentation and disturbance from increased noise, vibration and lighting as well as the introduction or spreading of non-native species.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Following application of the mitigation set out within the EMP (Application Document 2.7), a slight adverse (not significant) effects is predicted on the River Eden SAC and River Eden and Tributaries SSSI.</p> <p>The ES Chapter identifies that Chapel Wood (Appleby in Westmorland) CWS, and Chapel Wood Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) lie adjacent to the Order Limits south of Temple Sowerby to Appleby. Potential construction impacts identified include habitat degradation through potential dust deposition from dust emitting activities, accidental encroachment onto sensitive habitats and minor temporary habitat loss. Site-specific measures regarding dust emitting activities from construction or haul routes are secured within the EMP (Application Document Number 2.7). Fencing will be used in order to ensure no accidental encroachment on retained habitats. Works adjacent to this site will be 50m away from the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						boundary of the ancient woodland habitat, avoiding the potential for impacts to trees within the ancient woodland habitat, or for loss of, or damage to ground flora. Following application of the above embedded mitigation, slight adverse (not significant) effects are predicted on Chapel Wood (Appleby in Westmorland) CWS and Chapel Wood ASNW.	
136	TR0200174			Environmental/ Further Consultation	Respondents express concern that the proposed changes at Supplementary consultation are so significant that the PEI Report should have been updated and reconsulted on.	The proposed design changes identified were reviewed to determine whether they would change conclusions within the PEI report with respect to the likely significant environmental effects of the Project. It was concluded that none of these changes would result in any new or different likely significant effects on the environment, and therefore information was provided within each supplementary consultation brochure comparing the environmental effects of the proposed changes and confirming that the information presented in the PEI report remained relevant and applicable.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Due to their relatively small-scale, none of the changes presented at the supplementary consultation were considered to materially affect the environmental effects at the Project-wide level nor significantly alter in-combination effects as set out in the PEI report. The Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative and In-Combination effects [Application Document 3.02] sets out the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects of the Project with these changes having been incorporated, and each topic chapter reports significant effects that would be a result of individual schemes and those that would be anticipated on a route-wide scale.	
84			TR0200185, TR0200186	Environmental/ Further Research	Respondents representing West View Farm, Brough and West End Farm, Bowes, suggest the requirement for a hydrologist survey prior to construction works to ensure the supply from the spring at Flitholme is not disturbed.	The presence of the spring at Flitholme, close to Warcop, is known and is recorded within ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment, (Application Document 3.2), Paragraph 14.8.43 highlights the spring will likely be impacted by the proposed works. Outline measures to minimise construction impacts on the spring are included in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP)	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 2.7). Under the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, item RDWE-02 requires the preparation of a Programme of Ground Water and Surface Water Management Plan which will be approved and monitored by the Environment Agency. During the detailed design stage, a Hydrologist will likely be involved to carry out further assessments with regards to the spring as well as in monitoring and protecting the spring against the impact of the construction.	
217		Eden District Council		Environmental/ Lack of Environmental Modelling	Eden District Council express concern for the lack of acoustic, dust or light modelling to support the revised arrangement presented within the supplementary consultation and therefore are unable to identify if the new arrangement is likely to have more significant detrimental or beneficial impacts on residential receptors compared to what was consulted upon at the autumn 2021 Consultation.	The purpose of the supplementary consultation was to inform and seek feedback on specific changes to the Project in comparison to what was presented at the autumn 2021 consultation. This was a focused supplementary consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are relevant. Information on these changes was provided in Consultation Brochures for each set of changes. Each proposed change	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>identified was reviewed to determine whether it would change conclusions that were previously published within the PEI Report presented at the autumn 2021 Consultation and made available as part of the Supplementary Consultation. The PEI report considered that construction activity, including compounds, could be located anywhere within the area identified for construction and therefore likely noise and air quality effects arising from the compounds were identified. This supplementary consultation was to provide further granularity regarding the location of the key compound areas, building on that provided at statutory consultation. It was concluded that none of the changes covered by this consultation would change the conclusions presented in the PEI Report and therefore a revised environmental assessment including updated noise modelling was not provided. However, information was provided within each Consultation Brochure comparing the environmental impacts and effects of the proposed design changes and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>confirming that the information in the PEI Report remained relevant and applicable.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultation was considered in regard to the scale of the changes proposed, the likely interest in the changes and the potential for a change to environmental impacts and effects. This approach accords with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Guidance on the Pre-Application Process). The approach to the Supplementary Consultations, in light of the above considerations, is considered adequate and proportionate.</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). Section 12.10 of the ES Chapter presents the results of the assessment of construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential quantitative impacts of construction-related vehicle emissions on air quality. Potential</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>impacts on sensitive human and ecological receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network are identified and no likely significant effects are concluded.</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 environment, such as noise, dust and lighting will be managed to avoid or minimise effects on nearby residents and sensitive ecological receptors. The EMP is a certified document in the draft DCO, ensuring the commitments within it will be implemented.</p>	
225		Eden District Council		Environmental/ Soil/ Noise/ Air Quality	Eden District Council express concern for the proximity of the soil storage compound south the proposed junction at Kirkby Thore to the Kirkby Thore Primary School and the potential impact this will have on noise and air quality and therefore impact on children's learning and health.	<p>The presence of the school at Kirkby Thore and potential adverse impacts in this location as a result of the Project have been taken into account during the design of the Project. National Highways recognise that the proposed soil storage area is in close proximity to a number of receptors, including the school.</p> <p>The location is required due to the phasing of construction needed to construct the new road, with material generated by the cutting required to be stored close to its</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>reuse location (in the earth landscape bunds). In the long-term the reuse of this material will have a function in preventing noise and visual effects from the new road on the users of the Primary School.</p> <p>National Highways has developed an Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7) which sets out measures to be implemented during construction to protect nearby receptors, including Kirkby Thore Primary School. This includes the commitment to move material the shortest distance practicable before reuse and minimise the number of times material is relocated. This will minimise the number of vehicle movements in the soil storage area and therefore the noise and emissions that could affect the children at the school. All soil storage will be managed carefully so as to prevent dust generation.</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). Section 12.10 of the ES Chapter presents the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>results of the assessment of construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>National Highways recognise that during construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant temporary noise and vibration impacts at Kirkby Thore school during both the compound use phase and the road construction phase. The potential for temporary construction noise and vibration impacts is dependent on the construction activities being undertaken. The contractor will liaise closely with the local authority to agree the Best and Most Practicable means of mitigation for noise and vibration at this location, through the development and implementation of the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Annex B5 to the EMP).</p> <p>The impact of the Project on air quality at construction and operation, is assessed and reported in ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (Application Document 3.2).</p> <p>A qualitative assessment of the impacts of nuisance dust arising during construction has been carried out, using the assessment</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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> <p>The potential effects of the Project on population and human health is assessed within ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2). The ES Chapter identifies that the combined effects of Project noise and visual impacts in this area, 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						assessed as a negative health effect.	
232		Eden District Council		Environmental/ Soil/ Flooding	Eden District Council express concern that the Trout Beck Soil Storage compound is in close proximity to the water course and is located within the floodplain and suggest that it is re-assessed.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your comments about the compound areas within the Trout Beck flood plain. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>For information these compound areas have been included primarily to support the construction of the proposed bridge structure that spans the extents of the Trout Beck flood plain. Only minimal amounts of excavated materials are expected to be stored in these areas within the flood zone. We are aware of the importance of the flood zone and have taken due consideration to mitigate any environmental impacts. We will engage further on the environmental impacts with the Environment Agency during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The layout and use of these compound areas will be further considered during the detailed design stage of the Project. We will continue to work and consult with all impacted stakeholders</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						through the DCO process and into detailed design. 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. 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 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 as a result of the Project were identified.	
18			TR0200109 TR0200178	Environmental / Biodiversity	Respondents including representatives from Street Side	National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>farm, Cross Lanes, Barnard Castle express concern regarding the potential impact on agricultural land and the resulting impact on their business from the use of their land for species rich grassland and woodland mitigation.</p>	<p>minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take. Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). The project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects 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. Such agreements could include management agreements or section 253 Highways Act 1980 in appropriate circumstances. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.	
124		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Design	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council express concern around the use of compounds as ecological mitigation adding the timing will be key to ensure there is no delay to the implementation of mitigation.	Compound locations are not fixed at this time, pending the detailed design construction logistics being completed. It is possible that compound locations may be relocated within the order limits. The size and number are also subject to final evaluation based on detailed temporary works design. National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take. Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Within the EMP sets out a list of environmental actions and commitments and details when these should be in place prior to Project developments.	
91			TR0200186, TR0200185 TR0200178 TR0200184, TR0200187	Environmental Mitigation/ Lack of Information	Respondents representing West View Farm, Street Side Farm, Eastfield Farm, West End Farm express concern over lack of environmental mitigation identification on plans and note that the use of land as grassland mitigation will equate losses to their agricultural business.	This was a focused supplementary consultation, which sought feedback from local communities, land interests and key stakeholders to whom the proposed changes are of relevance to. Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. Environmental mitigation is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8). National	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Highways are committed to minimising the amount of land take required for the Project, including environmental mitigation, and to utilising the most appropriate land for mitigation. However, due to the nature of the mitigation proposed, it is often location specific in order to achieve the objective required (for example, screening of visual impacts for a specific receptor, habitat connectivity or mitigating impacts on a specific population of a protected species).</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>National Highways is committed to working with landowners to avoid the need to exercise compulsory acquisition powers if appropriate agreements can be entered into. Such agreements could include management agreements or section 253 Highways Act 1980 in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>However, not all types of environmental mitigation are well suited to those types of contractual arrangements given</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the long duration of the Project and the need to maintain certain categories of mitigation over the long term. As such, while National Highways is committed to exploring such arrangements in appropriate circumstances, it must, nonetheless, retain the ability to acquire such land in order to safeguard the delivery of the Project.	
240			TR0200176	Bowes Bypass - Environmental Mitigation/ Lack of Information	Respondents representing Blacklodge farm, Bowes express concern that they have no details of the environmental mitigation and its effect on the farm and whether this land is to be acquired or be under management agreement.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. The detail of environmental mitigation management regimes is also outlined in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) which will be part of the DCO application.	No
164			TR0200179	Bowes Bypass - Environmental Mitigation/ Noise/ Pollution	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site suggest creating a tree-lined noise bund in order to reduce the amount of noise pollution.	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) and takes into account the revised Project design.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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.</p> <p>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. All practicable measures to screen the surrounding area from highway noise have been applied through the embedded noise mitigation in the design. Within the ES, the Old Armoury campsite is not identified as being subject to a significant adverse noise impact during operation.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
120		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Request for Further Information	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest it is expected that detailed information be provided within the Environmental Management Plan, that they can comment on before they approve.	The EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out control measures to be employed during planning and construction of the Project and is submitted as part of the DCO application. The EMP will be developed into a second iteration by the Principal Contractor and implemented at construction stage. National Highways have been discussing the process of preparing an EMP with local authorities and the strategic environmental bodies prior to the submission of the DCO Application.	No
211		Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Soil Storage	Eden District Council express concern for the location of soil storage and its environmental impact. Respondents request confirmation that soil storage areas will not require permanent foundations.	Topsoil stripped during the construction of the Project will be re-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. 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. This is secured within the EMP	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 2.7). The Principal Contractor for the works will be made aware of a number of environmental constraints to the works such as water courses. The contractor will produce detailed method statements to ensure all constraints are identified and addressed, ensuring mitigation is in place where required.	
212		Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/	Eden District Council express concern about proximity of construction compounds to the River Eamont and request this be included within the environmental assessment and include safeguarding practices to mitigate any impacts.	Environmental Statement, 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. The ES Chapter identifies that following the implementation of mitigation listed in Ground and Surface Water Management Plan (Annex B7 of the EMP, Application Document 2.7), impact of the construction of the Project on the surface water receptors such as the River Eamont is likely to be negligible and not significant.	No
213		Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Soil Storage	Eden District Council express concern that the location of the	Environmental Statement, Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					soil storage compound at River Eamont flood regularly each year.	(Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of the impact of the Project on the water environment. A detailed flood risk assessment has been completed and is within the ES Appendices (Application Document 3.4) submitted with the DCO application. The risk of fluvial flooding to or from the Project is considered to be low due to the limited areas of construction that will be taking place within the flood risk areas. 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. Following the implementation of mitigation outlined in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), no significant impacts are identified.	
214		Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Biodiversity	Eden District Council note that if the soil storage at River Eamont is restored to open space confirmation will be sought that a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment	Biodiversity net gain is not currently a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, however, National Highways are committed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					has been undertaken prior to construction and reinstatement.	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 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).	
215		Eden District Council		Environmental Mitigation/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern that no information has been provided on how soil storage locations will be returned to their previous states.	Topsoil stripped during the construction of the Project will be re-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. A Soil Management Plan will be produced prior to works	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						commencing by the Principal Contractor and will set out the requirements of soil handling, storage and treatment. This is secured within the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	
173			TR0200178	Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Environmental Mitigation/ Liability	Respondents representing Street Side farm, Cross Lanes, Barnard Castle express concern for the responsibility of species rich grassland and woodland and request further information on who will be responsible for said land as it will not be of benefit to the landowner and the business. If left with the landowner, it will have a negative impact on the business' profitability. Adding that it is appreciated that environmental mitigation is vital, it should also be remembered that food production is also vital.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	No
49			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Environmental Mitigation/ Request further information	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about screening proposed and ask for details on the screening for the three residential properties and commercial uses facing the road at Whinfell House Farm, which will be faced with increased volume of traffic. Also suggesting details of the noise boundary be supplied as well.	ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects during construction and operation. Within this location the Project proposes grassland planting and hedgerow boundaries, there is no significant visual impact identified and therefore no specific screening planting is proposed.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<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 assessment considers traffic modelling undertaken for the Project. No significant effect is identified in this location as a result of the Project during operation and therefore mitigation for noise effects is not proposed.</p> <p>During construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant temporary noise and vibration impacts at this location. The potential for temporary construction noise and vibration impacts is dependent on the construction activities being undertaken. 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. The EMP also includes measures to reduce impacts during construction from dust, lighting and visual impacts,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and measures to protect nearby properties and businesses including prevention of severance of access.	
80			TR0200185	Appleby to Brough - Financial/	Respondent representing West View farm, Brough suggests financial support from National Highways for hydrology surveys prior to construction to ensure their supply from the spring at Flitholme is unaffected.	National Highways notes your request for a Hydrologist, to be financed by National Highways, to ensure the spring at Flitholme is not impacted by the proposed works. The presence of the spring at Flitholme, close to Warcop, is known and is recorded within Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14, Road Drainage and the Water Environment, (Application Document 3.2), Paragraph 14.8.43 highlights the spring will likely be impacted by the proposed works. Outline measures to reduce the construction impacts on the spring are included in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). Under the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments, item -RDWE-02 requires the preparation of a Programme of Ground Water and Surface Water Management Plan which will be approved and monitored by the Environment Agency. During the detailed design stage, a Hydrologist will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						employed, via the appointed Contractors design team to likely carry out further assessments with regards to the spring as well as be involved in monitoring and protecting the spring against the impact of the construction.	
200			TR0200179	Financial/ Business Compensation	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site at Bowes express concern for their planning application for a campsite business adding that if approval is denied as a result of the A66 design, the respondents will be seeking compensation.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, National Highways will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	No
55			TR0200179	Bowes Bypass - Financial/ Business	Respondents express concern over the effect the scheme and its construction will have on the Old Armoury camp site business, stating if the compounds are not moved, compensation will be sought for the detrimental impact on the business which may need to shut whilst works are being constructed.	National Highways acknowledges the respondent's concern with regards the impact of the proposed site compound location at Bowes on the Old Armoury camp site. National Highways would prefer to use locations for construction compounds that are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>encompassed as part of the permanent works; that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the 'live' A66 are provided. Access to the compound should be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to the compound should be included within the Order limits.</p> <p>As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected. Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Human Health, (Application Document 3.2.	

Consultee comments raised in response to Supplementary Consultation in relation to ‘Construction Compounds’ and National Highways regard

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
55			TR0200179	Financial/ Business	<p>Respondents representing Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern if the compounds in the vicinity of their business cannot be moved they will seek compensation as the Old Armoury Camp site would have to shut whilst the construction works are ongoing as they will have a detrimental impact on the business, even after the construction's works have finished.</p> <p>The proposed works will bring the A66 and associated infrastructure closer to the camp site.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the concern with regards the impact of the proposed site compound location at Bowes in relation to the Old Armoury camp site.</p> <p>We would prefer to use locations for construction compounds that are encompassed as part of the permanent works; that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the ‘live’ A66 are provided. Access to the compound should be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to the compound should be included within the Order limits.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), under the section ‘Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access’, which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p> <p>As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>committed to seeking to acquire the land for the Project to construct the works (including WCH provision) by agreement. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
60			TR0200179	Financial/ Utilities	<p>Respondents representing Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern over the financial implication for the Old Armoury camp site of moving electricity points in the respondent's field. Respondent is looking to be compensated for this by National Highways.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the concern with regards the impact of the proposed Project in relation to the electric points at Old Armoury camp site at Bowes. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>The preliminary design for the scheme has been completed in accordance with the latest</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>guidance and national design standards. As part of the design it has been identified that environmental mitigation measures are required to replace features or areas of environmental importance lost as a result of the schemes highways related proposals and to provide features to reduce noise and landscape intrusion. The assessment of the environmental requirements can be found within the Environmental Statement (ES) (Application Document 3.2),</p> <p>As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the ES Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).	
85			TR0200181	Engineering design	Respondent representing Stone Bridge Farm, Bowes express concern over the proposed bridge near Stone Bridge Farm. The respondent is concerned that their property value will be impacted by the new bridge over A66 as part of Bowes Bypass scheme. The respondent suggest that the bridge position be changed to impact the property less and/or that the properties are accessed from the A67 so there is no longer need for a bridge.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concern over the value of their property once the scheme is constructed and also with regards to the new accommodation overbridge location within the Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected. Further information on our property policies can be found	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses and properties has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2.).The provision of a new accommodation overbridge over the A66, to the east of your property, is to ensure continued access to the A66, via the The Street and improved junction at the A67, for local farms with land interest to the north of the A66. It should be noted that the overbridge has been moved further east, away from Stone Bridge Farm, in response to stakeholder feedback received at Statutory Consultation. The access road to this overbridge has also been realigned compared to the Statutory Consultation proposals and has now also been moved further from the property, closer to the A66. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the for the Bowes Bypass scheme.	
168			TR0200181	Bowes Bypass - Financial/ Business	<p>Respondents representing Stone Bridge Farm, Bowes express concern about the impacts of the proposed bridge near Stone Bridge House and some holiday cottages that are being developed. Respondent is concerned about the viability of the holiday cottage business and the value of the cottages.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondents concern regarding the impact of the Project in particular the new accommodation overbridge proposed over the A66, on their holiday cottages. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						properties has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2.).	
107			TR0200187	Appleby to Brough - Financial/ Property Value	Respondents representing Eastfield Farm, Warcop express concern that land proposed for environmental mitigation at Eastfield Farm in Warcop is placed closest to the farmstead and it is the most valuable land for the running of the business.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondent's concern with regards the impact of the Appleby to Brough scheme on the productivity of agricultural land which will remain after scheme constructed. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</p> <p>The preliminary design for the scheme has been completed in accordance with the latest guidance and national design standards. As part of the design it has been identified that environmental mitigation measures are required to replace features or areas of environmental importance lost as a result of the schemes highways related proposals and to provide features to reduce noise and landscape intrusion. The assessment of the environmental requirements can be found within the Environmental Statement (ES) (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
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the ES Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
236		Northern Powergrid		Financial / Cost	<p>Northern Powergrid oppose the Project, as a company standard procedure to protect assets, until receipt of written confirmation that National Highways will be responsible for all costs incurred by Northern Powergrid. Northern Powergrid suggest National Highways engage on construction compound changes with Northern</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your concern with regards to costs incurred as a result of the Project's proposals.</p> <p>We consulted with Northern Powergrid during the Stage 3 preliminary design phase about the impact of the Project on its assets as part of the management</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Powergrid engineers and the Design Team Manager, if not already done so, and there may be a re-charge for the engineers' time reviewing the proposals.	of statutory undertakers. These discussions will continue into detailed design. National Highways will consider paying any reasonable costs incurred directly as a result of the A66 Project. We have contacted Northern Powergrid regarding the agreement of Protected Provisions and any required side agreements and discussions are ongoing.	
125		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Flooding	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest any compound will need to be assessed against the risk of flooding, within the Environmental Statement.	National Highways acknowledges the request that any site compound locations across the Project will need to be assessed against the risk of flooding. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. 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). 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.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Surface water generated across the Order Limits would be managed by construction drainage (including suitably sized temporary settlement and drainage basins, drainage ditches and culverts). These would be installed early in the construction period as per the EMP (Application Document 2.7) which would manage surface flooding to ensure that flood risk does not increase as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p>	
119		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Flooding/ Mitigations	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest the Environmental Statement will need to consider how the surface runoff will be managed for the compounds.	<p>We acknowledge the concern that any site compound locations will need to consider drainage for managing run off. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.</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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>ES Chapter 14, Road Drainage, and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). 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.</p> <p>Surface water generated across the Order Limits would be managed by construction drainage (including suitably sized temporary settlement and drainage basins, drainage ditches and culverts). These would be installed early in the construction period as per the EMP (Application Document 2.7) which would manage surface flooding to ensure that flood risk does not increase as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p> <p>Drainage requirements including the management of surface runoff</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						will be considered as part of the site compound establishment plan which will be developed during the detailed design stage.	
6			TR0200176	Footpaths/ Animal Safety	<p>Respondents representing Black Lodge Farm, Bowes express concern over the footpaths proposed to be intersected by the new dual carriageway. Respondents are concerned it will be in conflict with livestock and gates and will cause issue if the livestock are in the underpass when another party wish to pass.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the responders concern regarding potential conflict on the shared track included in the Bowes Bypass scheme between livestock and walkers, cyclists & horse riders (WCH) users.</p> <p>Throughout the rural environment in the UK there are many examples of where motorised vehicles share the same road space with walkers, cyclists, horse riders and livestock whether this be rural roads or Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT's). With carefully management, the shared use routes we are proposing can be sustained by responsible use and management. The Highway Code and countryside Code apply to users of the shared tracks. The shared use tracks provided are 4m wide which allows for two-way movements, but this also offers the opportunity for safe passing by users including vehicles.</p> <p>To provide segregated facilities for</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						land owners and WCH users would require more land purchase which would increase costs. In addition further environmental mitigation would also need to be considered. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report (PDOR), section 5.6 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Bowes Bypass scheme.	
229		Eden District Council		Footpaths/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern for compounds between Temple Sowerby and Appleby where it intersects a current Public Rights of Way and seek confirmation the right would be retained. Respondent suggest the compounds between Temple Sowerby and Appleby be located to the north side of the route away from residential properties.	National Highways acknowledges the respondent's comments about the existing Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding (WCH) route. The construction phase planning for this scheme is at an early stage but it will have consideration for the existing WCH route. ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) provides an assessment of impacts and effects on PRow's or WCH during construction of the Project and assumes that all permanently impacted PRow's would have appropriate diversion routes in place during the works if closures	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						are required. The EMP (Application Document 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.	
169		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		General/ Request for Further Information/ Design	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council express concern that the proposed compound locations have also been located in one of the most populated areas of the A66 within Cumbria. The Councils would expect to see within the Alternatives Assessment, pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, adequate justification for why National Highways has chosen to place the compounds in these locations and why other locations have been discounted.	National Highways notes the enquiry in regards to the justification for compound locations. Paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 is applied to the permanent Project proposals and is not applicable to temporary works such as site compounds. The Stage 3 Consultant has engaged a Contractor to provide buildability advice and insight into how all the works for the Project works could be constructed and what facilities are required, The buildability Contractor has assessed the need for a number of site compound areas across the Project. The site compounds areas are provided for a number of reasons, the main one being the temporary storage of excavated material including topsoil. A number of the areas are	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>assigned to be used to house site offices, staff car parking, plant storage, welfare facilities and new materials storage. Most site compounds are temporary areas with the land to be returned to its former use or to be kept permanently for landscaping as part of the main works.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement ((Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p>	
13			TR0200109	General/ Request for Further Information	Respondents from Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern as to why The Old Rectory is not being used as an option for A66 route and construction compounds.	<p>National Highways notes the concerns of the residents of Ewebank Farm asking why a route through the Old Rectory at Rokeby has not been considered.</p> <p>The route alternative through the Rectory has been considered as part of the preliminary design process. Following statutory consultation a sifting process was undertaken which considered the design constraints, environmental concerns and national policy requirements. The decision was then made to adopt the black option for the proposed junction at</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Rokeby. The route and proposed junction selected avoids the demolition of the listed Old Rectory whilst providing a compliant standard of dual carriageway. Historic England, a key consultant, have also stated that they would not support demolition of the Old Rectory or moving the alignment as that would impact upon the setting of the nearby Church and the registered park and garden. Please refer to the Project Development Report, section 5.7 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme.	
237			TR0200108	General/ Land Take/ Environmental Mitigation/ Liability	Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express concerns regarding the Project and ask that land take is reduced, environmental mitigation is reduced, drainage is properly assessed and connected and no further rights of way are created and that they will have no liability of infrastructure.	National Highways would make the following comments against each of the subjects you are concerned with: Land take has been reduced through the design process - the Project will only take land permanently where it is required for the construction and operation of the works, including mitigation. Some land will also be temporarily	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>possessed and be returned to its former use following construction. Environmental mitigation - the Project is providing mitigation in accordance with current legislation</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. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) illustrate how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>Drainage properly assessed and connected - the preliminary drainage design has been undertaken based on a full assessment of water quality and flow requirements, including detailed flood modelling. This information is provided in Chapter 14: Road Drainage and Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (Application Document</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>3.2), including the FRA at Appendix 14.2 (Application Document 3.4). Further drainage surveys and design will be carried out in the detailed design stage of the Project, following the appropriate design standards, as secured through the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).</p> <p>The intention of the Project is not to create new rights of way but to re-connect existing rights of way severed by the proposed works. A new parallel and walking route running between Brough, and Appleby is to be created to the north of the new A66.</p> <p>No liability of infrastructure - the majority of the infrastructure created will be owned and maintained by National Highways or the local authority. There may be elements that will be located on private land where agreements will be put in place.</p>	
259	ANON-N6YD-XGQ9-A, ANON-N6YD-XGQM-X			Appleby to Brough - Community Impact/ Alternatives	Respondents express concern for the scheme stating it causes unnecessary disruption to people living on the south side of the existing A66. The respondents suggest that a northern route will avoid much of this.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concern regarding the proposed alignment for scheme 6 Appleby to Brough. The responder's comments do not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>National Highways needs to promote a route that minimises the impact of and potential damage to the 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 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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>minimising or satisfactorily mitigating environmental impacts and meet the project objectives. The northern route though the AONB would not conform with the key policy tests so was not considered.</p> <p>We have not assessed the northern route in detail in terms of economics, traffic modelling and construction or land purchase impacts so cannot compare it to the southern options. Any route to the north would still be a dual carriageway and would generate the same traffic numbers. Without a formal assessment of a northern alternative we cannot comment on what disruption would be caused.</p>	
239			TR0200108	Environmental/ Biodiversity	<p>Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express concern regarding the topsoil area for the changes to construction compounds, stating on the legend of the plan it was included in the autumn consultation – The area was marked as species rich grassland therefore the respondent did not feel they had a chance to comment in the autumn consultation.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the responders concern regarding changes made to the construction compounds within the Bowes scheme.</p> <p>The legend text on the drawing provided is incorrect for the area you refer to, and as you highlight the area for site compound was not included in the drawings for the statutory consultation in autumn 2021. This is part of the reason for this supplementary consultation as the design for the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						scheme has been developed with the provision of additional information. It has been identified that a temporary storage area for materials is required at the location you have highlighted, adjacent to the proposed junction and the area has subsequently been included within the Order limits. The area identified is for the temporary storage of materials and once the scheme is constructed the land will be landscaped as part of the permanent works.	
238			TR0200108	Environmental – pond / access	Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express concern regarding the proposed pond North of West View, asking if this is truly necessary, presuming that the other options have been considered. Stating if the pond and access cannot be reduced/improved, then they assume National Highways will purchase the land the proposed pond and access is located upon.	The proposed pond location is dictated by the need for it to be positioned outside the identified flood zone/ flood alert area associated with Howgill Beck. The preliminary drainage design has identified the pond location and has considered a number of factors when making this decision including topography of the land, geology and outfall locations. The size and location of all ponds will be confirmed during detailed design, though significant changes are not expected as the location of the pond is constrained by the requirements for the function of the pond as described above, and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						through the Order Limits and the commitments that are made in the Environmental Management Plan (Document Number 2.7). National Highways will purchase any land required to construct the pond and associated access tracks.	
246			TR0200109	Environmental - pond	Respondents of Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern regarding the viability of their farm. Due to the proposed junction and the proposed ponds it's splitting the farm into two and taking a considerable amount of land, meaning the farm will not be able to produce a livelihood.	National Highways acknowledges the respondents concerns regarding the impact of the A66 Project on their business at Ewebank Farm, Rokeby. The preliminary design for the Project has been completed in accordance with current design standards, taking into consideration the various known constraints identified. As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected (both through direct land take and through any impact on the future operation of the business).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2).</p>	
10			TR0200108	Access - PROW	Respondent representing Helbeck Hall, Brough express concern regarding the right of way being extended up the carriage drive and the respondent is unsure as to why this is the case. The respondent assumes no further public rights of way would be created other than the bridleway.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your concerns regarding public rights of way/ bridleways in the vicinity of your property.</p> <p>Bridleway 309/031 is diverted from the new junction, along the south side of the A66 to Musgrave Lane where it joins an existing Bridleway. An existing section of Bridleway 309/031 between the A66 and Cherry Tree House is to be stopped up. A new footway is to be included on the new bridge to link the severed footpaths to the north and south sides of the A66.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	
251			TR0200110	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - General/ Request for Further Information	Respondents representing Fremington, Brougham express support for changes in design specifically mentioning the new track parallel to the B6262 slip road.	The support of the proposed scheme design is acknowledged by National Highways.	No
244			TR0200109	General/ Oppose/ Land Take	Respondents representing Ewebank Farm, Rokeby , oppose location for current A66 scheme stating the best route is to construct the proposed A66 and construction compounds through the Rectory meaning less land is taken and a residential property is not left between two roads.	National Highways notes your opposition to the selected route for the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme and for further consideration of a route through the Old Rectory at Rokeby. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We can confirm that an alternative route through the Rectory has been considered as part of the preliminary design process. Following the Statutory Consultation, a sifting process was undertaken which considered the design constraints, environmental concerns and national policy requirements. The route and proposed junction selected to be taken forward to DCO avoids the demolition of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						listed Old Rectory whilst providing a compliant standard of dual carriageway. Historic England, a key consultant, have also stated that they would not support demolition of the Old Rectory or moving the alignment as that would impact upon the setting of the nearby Church and the registered park and garden. Please refer to the Project Development Overview Report, section 5.7 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme.	
170		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		General/ Request for Further Information	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest that the draft DCO needs to include clear proposals on how areas for temporary usage will be restored once the compounds, or temporary storage areas, are no longer needed.	The reinstatement of temporary construction areas including site compounds, material storage areas, is covered in the Project Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). The EMP sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project, as identified in the Environmental Statement (ES), and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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. Included in the EMP is the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) which identifies the environmental commitments required to address the potential environmental effects of the Project and includes the requirement for the contractor to create a soil management plan. National Highways will continue to work with all local authorities through the DCO process and into detailed design.	
114		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		General/ Suggestion	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest the use of sustainable compounds including solar powered offices and charge points for electric vehicles.	The site compound layouts and requirements are not fixed at this time, pending the detailed design and construction logistics being completed. The Principal Contractor is being requested to look at sustainable option for the site compound areas. .	No
22			TR0200110,	General/ Suggestion	Respondents representing Fremington, Brougham suggest they will require temporary water supply on their land in the Penrith to Temple Sowerby area,	The location of the water supply meter/ trough and access to it will be assessed by the Principal Contractor for the works. Temporary means of access or an alternative water supply will need	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					specifically to the retained fields behind the proposed compound.	to be considered with the landowner.	
25			TR0200191	Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - General/ Support	Respondent representing East Layton Hall, Richmond supports the new site compound adjacent to the new junction north of the current route of the A66, subject to further discussions and details on the proposals being outlined to the respondent.	National Highways thanks the respondent for their feedback about the compound location. National Highways will continue to work with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	No
24			TR0200191	General/ Support	Respondents representing East Layton Hall, Richmond support the location of compounds for soil storage subject to further discussions over the re-grading of the land which will change and create a new landform.	Storage areas will be established in locations where large fill requirements are needed or where key above ground structures are required. This will be subject to topography assessments and land suitability. Material movements will be carefully programmed to reduce storage periods and subsequent double handing of the material, with a focus on first time placement. Where there is an intention to return the land to the landowners we will work with them to return it in a usable form. Land will require some remediation in terms of planting to return it to the previous condition and this will be factored into the compensation agreed.	No
66			TR0200180	General/ Support/ Land	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby support	National Highways acknowledges the response.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Take/ Drainage/ Environmental Mitigation	<p>the scheme subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land taken is kept to a minimum • Responsibility of the embankment is not held with my client • Environmental Mitigation is properly assessed and reduced/removed as necessary • The drainage scheme is properly designed to resolve current and to avoid further flooding • Remove misprinted footpath 	<p>National Highways are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. The land required to construct the Project has been identified as part of the preliminary design and is included in the order limits. As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land for the Project by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>Following completion of all ecological surveys and the completion of relevant assessments (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity, ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual –</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Application Document 3.2) we have refined our mitigation plans. 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 Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and ow these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>The embankments created as part of the scheme will be the responsibility of National Highways.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been carried out for the scheme with flood prevention measures introduced into the design where required, A drainage design has been undertaken in accordance with the design</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>guidance provided in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The design will consider topography of the land, the geology of the ground, the existing drainage systems for the roads and fields and the requirements of a number of consultees including the local authority and Environment Agency.</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 Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14, Road Drainage, and the Water Environment (Application Document 3.2). 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.</p> <p>Your comments about removing a misprinted footpath are noted.</p>	
111		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		General/Support	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council supports the scheme, stating that the changes to the compound locations are appropriate.	National Highways thanks you for the feedback.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
208		Eden District Council		General/ Suggestion/ Community Impact	Eden District Council suggest main compounds be within 30 minutes of the work base which is consistent with the average commute time of residents in the Eden District.	National Highways notes your comments on compound locations. Following discussions with our buildability Principal Contractor for the works the Principal Contractors will establish either a main or satellite compound within the order limits for the majority of the schemes to provide a site office, welfare facilities, site vehicle parking and limited material storage area. The site work force will be expected to report to the site offices before moving to the work base location. The Principal Contractors are looking to install three main site compounds for the office based work force overseeing the works. These three main compounds are to be located within the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank, Temple Sowerby to Appleby and Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor scheme boundaries.	No
209		Eden District Council		General/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern for the use of the compounds and reiterate that they should solely be used for the storage of construction materials and plant and should not provide accommodation. Adding this must	National Highways notes your comments on the usage of the site compounds. We envisage the site compound will be used the following purposes:	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>be set out in the accommodation strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - site offices for site works and in some cases for main compounds for office based support staff - provision of welfare facilities - workers car parking - site vehicle parking and associated machinery storage - storage of new materials required to construct the works - a number of earmarked site compound area are to be used for the temporary storage of earthwork materials including top soil <p>It is not envisaged that any of the compounds will be used to provide accommodation for workers.</p> <p>The provision for accommodation of construction workers is covered in the Project Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). The EMP sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project, as identified in the Environmental Statement (ES), and to demonstrate compliance with relevant environmental legislation. it sets out the measures, commitments and</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						actions needed to manage and mitigate environmental effects identified within the ES during construction and operation of the Project. Included in the EMP under ref D-GEN--09 is the requirement for the contractor(s) to develop a Construction Worker Travel and Accommodation Plan before the work start on site. The plan requires stakeholder consultation and approval.	
210		Eden District Council		General/ Suggestion	Eden District Council suggest one site be used as the main compound and other sites be used as satellites for overnight storage of plant.	The Principal Contractor carrying out the works has identified the need to create three main site compounds across the Project. Two of these compounds will sit within Eden District Council boundaries. A main compound is to be established within the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank scheme which will also service the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme while a similar compound will be established within the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme which will also cover the Appleby to Brough scheme. Satellite compounds and construction areas will be established at a number of locations across the Project within each scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
218		Eden District Council		General/ Access	Eden District Council express concern for compound south of A66 at M6, junction 40, stating there is a concern for access to the compound if it intends to use the only current connection.	It is proposed, following initial discussions with Cumbria County Council, that redundant parts of the existing depot could possibly be used as part of the main site compound, which is proposed to be situated at this location. The details of the layout of the proposed site compound have yet to be established and they will be developed during the detailed design stage, ahead of construction. The main access to the site compound is proposed to be initially via the existing depot access and ingress. A new depot area access road is being built as part of the works and will eventually be adopted as the main access. It is also proposed to establish a haul road adjacent to the A66 to be able to access works areas around Kemplay Bank from the compound thus reducing the need for site traffic to use the A66.	No
219		Eden District Council		General/ Request for Further Information	Eden District Council express concern that the compound at M6, Junction 40 will require alteration or impact current operations of buildings and seek confirmation	The Principal Contractor will work with the Cumbria County Council depot representatives to ensure their day to day works are not significantly impacted by the proposed site compound	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					that this is a main construction compound.	operations. Contacts with the depot will be further enhanced to ensure a good working arrangement is established. It is proposed that this compound would be one of three main compounds to be set up to operate and manage the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. The work at the M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank and Penrith to Temple Sowerby schemes are expected to be serviced from this location.	
221		Eden District Council		General/ Suggestion	Eden District Council suggest for the M6, Junction 40 compound it could be used post construction to support future developments and wish National Highways to consider this.	National Highways acknowledges your request about the future use of the proposed main site compound at the Skirsgill Depot. The usage and layouts of the site compounds will be developed further during the detailed design as the construction logistic addressed. We are happy to explore future uses and would welcome further discussions to consider what options are available for the Skirsgill compound after the construction works are completed.	No
227		Eden District Council		General/ Property	Eden District Council express concern for the proximity of compounds between Temple	The properties at Sanderson Croft have been taken into account and will be further considered when planning for the compound areas	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Sowerby and Appleby to residential properties.	is undertaken during the detailed design stage of the Project. The areas identified are required as part of the works but the Contractor will be requested to reduce the impact on the surrounding properties. We will continue to work and consult with all impacted stakeholders through the DCO process and into detailed design.	
53			TR0200179	General Request for Information	Respondents representing Old Armoury camp site, Bowes express concern about the location of compounds relative to the Old Armoury camp site and has requested information on alternative sites considered.	National Highways notes your concern about site compound locations, in relation to the Armoury camp site, and if alternatives have been considered. We would prefer to use locations for construction compounds that are encompassed as part of the permanent works; that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the 'live' A66 are provided. Access to the compound should be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to the compound areas from local roads will be included within the Order limits. Alternative locations were considered as part of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>discussions with the contractors for the works</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses. . The size and number are also subject to final evaluation during the detailed design stage based on the detailed temporary works design requirements. National Highways will, however continue to work with impacted landowners throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
113		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Information/Compound Materials	<p>Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council express concern over what the Skirsgill compound will be used for. Adding that the use, number of staff and vehicles has not been assessed for Skirsgill Compound by the councils.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges your concern with regards the usage of the proposed site compounds and in particular the compound at Skirsgill Depot.</p> <p>We would prefer to use locations for construction compounds that are encompassed as part of the permanent works: that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the 'live' A66 are provided. Access to the compound should</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to the compound should be included within the Order limits.</p> <p>The contractors for the works have been consulted about site compound requirements and have formulated a compound strategy. They have identified the requirement for three main site compounds from which to manage the works from. Please also refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.</p> <p>It should be noted that the provision for the movements of construction workers is covered in the Project Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7). Included in the EMP under ref D-GEN--09 is the requirement for the contractor(s) to develop a Construction Worker Travel and Accommodation Plan before the work starts on site. The plan</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						requires stakeholder consultation and approval. National Highways will continue to engage with local authorities as these plans develop.	
230		Eden District Council		Request for Further Information/ Information on Compounds	Eden District Council express concern as to the lack of information available for compounds between Temple Sowerby and Appleby and add they expect to receive a draft Environmental Mitigation Plan.	National Highways acknowledges the respondent's comments about site compounds and the provision of a Project Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The contractors for the works have been consulted about site compound requirements and have formulated a compound strategy They have identified the requirement for three main site compounds from which to facilitate and manage the works from. Other compound areas across the Project have been identified to provide satellite compounds for welfare/ parking / storage facilities/ work areas or to provide areas for the temporary storage of excavated materials. Please refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>compounds and site accesses.</p> <p>An EMP has been created for the Project and will form part of the DCO submission (Application Document 2.7). The EMP sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project, as identified in the Environmental Statement (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. The EMP also details the reinstatement requirements for temporary compound areas. The plan will be further developed as the Project matures through detailed design and construction. National Highways will continue to work and consult with all impacted stakeholders through the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
199			TR0200179	Information Request for Information	Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site at Bowes express concern over the lack of information provided adding	National Highways acknowledges the responders concerns regarding provision of further information.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>further information has already been requested and not provided on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety Audit of the Proposed Junctions/Slip Road onto the A67 • Design of Junctions/ Slip Road /A67 • Design and Construction of the proposed compounds • Other compound options which have been considered. 	<p>A Road Safety Audit has been completed against the preliminary design for the Project and was carried out in accordance with current guidance. Please refer to the Section 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) which summarises the findings of the Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>For the design development information please refer to the Project Development Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of all the schemes included within the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. With regards to site compounds we would prefer to use locations for construction compounds that are encompassed as part of the permanent works: that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised; and that suitable access and egress points to prevent disruption to the 'live' A66 are provided. Access to the compound should be via local roads or the A66. Any land required to provide access to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>the compound should be included within the Order limits.</p> <p>The contractors for the works have been consulted about site compound requirements and have formulated a compound strategy which has been adopted for the DCO submission. The proposed site compound locations are shown on the General Arrangement drawings (Application Document 2.5).</p>	
193			TR0200191	Land take/ Soil Storage	Respondent representing East Layton Hall, Richmond suggests that land used for soil storage and compounds is not handed back to the land owner if it is not capable of being farmed commercially.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams. Further information can be found in the Environmental Statement Chapter 9 (Application Document 3.1-3.4) and the soil management plan in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7).	
254			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Land take/ Request for Further Information	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern at the excessive size of the compound at the Center Parcs Junction. Asking for justification of the size, as disturbance to agricultural land takes time to recover.	Site compounds are required for a number of reasons. They can be provided for a combination of the following, areas to set up site offices, welfare facilities and car parking facilities (for site staff), they could be used to store new materials brought to site for construction of the works or they can be used for the temporary storage of excavated materials. It should be noted that the majority of the compounds are temporary and will be returned to their former use upon completion of the works unless they will be used permanently for environmental mitigation purposes. The site compound you refer to has been identified to provide a mixture of the above-mentioned requirements. It is also an area where the land form is to be regraded to integrate the new junction into the landscape. Compound locations are not fixed at this time, pending the detailed design construction logistics being completed. It is possible that compound locations may be relocated within the order limits.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The size and number are also subject to final evaluation based on detailed temporary works design.	
166			TR0200180	Land take/ Lack of Information	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express concern over incorrect plans as it shows a public right of way re-directed over the respondents land as well as part of the bridleway being omitted from the plans entirely.	National Highways acknowledges this point. A correction has been made now to the relevant plans for the DCO to reflect the current arrangement of the bridleway. 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). Supporting summary information is provided in Walking, Cycling and Horse Riding Proposals (Application Document 2.4).	No
76			TR0200185, TR0200186	Land take/ Concern	Respondents representing West View Farm Brough and express concern over loss of land.	National Highways notes your concerns about the loss of your land to the Project. Any land required for the Project will be discussed with the individual landowners, and where appropriate occupiers concerned, as part of 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						persons to negotiate the acquisition of the required interests in land. National Highways hopes that individual landowners concerns in relation to accommodation works can be progress via this mechanism. Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.	
71			TR0200180	Land take/ Mitigation	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express concern over a new embankment on the newest plan adding it will require greater land take but does not provide screening or mitigation to any properties.	National Highways notes the respondent's concerns about any new embankment and the impact this may have on agricultural land. Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N to this Consultation Report. National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	
65			TR0200180	Land take	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>concern over the amount of land that the respondent may lose because of this scheme.</p>	<p>not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p> <p>National Highways have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is a reduction in area of the</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p>	
90			TR0200186	Bowes Bypass - Land take/ Ponds	Respondents express concern over the number of ponds on land affecting valuable productive agricultural land at West End Farm.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. We are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
68			TR0200180	Land take/ Biodiversity	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express concern over their agricultural land being taken for grassland mitigation when there is no grassland within the proposed location at present.	Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. National Highways 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, on a precautionary basis, 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
159			TR0200191	Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor - Land take/ Financial	Respondents representing East Layton Hall, Richmond express concern regarding the re-grade of the landscape, the impact on farming operations and not wishing to have the land handed back if it is not possible to farm commercially. Which will have significant implications on the compensation claim.	The regrading of the land is designed to integrate the junction into the landscape and to return as much land back to agricultural use. National Highways will continue to engage with landowners on our final proposals.	No
99			TR0200183	Land take	Respondents representing Bowes and Romalldkirk Estate express concern relating to the amount of their land being taken for the Project.	Where possible National Highways have sought to minimise land take and utilise less valuable land. We have worked with landowners to mitigate land impacts where possible. National Highways have refined our mitigation plans since PEI Report. Several factors have influenced these changes. At consultation, 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>a reduction in area of the mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p>	
103			TR0200184	Land take/ Business	Respondents representing Ravensworth Lodge express concern relating to the red line boundary as this will cause half of the respondents field to be acquired and will negatively affect their business.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
67			TR0200180	Land take/ Environmental Mitigation	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express concern that the plans do not show environmental mitigation and is therefore not providing the whole picture of the land take	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. The detail of environmental mitigation management regimes is also outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) which will be part of the DCO application.</p> <p>National Highways 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 on a precautionary basis 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</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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 Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p>	
70			TR0200180	Land take/ Return of Land	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby suggest after agreeing to a compound licence fee, that the topsoil land use be returned to respondents and to the quality it was before to	Any site compound areas will be used temporarily and will be returned to their original land use or be landscaped once they are no longer required. Then land can be returned to agricultural production and we recognise that	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					be used for agricultural production.	there will be a period of remediation.	
172			TR0200178	Cross Lanes to Rokeby - Land take/ Environmental	Respondents representing West View Farm Brough suggest land taken from Street Side Farm be modified from the productive agricultural land to less productive around the farm buildings adding this can then be incorporated within the environmental scheme.	Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. National Highways 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 on a precautionary basis 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>a reduction in area of the mitigation deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and ow these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	
83			TR0200185	Land take/ Mitigation	Respondents representing West View Farm, Brough, suggest	National Highways is aware of your comments from the Statutory	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>numerous options to reduce land take which include:</p> <p>i) The road at either side of Langrigg westbound junction be pushed closer to the access road to reduce the central reservation and to reduce encroachment into the productive agricultural land.</p> <p>ii) Moving the access track to the South of the proposed pond to make best use of the land.</p> <p>iii) Similarly bringing the access to Flitholme further south round by pond to make best use of the land</p> <p>iv) Remove /reduce the environmental mitigation from the most productive agricultural land</p>	<p>Consultation and the design teams have taken considered them when finalising the preliminary design for the Project. A number of your suggestions may not be able to be adopted as they would not meet the design standards we are working to.</p> <p>Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>The Project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	
178			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Land take/ Balancing Pond	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest the hardstanding adjacent to the balancing ponds, at the eastern end of the map Penrith to Temple Sowerby Sheet 1 of 3 supplied with the Supplementary consultation material, should be reduced in size. Respondent	National Highways acknowledges the response. National Highways are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					states that they were told that the hardstanding were to be suitable for a single vehicle to park and turn around, but that the area seems bigger and are seeking clarification.	landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
128			TR0200178	Land take / access	Respondents from Street Side Farm, Cross Lanes, Rokeby suggest there is an open ditch between the most eastern field to their neighbour's farm and the 2nd eastern field. Respondent asks if the ditch can be filled in to make one field to reduce the impact of the field being made smaller, adding an access track would then not be required as a result.	National Highways acknowledges the response for the owners of Ewebank Farm regarding elements of the proposed drainage design for the work. The drainage design for the scheme at Cross Lanes to Rokeby has been carried out in accordance with latest design guidance. The drainage design will be further reviewed at the detailed design stage and your comments will be considered. Please refer to the Project Development Report (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of all the schemes included within the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project. National Highways are, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						DCO process and into detailed design.	
79			TR0200185	Appleby to Brough - Land take/ Mitigation	Respondents representing West View Farm in Brough suggest to move environmental mitigation to less valuable land. Adding there are numerous locations north of the A66 where the land could be re-provided.	<p>Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The Project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery 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
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Environmental mitigation is set out in the EMP (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within Order Limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	
88			TR0200181	Land take/ Suggestion	Respondents representing Stone Bridge Farm, Bowes suggest using less productive agricultural land.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response.</p> <p>The preliminary design for the Project has identified the land required to be purchased in order to construct the works. .As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land required for the Project (by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and the required environmental mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the land subject to acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The detail of environmental mitigation management regimes is also outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7).</p>	
56			TR0200179	Land take / Suggestion	<p>Respondents representing the Old Armoury camp site at Bowes, suggests using a retaining wall as opposed to an embankment as an alternative for the construction of the new A66 alignment and asks if other alternatives have been considered to avoid land take.</p>	<p>National Highways notes the comment from the owner of Old Armoury camp site at Bowes.</p> <p>The preliminary design has allowed for an embankment to be provided for the slip road. Further assessments would need to be considered during the detailed design to determine if a retaining wall solution could be provided and if it would fit into the landscape setting.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>Consideration of alternatives for the scheme design have been assessed. Please refer to the Project Development Report, section 5.7 (Application Document 4.1) and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3, Assessment of Alternatives, (Application Document 3.2) which explain the design development of each scheme within the Project.</p>	
26			TR0200190	Land take/ Return Land	<p>Respondents representing Brougham Castle Farm, Brougham express support for the compounds but add any land taken for compounds should be given back once the Project has been completed.</p>	<p>National Highways thanks the respondent for the feedback about the compound locations.</p> <p>The land taken for site compounds will be taken permanently for the construction of the works. Some compound areas will be retained for the implementation of environmental mitigation works whilst other areas will be returned to their former use and will be</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						reinstated in accordance with the requirements of the Project Environmental Management Plan (Application Reference 2.7) National Highways will continue to work with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.	
69			TR0200180	Land take Request for Information	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby express concern over their land being taken and would like evidence for why the mitigation is required.	National Highways acknowledges the response. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. National Highways are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. Mitigation is required to minimise and avoid likely significant environmental effects. ES Biodiversity assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity - Application Document 3.2) utilises the completed ecological survey information to assess potential impacts on habitats and protected species and determine the mitigation necessary to mitigate these impacts. The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and ow these areas of habitat will be managed.	
43			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Lay-bys/ Location	Respondent representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the location of and excessive amount of lay-bys and their visibility to residential properties and business units. Respondent states that the lay-bys will be obvious from the three residential properties opposite Whinfall House as well as clearly visible from other residential properties such as Swineghyll Cottages, Low Woodside Farmhouse, Lower Woodside Farmhouse and Woodside Farmhouse. The respondent suggests that the location of lay-bys should be amended to less obvious locations in terms of local residential property.	National Highways notes the concerns on the proposed lay-bys locations and visibility to residential properties within the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme extents. The lay-by locations have been assessed and determined in accordance with design directive CD 169 - The design of lay-bys, maintenance hardstandings, rest areas, service areas and observation platforms. In accordance with CD 169 non-emergency lay-bys should be provided on trunk roads at 2.5km intervals in the direction of travel. This is not always achievable because of a number of features which also need to be considered. Lay-bys cannot be provided on the outside of a right-hand bend or the inside of a left-hand bend, the allowable radius is determined using the design speed of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>road. Stopping sight visibility on approach is another key constraint with 450m recommend for a dual carriageway of design speed 120kph. Lay-bys should not be sited within 450m of an access or junctions onto the dual carriageway. Finally the layout and length of the proposed lay-by need consideration, the lay-bys proposed on the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme are approximately 320m in length from start of entry taper to end of exit taper. The preliminary design has considered the above mentioned factors as well as other design constraint in identifying locations for the proposed lay-bys.</p> <p>It should be noted that the number of lay-bys proposed as part of the scheme replicates the existing number of lay-bys currently provided along this stretch of the A66.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes an assessment of visual effects. The assessment identifies that during operation there are no significant visual impacts at Swineghyll</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Cottages, Low Woodside Farmhouse, Lower Woodside Farmhouse, Whinfell House or Woodside Farmhouse. We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	
29			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Liability/ Track Maintenance	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern as to how public liability would be dealt with in terms of claims by cyclists and pedestrians when potholes are created by agricultural and estate traffic.	The ownership, liability for claims and maintenance of the proposed access tracks will be with National Highways unless an agreement is reached with the local authority or third parties to maintain the infrastructure assets and to take over any liabilities. Further discussions and consultation will be undertaken at the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
11			TR0200108	Liability/ Infrastructure Maintenance	Respondents representing Helbeck Hall, Brough oppose changes to construction compounds stating they will not be responsible for the liability whatsoever for any infrastructure/embankments/roads /bridges/ponds in connection with the proposed A66.	National Highways will purchase all the land identified within the Order limits to construct the scheme including any identified site compound areas and will take liability unless agreements are reached with the local authority or the land is sold on and responsibility is passed to a third party. Structures and ponds will be owned and maintained by National Highways or the local council.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						National Highways will be responsible for the A66 trunk road whilst new or existing side roads will be passed to the local highway authority to maintain.	
50			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Local Services	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the existing utility services that cross the current A66 and how these will be dealt with.	National Highways acknowledges your comments regarding statutory undertakers plant and equipment. As part of the preliminary design we have consulted with statutory undertakers and other providers under the New Roads and Street Works Act (NRSWA) to identify the locations of the existing plant and equipment across the Project extents. Any assets or equipment impacted by the Project have been identified and each affected utility consulted to ascertain the diversion or protection works required, the extents of these works are included within the order limits. Discussions with affected statutory undertakers or providers will continue into detailed design and any required diversion or protection works will be programmed accordingly.	No
105			TR0200184	Maintenance/ Environmental Mitigation	Respondents express concern relating to the maintenance of	National Highways acknowledges the response regarding	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					environmental mitigation land and the potential for fly tipping.	<p>environmental mitigation maintenance and fly tipping.</p> <p>The Project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed and maintained.</p> <p>Your concerns regarding fly tipping are noted and consideration will be given during detailed design to close out opportunities for fly tipping. Any incidents of fly tipping should be reported to the Police and local authority.</p>	
28			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Maintenance Requests	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about how repairs would be requested for the access track given the difficulty in	The maintenance of any National Highways assets will most likely be handed over to the National Highways operations team. They will be expected to put in place a	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				further information	galvanising the local authority to carry out repairs on existing adopted highways or semi-private tracks.	maintenance and inspection plan for these assets. They have framework specialist contractors who they can call upon to undertake maintenance works including rapid response.	
249			TR0200109	Environmental Mitigation/ Lack of Information	Respondents express concern that there is no mention of environmental mitigation and therefore how no idea of knowing how they will be affected by changes to construction compounds.	The environmental mitigation has been further refined since the statutory consultation, informed by further environmental surveys, design development, stakeholder feedback and environmental assessment. There were no specific changes to the environmental mitigation proposed as a result of the development of the compound strategy. At the time of statutory 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. The outcome from the completed assessment is a reduction in area of the mitigation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>deemed necessary to mitigate likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8) demonstrates how the mitigation could be delivered within the Order Limits. Annex B1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out the likely species to be planted and how these areas of habitat will be managed.</p> <p>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.</p>	
16			TR0200109	Flooding/ Drainage/ Mitigation	<p>Respondents representing Ewe Bank Farm, Rokeby suggest ways to mitigate drainage stating the drainage ponds and given the levels are very similar to the north and the south could the pond furthest east be located on the north and drain straight into the River Tees. Respondent asks if the pond opposite the Rectory could be located between the two roads, or if the proposed A66 were to go through the Rectory, could</p>	<p>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).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>the pond be moved further north since the proposed A66 would be further north, avoiding taking further productive agricultural land. Currently between the Junction and the pond the road cuts part of the farm off from the rest of the farm which will hinder the farms viability and profitability.</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.</p> <p>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>The EMP (Application Document 2.7) secures that a detailed drainage design in accordance with DMRB LA113 will be implemented at detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Old Rectory is a non-designated post-medieval building which was associated with the Church of St Mary and consideration has been given to the potential impact of the Project in this area. National Highways</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>has worked closely with Historic England to develop a Project 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.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p> <p>National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p>	
15			TR0200109	Land Take/ Mitigation	Respondent representing Ewe Bank Farm, Rokeby suggest ways to mitigate land take in changes to	National Highways acknowledges the respondent's suggestions with regards to construction compound	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>construction compounds stating the driveway should run alongside the current woodland (Jack Wood) and join into the junction on the South, like Tutta Beck this is to avoid taking additional good productive arable land. It also means that agricultural machinery would not need to access the public highway which only enhances safety.</p>	<p>locations within the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme.</p> <p>We have carefully considered the design of the scheme through the options identification and appraisal process. Please refer to the Environmental Statement (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>With regard to the suggestion of an access off the new junction at Rokeby, this would be regarded as a hazard as it is not in accordance with current highway design guidance. The road cannot join the junction at the point you recommend as there is poor visibility to traffic travelling over the bridge. Our design provides clear visibility to traffic exiting and entering the T junction. The proposed access track, adjacent to the A66, is designed as a shared use track for use by cyclists/ walkers as well as being a private means of access. Wedo not want to route any cyclist or pedestrians through or near to your property. In addition your</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>proposed route tight to Jack Wood would not be considered as the construction of the track could impact the woodlands requiring additional environmental mitigation measures, the track would need to be offset to prevent any damage. Similarly if a separate WCH track and private means of access were to be considered it would require additional land purchase and further environmental mitigation. The suggested alternative lies largely outside the DCO order limits. Please refer to ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) which considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</p>	
122		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Mitigation/Compound Location	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest the possibility of screening residential and other receptors using earth mounds for the larger compounds.	<p>National Highways acknowledges the respondent's suggestions with regards to screening residential and other receptors from large site compounds using mounds .</p> <p>The Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Effects (Application Document 3.2) includes a full impact assessment of visual effects during construction.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						During construction, the Project will adopt the relevant measures set out within the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7), to ensure best practice construction measures. Measures include that no part of the Project can start until the design of the landscaping scheme has been prepared for that part in accordance with the Project Design Principles (Application Document 5.11) and which is based on the mitigation measures included in the Environmental Statement. The EMP also notes that consultation shall be undertaken with the relevant local planning authorities on the detailed landscape design for the Project as it evolves with a collaborative detailed design of earthworks and soft landscape treatments.	
165			TR0200180	Mitigation/ PRow Usage	Respondents representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby suggest the usage of cameras on the public right of way to assess its usage.	While ProWs are not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation relating to the location and land required for temporary construction compounds, National Highways consulted this as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N.</p> <p>Our 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. We will also be carrying out pedestrian counts on PoRW in the next few months.</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>	
206			TR0200186	Bowes Bypass - Modified Design/ Environmental Mitigation	Respondent suggest placing environmental mitigation on less valuable land than that on West End Farm, identifying land north of the A66 as this less valuable land.	Land needed for environmental mitigation was not associated with the subject matter for this specific targeted supplementary consultation, which related to the location and land required for	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>temporary construction compounds. National Highways consulted on environmental mitigation as part of the statutory consultation of Autumn 2021 and our response to issues raised on this matter are set out in Annex N. National Highways has sought to achieve a balance between minimising land-take and securing sufficient land to deliver the scheme and required mitigation, noting that the detailed design of the scheme has yet to be undertaken. The limits of the Land subject to compulsory acquisition have been drawn to avoid unnecessary land take.</p> <p>The Project requires the land identified for environmental mitigation in order to mitigate its adverse effects as such it is essential to the delivery of the Project. Whilst the project team have tried to minimise the amount of productive land taken for mitigation, and located mitigation on less valuable land where reasonably practicable, in many cases there are specific reasons for the location of certain mitigation (for example providing visual screening to specific</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>receptors, connecting habitats or mitigating effects on specific populations of protected species). Environmental mitigation is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (Application Document 2.7), and an indication of how environmental mitigation could be implemented within order limits is presented within Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.8).</p> <p>Landowners affected by mitigation requirements will have these impacts discussed with them, during the detailed design.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers both temporary and permanent impacts on agricultural land and agricultural land holdings.</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>	
54			TR0200179	Modified Design- Land take	Respondents from the Old Arnoury camp site at Bowes suggest using already established compounds in the quarries to reduce land wasted by scheme	The compound requirements of a project of this size, scale and length are very specific. Several access points or independent haul routes, work areas and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					and any negative effect on respondent's business.	compounds will need to be established. These will vary by scheme depending on their service requirements, traffic management phasing and the works being undertaken. Where overbridges, underpasses and culverts are required, more plant and materials will be required, thus larger work areas are to be expected. The compound sizes must be relative to the available land, connectivity with the A66 and interface with utilities to minimise the environmental impacts of the works.	
100			TR0200183	Modified Design/ Animal Safety	Respondents representing Bowes and Romalldkirk Estate suggests an underpass being built rather than a bridge, as a bridge could cause issues for the tenants of the land who need to run livestock across from North to the South of the proposed bridge.	National Highways acknowledges the respondent's suggestions for the provision of an underpass rather than the accommodation bridge proposed at the location east of Stone Bridge Farm within the Bowes Bypass scheme. This response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter. The preliminary design has given consideration of an underpass at this location, but it was discounted as there were a number of design concerns. To construct an underpass at this location, and to achieve a required headroom	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>clearance for vehicles using the access road under the A66, would require an excavation in the region of 7m in depth. The excavation extents would be significant and would require a temporary carriageway to be constructed for the A66 to allow the safe construct. A bridge will provide better visibility for road users and walkers/ cyclists.</p> <p>In terms of drainage provision the underpass option would require a pump or similar to be installed in order to drain groundwater and rainfall that will build up as the underpass road surface would be well below existing ground levels. A pump would require an attenuation facility or outfall to pump to and would be a significant maintenance risk for the maintainer. Similarly in periods of snowfall an underpass has the risk of being closed until the snow is cleared or has melted. .</p>	
51			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Noise/Design	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the noise of the scheme adding that the use of quiet tarmac was discussed with National Highways representatives and ask for	ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) models and assesses the potential increase in noise arising from the Project when operational. With the application of embedded design mitigation, including low	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					assurances that this will happen outside Whinfell House Farm.	noise road surface which will be applied to the mainline A66, no further noise mitigation (noise barrier) is required at this location and no significant noise impact during operation is identified.	
248			TR0200178	Noise/ Traffic	Respondents who are residents of Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern over the increased noise as a result of increased traffic volumes passing at higher speeds.	National Highways acknowledges the response from the residents of Ewebank Farm. We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) models and assesses the potential increase in noise arising from the project when operational. With the application of embedded design mitigation, including low noise road surface, no further noise mitigation (noise barrier) is required at this location. Annex B5 Noise and Vibration Management Plan of the EMP	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						(Application Document 2.7) sets out control measure which will be in place to manage and minimise construction noise. This includes the requirement to consult with the Local Authority to agree appropriate noise control measures.	
117		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Noise/ Compound Location	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council express concern that the compound locations will be in close proximity to Kirkby Thore Primary School as it can cause significant construction noise and the period expected is for five ears. Respondents suggest the soil storage construction compound south of proposed junction at Kirkby Thore be relocated further away from Kirkby Thore Primary School.	<p>The presence of the school at Kirkby Thore and potential adverse impacts in this location as a result of the Project have been taken into account during the design of the Project.</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). Section 12.10 of the ES Chapter presents the results of the assessment of construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>During construction, the Project has the potential to cause likely significant temporary noise and vibration impacts at Kirkby Thore school during the compound phase and the road construction phase. The potential for temporary construction noise and vibration impacts is dependent on the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>construction activities being undertaken. Construction and vibration impacts have been assessed as significant effects when construction is at its busiest and closest to receptors.</p> <p>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> <p>With the use of BPM, as per the EMP and NVMP (Application Document 2.7), it remains possible that construction noise levels will exceed the SOAEL during each of the construction phases at a number of receptors, however, the total number of receptors likely to experience noise levels greater than the SOAEL has reduced. Where the construction noise level is predicted to be greater than the SOAEL, further mitigation measures will be utilised (where practicable) in the form of the construction program to minimise the possibility that receptors are</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						not exposed to noise levels greater than the SOAEL for ten or more days and/or nights in any 15 consecutive days and/or nights or if the noise level is above the SOAEL for a total number of 40 or more days in any six consecutive months.	
97			TR0200182	Ponds/ Drainage	Respondent expresses concern over the feasibility and ability to install a drainage pond south of the A66 instead of the previously proposed pond north of the A66.	We have identified sufficient land to provide the ponds required for the drainage system for the Project. The drainage system will be finalised during the next stage to ensure it operates effectively for the detailed design of the Project. There may be some scope at that stage to adjust the ponds, but until detailed design is undertaken this will not be known.	No
180			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Ponds/ Size and Number	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate express concern about the size and number of balancing ponds located on Winderwath Estate. Respondents wish to be provided with the detailed design specifications and criteria on which these ponds have been designed and to clarify the need for multiple ponds in some locations. Respondents also express concern about	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).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>understanding the outfalls from the balancing ponds and the impact on adjoining land. They request full details on how the outfalls from the balancing ponds would be regulated and calculations on the impact on local watercourses. Particularly for the outfalls north of the new A66 road. Respondents suggest that walking and cycling tracks are located between the balancing ponds and the highway and that balancing ponds could then be fenced off and a small hardstanding area for National Highways vehicle access provided within that area.</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.</p> <p>We have identified sufficient land to provide the ponds required for the drainage system for the Project. The drainage system will be finalised during the next stage to ensure it operates effectively for the detailed design of the Project.</p> <p>There may be some scope at that stage to adjust the ponds, but until detailed design is undertaken this will not be known.</p> <p>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>The designs make allowance for climate change. The</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Environmental Management Plan (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>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> <p>A permanent access is required to the pond for maintenance purposes. We will continue to work and consult with all impacted landowners through the DCO process and into detailed design.</p>	
247			TR0200178	Ponds/ Location	<p>Respondents from Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern for the location of the ponds. They express the view that the western pond will not work as it is located on a hill and would be better further north, and that the eastern pond would depend on whether access to the next fields will be</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the concern expressed regarding the proposed pond locations in relation to their property at Ewebank Farm, Rokeby.</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design for the scheme at Rokeby to Cross Lanes a drainage design</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					required, and this is dependent on the exact location of the pond.	has been undertaken in accordance with current design standards. The design has identified the need for the proposed ponds and has considered a number of design factors when determining the pond locations. We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design.	
78			TR0200185	Appleby to Brough Ponds/ Impact	Respondents representing West View Farm Brough express concern over ponds on their land being affected by the Project.	The preliminary design has identified the areas of land required to construct the Project and National Highways will purchase all the land identified within the order limits. The drainage design , carried out in accordance with the latest design standards has identified the need for attenuation ponds to control the flow of water into the identified outfalls. The design has bene carried out after consultation with local authorities and the Environment Agency and takes into account the topography of the land, the ground geology and the existing drainage infrastructure. National Highways have worked with landowners to mitigate land impacts where possible.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
242			TR0200177	Ponds Requests further information	Respondents, from Tree House Farm, Brignall, Barnard Castle, express concern and would like to discuss matters further regarding accommodation works and drainage issues attendant to the pond.	National Highways acknowledges the response from representatives of Tree House Farm, Brignall. We have identified sufficient land to provide the ponds required for the drainage system for the Project. The drainage system will be finalised during the next stage to ensure it operates effectively for the detailed design of the Project. There may be some scope at that stage to adjust the ponds, but until detailed design is undertaken this will not be known. We will continue to engage with all landowners through the PLOs.	No
258		Warcop Parish Council		Request for information/ Compounds/ Alternatives	Warcop Parish Council expresses concern for compounds, asking where they will be accessed and stating a northern route would be better as it will cause less disruption for residents who use the re-cycling site. Also adding clarification would help.	The Principal Contractor will decide on the access to the compound. The access options are: an entrance off Station Road, the southern edge, to access the compound area utilising the existing junction with the A66; or connecting to the existing MOD access road south of the existing A66 . National Highways needs 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	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>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</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						considered.	
257	ANON-N6YD-XGQM-X			Request for information/ Compounds	Respondents express concern that they believe that 30 more compounds have been proposed at the Supplementary consultation than were proposed during the consultation in autumn 2021 and that these will have an adverse effect on the landscape and on views.	The Stage 3 Consultant has engaged a buildability contractor to provide buildability advice and insight into how all the works for the Project works could be constructed and what facilities are required, The buildability contractor has assessed the need for a number of site compound areas across the Project. The site compounds areas are provided for a number of reasons, the main one being the temporary storage of excavated material including topsoil. A number of the areas are assigned are to be used to house site offices, staff car parking, plant storage, welfare facilities and new materials storage. Most site compounds are temporary areas with the land to be returned to its former use and reinstated in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan (Application Reference 2.7). Some compound areas will be retained permanently by National Highways for landscaping as part of the environmental mitigation works. An EMP has been created for the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Project and will form part of the DCO submission (Application Document 2.7). The EMP sets out the management actions that need to be implemented to mitigate the environmental effects of the Project, as identified in the Environmental Statement (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. The EMP also details the reinstatement requirements for temporary compound areas. Please also refer to Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2), under the section 'Construction compounds, welfare facilities and site access', which details the considerations for construction compounds and site accesses.	
256	ANON-N6YD-XGQM-X			Appleby to Brough - Request for information/ Compounds Location	Respondents express concern as they are unclear where the previous compounds were while also being concerned of how close compounds will be to their property.	National Highways take on board the respondent's request that consultation compounds are kept to a minimum size and National Highways will continue to liaise with them throughout the detailed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						design phase. The location, size and number of site compounds has changed from the Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021 as each scheme design has developed. Details of the previous locations of compounds in the Warcop area can be found in the map book provided for the statutory consultation which are available on the project webpage.	
255			TR0200110	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - for information/ Ownership of Track	Respondents representing Fremington, Brougham express concern asking for confirmation on who will be the owner of the track south of the A66 between the Llama Karma Kafe and the track parallel to the B626 slip road (on Penrith to Temple Sowerby Sheet 1 of 3) and who will have right of way and who is responsible for maintenance.	The new track is proposed to allow the landowner to access the field. It is proposed that this route will also be used by pedestrians walking from Brougham to the Countess Pillar. Any new tracks to be provided as part of the works will either be owned and maintained by National Highways or the local authority. Some tracks may be passed into the ownership of the land owner, under a legal agreement which will stipulate access and maintenance requirements. The proposed construction of the path will be confirmed at detailed design.	No
253			TR0200110	Penrith to Temple Sowerby -	Respondents representing Fremington, Brougham express concern asking whether they will have right of access to cross the compound to access the retained	The site compound area will be managed by the Principal Contractor for the works. Access to the field will be maintained throughout the construction phase	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Request for information Access	field behind the compound? They will require access to this field and presently the only access is from the Llama Karma Café car park. The area in question is at Penrith to Temple Sowerby Sheet 1 of 3 in the Supplementary consultation material.	either via the former Llama Karma Kafe car park or by the dedicated track suggested in the design from the layby. Health and safety is a major consideration when constructing the works and site movements will need to be controlled at the former cafe which may make the latter option preferable. We will continue to work the with landowner.	
252				Access			No
118		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Request further information/ Compound	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest further information be provided in the draft DCO identifying the nature of activities to be undertaken at the compound. Adding this should include the likely effects of noise, dust and light pollution from the compound.	The proposed compound locations are identified within the order limits and will be developed further at the detailed design stage with construction logistics being completed. It is possible that compound locations may be relocated within the order limits. The size and number are also subject to final evaluation based on detailed temporary works design. We will discuss the detail of activities on specific compounds with Local Authorities and impacted landowners as it emerges. Assesments of noise, dust and visual impacts are included within the Environmental Statement	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>which forms part of our DCO application. Further information on compounds can be found in chapter two of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with the council as plans develop further.</p>	
126		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Request further information/ Soil Storage	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest the need for soil storage along the A66 NTP corridor requires further justification to establish whether these are short term or likely to be required for the duration of the construction period.	National Highways has sought to minimise the need for movement of soils by using soil storage as a temporary measure where it might be required to fill on a site nearby. There are also sites where we will use stored soils as landscaping bunds or similar. We will continue to share this information as it evolves once Principal Contractors are in place.	No
243			TR0200177	Requests further information/ Design Plans	Respondents express concern regarding the lack of details of the plans available.	National Highways acknowledges the response. More detailed plans are available in our map books which can be found on the National Highway's A66 project page. We are committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to share updated information as it becomes available.	No
75			TR0200180	Safety/ Design	Respondent representing High Grange Farm, Melsonby suggests extending the service road to the	National Highways acknowledges the response. While this response does not apply to the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					Gilling junction to improve safety, adding they are aware this would require an extension to the eastern boundary of the order limits.	supplementary consultation subject matter, we are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.	
202			TR0200179	Safety/ A67	Respondents of the Old Armoury camp site at Bowes express concern over the safety of the scheme, as the A67 will become more popular. Concern arises because this can be a very dangerous road and could lead to fatalities if motorists aren't made aware.	National Highways acknowledges the response of the Old Armoury camp site regarding the safety of the proposed scheme. Our modelling shows there is a decrease in traffic on the A67 as the improved and therefore faster A66 attracts more long distance east west traffic from the A67, for instance traffic between Cumbria and the rural areas to the south and west of Darlington. It is expected that a reduction in traffic would lead to fewer road traffic accidents on the A67. Chapter 8.1 of the Transport Assessment Application Document 3.7 shows the impacts of the scheme. Figures 8-18 and 8-21 and Tables 8.5 and 8.6 of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Transport Assessment show traffic impacts on the A67.	
203			TR0200179	Safety/ Design	<p>Respondents from the Old Armoury camp site at Bowes suggest moving the slip road further south to a safer location as it will provide greater visibility for motorists of oncoming vehicles. Adding that the road safety audit had been requested but not yet provided.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response from the Old Armoury camp site raising concerns about the safety of the design.</p> <p>While this response does not apply to the supplementary consultation subject matter, we are, however, committed to working with impacted landowners and will continue to do so throughout the DCO process and into detailed design. As we move through this process, we will address specific questions relating to individual landowners. This process will be undertaken by the dedicated public liaison officer alongside the design and construction teams.</p> <p>A Road Safety Audit has been completed against the preliminary design for the Project and was carried out in accordance with current guidance. Please refer to the Section 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7) which summarises the findings of the Road Safety Audit.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
38			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Security/ Access	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest measures will be needed along public access routes to prevent illegal access by vehicles and at junctions where the cycle track joins the highway.	The proposals for the shared use tracks and routes will be reviewed and developed further at the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
143			TR0200192	Penrith to Temple Sowerby - Security WCH	Respondents representing Winderwath Settled Estate suggest the issues of trespass can be mitigated with infrastructure to prevent illegal access and local access routes being gated and padlocked. While the cycle and walking routes can be separated with fencing/hedges.	This relevant point is noted. Further engagement will be undertaken with local authorities and other bodies on the detailed design of WCH routes, following submission of the DCO application. In addition, a Public Rights of Way Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7) The EMP will provide a list of the PRoW's affected and will set out the management measures to be developed by the contractors for each of the affected routes by the Project. The shared access tracks that would be constructed adjacent to your land will be segregated by fencing or another form of boundary treatment. Refer to the General Arrangement Drawings (Application Document 2.5) for further details	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
130			TR0200178	Services/ Utilities	<p>Respondents from Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern that the water supply that currently runs under the existing A66 supplies Street Side Farm and Birk House. The water meter is located on south side of A66 and water supply cannot be interrupted. Note also that that Street Side Farm is at the end of overhead electricity and phone lines that pass over the A66.</p>	<p>National Highways acknowledges the response from Ewebank Farm</p> <p>As part of the preliminary design process we have ascertained the records of the all the statutory undertakers (SU's) with plant and apparatus in the area. We have in liaison with affected SU's identified any proposed diversion work requirements. As we move into the detailed design stage we will continue to liaise with affected undertakers to identify any required protection or diversion works including for affected private supplies. We will work with all impacted landowners to ensure they have continuity of supply for all utilities.</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). A plan to maintain, reinstate or compensate water supplies will be prepared, and implemented. This is secured through implementation of the EMP (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
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
116		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Surveys/ Pavement Condition	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest that pavement condition surveys are undertaken prior to the establishment of compounds.	National Highways acknowledges the comments about undertaking pavement condition surveys before the establishment of site compounds. Site walkover condition surveys will be carried out on the local road network to be utilised by the Project by the contractor for the works alongside representatives of National Highways and the local highway authority. The survey will review and record the condition of the side road and identify any potential mitigation works. This survey is covered in the Construction Traffic Management Plan, which is a requirement of the Project Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Reference 2.7).on such detail.	No
245			TR0200178	Topsoil/ Storage	Respondents from Ewebank Farm, Rokeby suggest the proposed topsoil storage area to be located in the field corner to ensure majority of field farmable but would be subject to a compound licence fee being agreed.	National Highways acknowledges this suggestion regarding the temporary topsoil storage area in one of the fields at Ewebank Farm. When selecting locations for compounds or work areas, it will be ensured wherever possible and practical that: the areas are encompassed as part of the permanent works; that impacts to local stakeholders are minimised;	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>and that suitable access and egress points are provided.</p> <p>As part of the Development Consent Order process, we are committed to seeking to acquire the land it requires for the Project (including WCH provision) by agreement rather than by compulsory purchase. All directly impacted land interests have received a letter from us inviting them to engage in further discussion with regards to the scheme and how they are affected.</p> <p>Further information on our property policies can be found in the publications section on our website.</p> <p>An assessment of the effect of the works on businesses has also been carried out, please refer to the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13, Population and Human Health, (Application Document 3.2.</p>	
102			TR0200184	Traffic/ Increase	Respondents express concern relating to the potential increase of traffic from the Richmond area heading west due to the slip road from Brownson Bank directly onto the proposed A66.	The traffic modelling undertaken by National Highways shows that there is an increase of 720 vehicles per day on the B6274 to the south of the A66 however as the route is not heavily trafficked	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 the south of the A66 is due to the increase in design speed and capacity on the A66 encouraging traffic to use the A66 for more of their journey. Chapter 8.1 of the Transport Assessment Application Document 3.7 shows the impacts of the scheme. Figure 8-24 and Table 8.7 of the Transport Assessment show traffic impacts around Brownson Bank.	
115		Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council		Traffic/ Traffic Management Plans	Cumbria County Council and Eden District Council suggest for compounds at Warcop a Construction Traffic Management Plan should be included where compounds access onto the local road.	The site compounds strategy and access arrangements will be further developed and Annex B13 of the EMP (Application Document 2.7) sets out framework Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be developed by the Principal Contractors.	No
250			TR0200178	Variable Message Sign/ Location	Respondents living at Ewebank Farm, Rokeby express concern over the proposed location of a variable message sign being right outside Street Side farmhouse and in line of site of property. Can	National Highways acknowledges the concern of the residents regarding the location of the proposed Variable Message Sign outside Street Side Farm. The position of signage will be refined and reviewed as part of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					it be moved either way out of the sight of the house?	the detailed design stage. The proposed sign needs to meet current design criteria in terms of its safe location and visibility to road users. We will continue to consult with you throughout the DCO process and detailed design.	
220		Eden District Council		Survey/Compound	Eden District Council suggest appropriate surveys be undertaken for the compound at M6, Junction 40 as the site was formerly a sand/gravel quarry to ensure it is suitable.	National Highways thanks you for your advice regarding the current site ground conditions in the area and would request copies of your records if our consultants do not have this information as yet. Phase 1 preliminary GI has been carried out along the route, to identify baseline ground conditions within the Order Limits and further investigations are planned as part of phase 2 GI works, refer to ES Chapter 9, Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2) for further information. 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. This is secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7).	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						The site compound foundations will be assessed following the receipt of the results from the phase 2 GI works and any other relevant information that becomes available.	
231		Eden District Council		Land conflict/ Residential Development	Eden District Council express concern that the compound north of Cross Street, Kirkby Thore overlaps an existing residential development whose planning application has been approved adding National Highways would need to alter the DCO to avoid land conflicts and consider impacts on this development during construction.	National Highways appreciates this response from the Local Authority. We are aware of the planned development at this location and we have adjusted our plans to remove the impact they might have had on the planned development. We will continue to work with Eden District Council as our plans progress into the DCO. ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential noise and vibration impacts on this development. The construction of the Project has the potential to give rise to potential noise impacts at this development site and nearby receptors. With the implementation of an appropriate Noise and Vibration Management Plan and the EMP (Application Document 2.7), it is expected that noise impacts arising from construction will be minimised.	No

Brough Hill - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
19	165384, 165432, 165488, 166094, 166720, 166730, 166731, 166733	Warcop Parish Council	167221	A66 - Northern route	<p>Respondents including Warcop Parish Council suggest that the new A66 takes the Northern route option as it would then be unnecessary to move the site of the Brough Hill Fair, which has been used by the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) community for centuries.</p>	<p>The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the Project to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the AONB and MoD training ranges to the north of the old A66.</p> <p>The North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. In accordance with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) paragraph 5.151, the Secretary of State is directed to refuse development consent in nationally designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. A route even further into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66, would have considerable impact on the AONB and MoD operations and would highly likely not obtain a grant of DCO.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Following feedback from stakeholders on the May 2020 Preferred Route Alignment, 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. An alignment with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB was considered by the design team prior to Statutory Consultation. During the design stage there was engagement with the MoD, GRT community, Warcop Parish Council, local landowners, and Statutory Bodies on this alignment alternative. All were given the opportunity to comment, and engagement has shown there was a level of support for this alternative when compared with the Preferred Route design announced in May 2020. As such, a revised route alignment was presented at Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate exceptional circumstances for constructing the new route in the AONB a sifting exercise was</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 statutory 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 Statutory consultation and is presented in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). It shows that the route submitted with the DCO is more consentable than a route further to the north. The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) provides further details on the work carried out in assessing the route alignment against alternatives.	
80	167214, 167218			A66 - Other	Respondents suggesting Site 1 Central Site would be the best option for relocating the Brough Hill Fair site. Respondents also suggest relocating the West View Farm overbridge and that the existing A66 should remain for	National Highways' acknowledges the support for Site 1 Central Site. West View Farm overbridge has been positioned to provide optimum access to Warcop and MoD land to the north of the A66. The current direct access to the Brough Hill Fair site from the A66	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					access throughout the whole Appleby to Brough scheme .	is no longer possible with the proposed dualling. Access to Site 1 Central Site is via Station Road which connects to the dualled A66 at the Warcop westbound junction.	
86	166087, 166722, 167210, 167211	Warcop Parish Council		Alternative site - MoD	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council suggest an alternative site for the Brough Hill Fair, to the north of the A66 close to MoD land, or near Appleby.	Alternative sites have been considered and discounted on account of them not being suitable for the GRT community requirements. We have consulted with the GRT Community on both sites under consideration as part of the Supplementary Consultation. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
335	166079			Alternative use-Biodiversity	Respondent suggests that Site 2 Eastern Site is better suited for environmental purposes such as wetland.	National Highways acknowledges your comments on this matter. Site 1 Central Site has been selected as the preferred site for the relocated fair. National Highways are proposing environmental mitigation in the location of Site 2 Eastern Site in the form of grassland. Our Environmental Assessment (Application Document 3.2) notes this proposal and also states why this is the case and where and why wetland habitat is proposed elsewhere on the project. Site 2 Eastern Site is not suitable for wetland.	No
677	167219			Alternative use-Biodiversity	Respondent suggests that work is carried out on Site 1 Central Site to make it more suitable in terms of size, increasing to 2 acres, and creation of one suitable access point. It is recommended to plant on spare land for environmental diversity.	National Highways acknowledges this response in this matter. The provision of land is based on current and anticipated attendance at the fair. Sufficient land has been provided in this regard. Site 1 Central Site is 5 acres in size. Access to Site 1 is singular and provided via Station	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Road. Environmental mitigation is proposed at Site 1 in the form of species rich grassland.</p> <p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout.</p> <p>Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	
582	166735			Community impact - Businesses	Respondent supports Site 2 Eastern Site citing increased business for local businesses.	National Highways acknowledges the comment.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	
415	166091			Community impact - Available Utilities	Respondent expresses concern about the lack of water available to Site 1 Central Site.	<p>Site 1 Central Site is currently served by a mains water supply. The mains water supply would be retained to serve Site 1 Central Site so there would be water available.</p> <p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
21	165318, 166037			Community impact - Limited Impact	Respondent supports Site 1 Central Site due to the impact of the new site being limited to neighbouring fields only.	National Highways acknowledges this comment. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. While there are neighbouring properties to both sites we have chosen this site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout.	
13	165316, 165385, 165420, 165493, 165561, 165732, 165844, 165845, 166037, 166079, 166082, 166088, 166089, 166091, 166092, 166093, 166388, 166390, 166391, 166723, 166724,		166080, 166081	Community impact - Unregulated Expansion	Respondents are concerned about the potential for the unregulated expansion of Site 2 Eastern Site and/or GRT community members settling in unsuitable locations cutting off access to property. Additionally, respondents express concern about increased antisocial behaviour around local villages around the time of the fair.	Following Supplementary Consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. Site 1 Central Site has been selected as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166725, 166726, 166727, 166734, 166735, 167209, 167212, 167213, 167215, 167219, 167397					cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
55	165487, 165557, 165843, 165844, 166089, 166722, 166723, 166724, 166732, 167219	Brough Parish Council		Community impact – Community Disruption	Respondents including Brough Parish Council are concerned about the potential friction caused between the GRT community and local residents from the close proximity of both communities. Concerns are also raised about the lack of support for Site 2 Eastern Site by the GRT community themselves.	National Highways has consulted with the GRT Community on both sites. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No
12	165316, 165493, 165556, 165560, 165562, 165729, 165730, 165731, 165732, 165843, 165845, 166035,	Brough Parish Council, Eden District Council, Cumbria County Council	166081, 167221	Community impact - Proximity to properties	Respondents including Brough Parish Council, Eden District Council and Cumbria County Council are concerned about the proximity of Site 2 Eastern Site to the local villages, schools, and houses and the potential strain on local facilities e.g. shops, pubs, roads, from the increase in people. Additionally, respondents express concern about community disruption from the increase of	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166036, 166037, 166073, 166074, 166076, 166077, 166079, 166082, 166083, 166085, 166086, 166088, 166091, 166389, 166391, 166725, 166726, 166727, 166728, 166729, 166735, 167209, 167210, 167211, 167216, 167217, 167218, 167219, 167396, 167398				people for the horse fair. Respondents also mention the potential distress and anxiety caused by this increase.		
16	165317, 165419			Community impact - Anti-	Respondents express concern about the potential for increased anti-social behaviour if Site 2	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				social Behaviour	Eastern Site is progressed, due to proximity to Brough.	Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	
114	165493, 165732, 166091, 166388, 166391, 166723, 166724, 166725, 166727, 166734, 167218, 167398		167221	Community impact - Property	Respondents express concern about devaluation of properties, and potential loss of farmland if Site 2 Eastern Site is progressed. Additionally, respondents express concerns about damage to businesses in terms of loss of profit, pressure to close, hiring of extra police/security, and reduced customer footfall.	National Highways acknowledges concerns regarding this matter. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be used by National Highways as environmental mitigation. National Highways anticipates that the same policing provision would be made when the event is held at the replacement site as would apply at its current location. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of noise bunding and screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
24	165384, 166091, 166720, 167210, 167211	Warcop Parish Council		Community impact - Property	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council express concerns about Site 1 Central Site's close proximity to residential areas and local farms.	National Highways acknowledges concerns regarding this matter. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be used by National Highways as environmental mitigation. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
248	166036, 166091, 166727, 167215			Community impact - Available Utilities	Respondents express concerns about the waste management and toilet facilities of Site 2 Eastern Site and who will be responsible for this. Additionally, concerns are raised about the access to a suitable water source.	Following the supplementary consultation however, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No
6	165316, 165385, 165420, 165493, 165560, 165562, 165729, 165730, 165731, 165844, 166035, 166036, 166037,		166080	Community impact - Support/Community Disruption	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to low impact on local facilities e.g. pubs, shops, etc. and also due to decreased disruption to all communities due to distance from houses and the village of Brough and Warcop. Additionally, respondents highlight support from the MoD will reduce impact on the local community.	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166038, 166073, 166078, 166079, 166082, 166085, 166088, 166089, 166090, 166091, 166093, 166390, 166391, 166723, 166724, 166725, 166726, 166729, 167209, 167217, 167218, 167396, 167397, 167398					Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
130	165557, 165844, 166036, 166079, 166085, 166723, 166724, 166726,		166080, 166081	Community impact - Support/ Available Utilities	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to previous facilities of toilets and waste management provided by the MoD and land is a designated 'bivvy' site. Additionally respondents state any works needed to be carried out to make it more suitable would be minimal.	National Highways acknowledges support for Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166727, 167215					<p>Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout.</p> <p>National Highways acknowledges that a level of remediation work will be necessary on Site 1 Central Site to make it suitable for the fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	
36	165419			Community impact/land	The respondent is concerned about devaluation of property.	National Highways acknowledges concerns regarding this matter. However the fair is unlikely to impact property value as it is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>used by National Highways as environmental mitigation. This mitigation, in itself will improve the appearance of the site.</p> <p>For background we selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair following Supplementary Consultation. We decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	
61	165487			Community impact/land	There are dwellings adjacent to Site 2 Eastern Site, which makes the site even less suitable.	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
2	165198, 165418, 165491, 165492, 165557, 165560, 166085, 166087, 166088, 166723, 166724, 166725, 166726, 166732			Cost - Land Acquisition	Respondents highlight concerns regarding Site 2 Eastern Site, including the source of funding to purchase the required land.	Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	No
89	165491, 165844, 166038, 166085, 166088, 166726, 166732			Cost - Support	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to the decreased cost to set up and run Site 1 Central Site.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for this site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
87		Warcop Parish Council		Environment – cultural heritage	Warcop Parish Council stating that destroying a historical and cultural site is discriminatory against an already persecuted and much maligned group and it is unbelievable that National Highways could even consider a scheme that requires relocation of the Brough Hill Fair site, as an option. Respondents state a preference to keep the existing site and move the road north of the existing A66.	The preferred route alignment of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. The route has been selected to minimise impact on the AONB and MoD training ranges 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. In accordance with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) paragraph 5.151, the Secretary of State is	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>directed to refuse development consent in nationally designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. A route further into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66, which avoids the current Brough Hill Fair site, would have considerable impact on the AONB and MoD operations and would highly likely not obtain a grant of DCO.</p> <p>Our Equality Impact Assessment explains how National Highways has taken into account its public sector equality duty in relation to this matter.</p>	
430	166093			Environment - Linked to Current site	It makes sense to use Site 1 Central Site as it is directly linked to the current site	<p>National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Site 1 Central Site.</p> <p>Our Equality Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) explains how National Highways has taken into account its public sector equality duty in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred location for the Brough Hill Fair.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						We have chosen this site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
216	165845			Environment – air quality	Respondent expresses concern about increased air pollution from Site 2 Eastern Site.	National Highways acknowledges concerns regarding this matter. However the fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be used by National Highways as environmental mitigation. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
361	166084			Environment - flooding	Respondent expresses concern that the ground of Site 1 Central Site is water-logged.	Site 1 Central Site is outwith a flood zone. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report. Details of the flood risk assessment carried out for the Project and the project drainage design are reported in ES Appendix 14.2: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (Application Document 3.2). 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.	
451	166390			Environment – landscape and visual	Respondent supports Site 1 Central Site as there is decreased visual impact due to the site being covered by the valley.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
474	166721			Environment - noise	Respondent supports Site 2 Eastern Site citing reduced noise for camping due to increased distance from the A66.	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 2 Eastern Site . Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
480	165432	Warcop Parish Council, Eden District Council		Environment – cultural heritage	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council and Eden District Council are concerned about the damage and destruction to historic cultural heritage of the Brough Hill Fair and comment on the discriminatory nature of this destruction of heritage.	<p>The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. Our Equality Impact Assessment (Application Document 3.10) explains how National Highways has taken into account its public sector equality duty in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Engagement with the GRT Community has been ongoing throughout design development in order to understand their requirements for a replacement site. Following Supplementary Consultation, at which two sites were presented (Site 1 Central Site and Site 2 Eastern Site), National Highways have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						We have decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
449	166390, 166727, 167218, 167396			Environment – landscape and visual	Respondents express concern about the potential visual impact of the fair itself at Site 2 Eastern Site for local houses and recreational buildings i.e. Brough Castle and any refuse left in this location after the fair.	National Highways acknowledges concerns on this matter. The Brough Hill fair is an annual event which involves the location of a small number of caravans and horses to be situated within a rural site. Last year's fair contained 10 caravans. While it is acknowledged there may be a temporary visual change when the event is on for nearby residential receptors, for the remainder of the year the site would be maintained as	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>agricultural land. The land would not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community. A maintenance plan would be put in place to ensure that appropriate provisions were made for maintenance of the site before, during and after the fair. This is how it operates on the current site.</p> <p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
471	166721, 167210, 167211			Environment - noise	<p>Respondents express concern about the proximity of the A66 to Site 1 Central Site causing increased noise pollution disturbing the community using the site and reducing suitability for recreation.</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). A combination of moderate and significant adverse effects are predicted on receptors at Site 1 Central Site.</p> <p>Following supplementary consultation, Site 1 Central Site was selected because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated.</p> <p>The relocated Brough Hill Fair site is to be graded as an even surface where reasonably practicable and integrated into the landscape through use of appropriately designed bunding and planting to screen the site from the A66 and adjacent farm business and to reduce headlight glare, as set out</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						in the PDP (Application Document 5.11).	
599	167210, 167211			Environment – air quality	Respondents express concern about vehicle fumes from the proximity to the A66 impacting the recreational suitability of Site 1 Central Site.	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. There are no significant effects arising from air quality changes to any human receptor on the Project. Site 1 Central Site will contain environmental mitigation in the form of species rich grassland. There are several receptors in very close proximity to Site 1. Air Quality effects on these properties are stated in the ES. No significant effects on human receptors for AQ are predicted in Site 1 location.	No
601	167210, 167211			Environment - ground suitability	Respondents highlight concern towards the softness of the ground at Site 1 Central Site being unsuitable for vehicles and caravans.	The existing ground within the full site extents will be rolled and compacted to provide a firm, evenly-graded surface. The site will be positively drained using a herringbone land drainage system. Further details on the proposed remediation of Site 1 Central Site are provided in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
50	165487, 165491, 165493, 165560, 165729, 165730, 165843, 165844, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166072, 166073, 166075, 166076, 166078, 166079, 166083, 166085, 166086, 166088, 166090, 166092, 166093, 166387, 166391, 166723, 166724, 166725, 166726, 166730, 166731, 167210, 167211,	Brough Parish Council, Warcop Parish Council		Environment - flooding	Respondents including Brough Parish Council and Warcop Parish Council highlight concerns about the lack of drainage at Site 2 Eastern Site, the potential for flooding as it is on a floodplain, and is wet land and therefore unsuitable for caravans.	National Highways acknowledges the potential for flooding and wet land at Site 2 Eastern Site, which would have to include drainage works. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	167212, 167217, 167396						
53	165556, 165843, 166037, 166076, 166083, 166091, 166725, 167398	Brough Parish Council		Environment – cultural heritage	Respondents including Brough Parish Council highlight concerns that Site 2 Eastern Site holds no cultural heritage for the GRT community and is therefore unsuitable. Some respondents raise concerns about grade listed buildings or historic building in the area that could be damaged by the fair.	Discussions with the GRT Community have been held throughout the current design phase in order to understand their requirements for a replacement site. We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Damage to nearby listed and historic buildings by the fair is not anticipated. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						number of people for typically four days each year.	
54	165487, 165729, 165843, 165844, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166073, 166075, 166078, 166088, 166090, 167217	Brough Parish Council, Warcop Parish Council	167221	Environment - ground suitability	Respondents including Brough Parish Council and Warcop Parish Council highlight concerns that the land of Site 2 Eastern Site is uneven, has a steep incline, and is boggy so is unsuitable for the caravans and horse-drawn vehicles.	National Highways acknowledges that a level of remediation work would be necessary on Site 2 Eastern Site. This would include levelling the site to some extent. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No
214	165845, 167218			Environment - noise	Respondents raise concerns about the increase in noise from the traffic of the fair if it were to be located on Site 2 Eastern Site.	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. The Brough Hill Fair is an annual event which involves the location of a small number of caravans and horses to be situated within a rural site, this number of vehicles is considered unlikely to generate significant road traffic noise. Noise from the fair has not been quantitatively assessed through modelling, however given that noise from the fair is temporary	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						and the small number of vehicles involved, it is considered unlikely that there would be any likely significant noise effects from road traffic noise associated with the fair.	
232	166035, 166036, 166073, 166390, 167217			Environment - Biodiversity	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site. Respondents also note that a previous request for planning permission for a caravan park at Site 2 Eastern Site was refused due to the area being classified as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	National Highways welcomes the support for Site 1 Central Site. National Highways acknowledges the respondents comments on this matter regarding previous planning applications for changes of use on Site 2 Eastern Site. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. The AONB is located north of the A66 in the location of Site 2 Eastern Site and not within it, this site is further from the AONB than Site 1 and the current Brough Hill Fair site. ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (Application Document 3.2) sets out the landscape assessment of the A66 and its supporting components and identifies that though there will be changes to the AONB, there are no significant effects.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
7	165316, 165418, 165420, 165487, 165489, 165491, 165492, 165493, 165555, 165560, 165562, 165732, 165843, 165844, 165845, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166038, 166073, 166074, 166075, 166076, 166078, 166079, 166082, 166083, 166086, 166088, 166089, 166090, 166091, 166092, 166391,	Brough Parish Council	166080, 166081, 167221	Environment	Respondents including Brough Parish Council support Site 1 Central Site due to being close to the original Brough Hill Fair site. Respondents highlight the importance to the GRT cultural heritage of the original site and express the need to keep the GRT as close to the Original Site as possible. Additionally respondents highlight that for the GRT already know the location of the new site.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Site 1 Central Site. This site allows us to utilise part of the existing Brough Hill fair site and maintain that cultural connection. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166723, 166724, 166725, 166726, 166729, 166734, 167209, 167213, 167215, 167216, 167217						
200	165844, 166085, 166088, 166723, 166724		167221	Environment - ground suitability	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to the ground being more level than the alternative site and therefore is more suitable for caravans.	National Highways acknowledges support for this option. We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair.	No
26	165384, 166084	Eden District Council		Environment – drainage/flooding	Respondents including Eden District Council support Site 2 Eastern Site citing drainage ability and the land not being on a flood plain.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Site 2 Eastern Site. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
487	166723			Drainage / flooding	The ground on Site 1 Central Site is more level and drained than the newly proposed site, making it much more suitable for the use proposed.	National Highways acknowledges respondent's comments regarding Site 1 Central Site and how it is level and better drained than Site 2 Eastern Site. Following supplementary consultation, National Highways has selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. Site 1 Central Site was chosen because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						less drainage issues than first anticipated.	
63	165487			Environment	There is no link with the traditional site of Brough Hill Fair on Site 2 Eastern Site, and no continuation of an important aspect of local heritage.	<p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	No
696		Eden District Council		Further engagement -	Eden District Council suggest that a full scale consultation is	The supplementary non-statutory consultation has been held directly	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
				Appleby Horse Fair	conducted around the relocation of Brough Hill Fair to allow local communities to input their comments.	<p>with affected landowners, community groups, stakeholders and statutory organisations on two possible sites for the relocated fair. The communities of Brough and Warcop were both invited to take part through a leaflet drop and local events.</p> <p>The intention was to seek feedback from these specific consultees on the possible site locations as they related to their property interests or responsibilities. In-person events for supplementary consultation matters were held in spring 2022 and advertised to affected parties beforehand.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation has been based on the approach recommended in DCLG's guidance on the Pre-Application Process (March 2015). This states: "In circumstances where a particular issue has arisen during the pre-application consultation, or where it is localised in nature, it may be appropriate to hold a non-statutory, supplementary consultation." (paragraph 76)</p> <p>To accord with this guidance we applied three tests (as set out in paragraph 73 of the guidance) to</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>judge whether supplementary consultation on a particular issue or within a local area was required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is of sufficient scale (the physical nature of the change). • It introduces material change to the environmental impacts of the Project. • The level of public interest in the change as expressed during consultation. <p>A decision was made on holding a non-statutory consultation if the changes proposed met one or more of these tests. on a local level. The change proposed was both local in nature and/or related to a particular issues and did not impact the overall Project in a manner that would make it fundamentally different to that which was presented at statutory consultation between 24 September 2021 to 6 November 2021 so it was concluded that further statutory consultation on the entire Project was not required.</p> <p>National Highways paid due consideration to the requirements in the PA 2008 as to whether</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						supplementary statutory and non-statutory consultation was needed when assessing the extent of the Project changes post statutory consultation in autumn 2021. Our decision to undertake the supplementary consultation and planning of the various events took cognisance of the PA 2008's guidance.	
14	165316, 165555, 165844, 166073, 166075, 166077, 166078, 166083, 166087, 166088, 166089, 166092, 166387, 166725, 167213, 167214, 167215, 167217, 167397, 167398		167221	General - Support	Respondents provide general support for Site 1 Central Site.	National Highways acknowledges support for Site 1 Central Site. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
81	166721	Warcop Parish Council		General - Support	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council support Site 2 Eastern Site in general and due to being in proximity to Brough Hill Fair's name sake of Brough Village.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 2 Eastern Site.</p> <p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
664	167219	Eden District Council	167221	Information / materials/ consultation	<p>Respondents raise concerns regarding consultation materials, lack of information and length of consultation.</p> <p>Respondents also commented on the inaccuracy of the numbers of caravans, horses and people estimated by National Highways to attend the Brough Hill Fair, citing fluctuations due to Covid 19.</p> <p>Respondents query the effectiveness of the access point at Musgrave Lane.</p>	<p>Every home and businesses in Warcop and Brough and all the areas in between were sent a leaflet explaining the consultation and the events. Public events were held in both Brough and Warcop and posters were used to publicise these. All materials were made available online.</p> <p>At last year's Brough Hill Fair event there was approximately 10 caravans, however that was during the Covid 19 pandemic and the weather was poor.</p> <p>Proposals include the upgrading of the access lane from Musgrave Lane to serve the local residents form part of the overall scheme proposals.</p>	No
117	165555, 167209, 167219	Eden District Council		Junction design - traffic and transport	<p>Respondents oppose Site 2 Eastern Site for the location of the Brough Hill Fair site. Respondents including Eden District Council also raise concerns over access to nearby properties during the Fair if Site 2 Eastern Site is progressed.</p>	<p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					<p>Respondents also raise concerns regarding the removal of the slip-road from the A66 eastbound to Brough Main Street, and the proposed new junction at Brough Main Street.</p>	<p>this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Regarding access to Brough, it is not proposed to remove the existing eastbound slip road to Brough as this is outside the limits of the scheme. The junction at Brough remains as it currently is. A new local road will be constructed to link to Main Street and it is anticipated that this will have low traffic volumes, being used mostly by local and farm traffic.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
78		Warcop Parish Council		Location - Suitability	Warcop Parish Council expresses concern towards suitability of the land for either Site 1 Central Site or Site 2 Eastern Site, citing need for investment to make either, usable. Respondents also note and proximity of both proposed sites to the A66 being unfavourable for horses.	<p>National Highways acknowledges that a level of remediation work will be necessary on both potential sites, this will include drainage works and bunding/screening.</p> <p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
176	165731			Not a priority - Lack of Use	Respondents note low attendance at Brough Hill Fair stating the past 3 years before lockdown there have only been a maximum of around 8-10 caravans there. After lockdown 2021 there were only 2-3.	National Highways acknowledges that the Brough Hill Fair is not attended by large numbers of the GRT Community. At last year's Brough Hill Fair event, there were around 10 caravans but that was during the pandemic and the weather was poor. The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary.	No
171	165731, 166087			Not a priority - decreasing GRT community	Respondents express concern that the GRT community is decreasing in size and therefore relocation is not a priority.	National Highways acknowledges that the Brough Hill Fair is not attended by large numbers of the GRT Community. At last year's Brough Hill Fair event there was around 10 caravans but that was during the pandemic and the weather was poor. The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. Our Equality Impact Assessment explains how National Highways has taken into account its public sector equality duty in relation to this matter.	No
3	165198, 166038, 166082,			Not a priority - decreasing	Respondents raise concerns that the attendance of the fair has	National Highways acknowledges that the Brough Hill Fair is not attended by large numbers of the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166087, 166093, 167219			GRT community	been decreasing so relocation of the fair is not a priority.	GRT Community. At last year's Brough Hill Fair event there was around 10 caravans but that was during the pandemic and the weather was poor. The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary.	
45	165432			Process - Alternatives	Respondents are concerned about the decided route options, stating their suggestions for a more northerly route through the AONB and MoD land have been ignored by National Highways.	National Highways acknowledges the consultees' requests for the Project to follow a more northerly route for the new dual carriageway into the AONB and MoD training ranges to the north of the old A66. The North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is protected as a nationally designated site by legislation and policy. In accordance with the National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) paragraph 5.151, the Secretary of State is directed to refuse development consent in nationally designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that it is in the public interest. A route even further into the AONB and MoD land to the north of the existing A66, would have considerable	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>impact on the AONB and MoD operations and would highly likely not obtain a grant of DCO.</p> <p>Following feedback from stakeholders on the May 2020 Preferred Route Alignment, 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. An alignment with lower visual and noise impact on nearby residents and businesses that coincided and overlapped with the fringes and edge of the AONB was considered by the design team prior to Statutory Consultation. During the design stage there was engagement with the MoD, GRT community, Warcop Parish Council, local landowners, and Statutory Bodies on this alignment alternative. All were given the opportunity to comment, and engagement has shown there was a level of support for this alternative when compared with the Preferred Route design announced in May 2020. As such, a revised route alignment was presented at Statutory Consultation in autumn 2021.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						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 statutory 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 Statutory consultation and is presented in the Case for the Project (Application Document 2.2). It shows that the route submitted with the DCO is more consentable than a route further to the north. The Project Development Overview Report (Application Document 4.1) provides further details on the work carried out in assessing the route alignment against alternatives.	
715			167221	Process - Consultation	Respondents are concerned about the lack of time given for stakeholders to provide a response.	The principle of relocation and the proposed siting covered in the statutory consultation. However following the statutory consultation	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>in autumn 2021, we reviewed the feedback received and this led to a possible alternative location for Brough Hill Fair. We carried out supplementary consultation on the site proposed and the possible alternative site to help us determine which of the two sites to take forward.</p> <p>The approach to the supplementary consultations was determined in accordance with Government guidance (DCLG, 2015 Pre-application Approach). In accordance with this guidance, a non statutory targeted consultation was undertaken. This approach is explained in further detailed in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>The supplementary consultation was carried out to provide representatives of the Gypsy and Traveller communities, as well as members of the local community with an opportunity to share their feedback on the changes. In addition a range of stakeholder organisations were consulted.</p> <p>The consultation was focused on changes to the proposed location of the Brough Hill Fair and ran from 11 March 2022 to April 2022,</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						which was proportionate to the matters consulted on.	
673	167219		167221	Process - Consultation/consultation	Respondents are concerned about the poor communication and promotion of the proposals to local stakeholders, also flagged is the lack of follow up communication to stakeholder queries.	<p>We undertook several measures to publicise the supplementary consultation opportunity. This included direct engagement with: Gypsy and Traveller community representatives; directly impacted persons with an interest in the land, relevant host local authorities and the Community Liaison Group.</p> <p>Every home and businesses in Warcop and Brough and all the areas in between were sent a leaflet explaining the consultation and the events. Public events were held in both Brough and Warcop and posters were used to publicise these. All materials were made available online.</p> <p>We have continued with our programme of ongoing engagement including in the preparation of Statements of Common Group and with land interests.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
472	166721			Request for information - Amenity	Respondent is querying whether the Recycle Centre on Station Road will be moved to Warcop if this proposal goes ahead?	No, the Recycling Centre will not be moved as part of the fair site relocation.	No
683		Eden District Council, Cumbria County Council		Land	Eden District Council and Cumbria County Council request information on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will be the landowner/claim responsibility of Site 2 Eastern Site? Will agreements need to be put in place to protect the fair? Have nearby properties been provided a consultation? Who will manage the traffic for the fair? 	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. National Highways are purchasing the land at Site 1 Central Site and Site 2 Eastern Site for the Project and will be using the land in both locations for environmental mitigation. Before consultation, discussions took place with nearby land and property owners and in the vicinity both Site 1 Central Site and Site 2 Eastern Site, regarding the proposed relocation of the fair. We do not envisage any additional traffic management being required as the visitors to the fair are already on the highway network for the current Brough Hill Fair.	No
470	166721			Size / shape/design	Respondent expresses concerns about the shape of Site 1 Central Site.	National Highways acknowledges this response in this matter. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						<p>Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	
27	165384			Size / shape design	Respondent supports Site 2 Eastern Site due to better shape.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your support for this site.</p> <p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
9	165316, 165487, 165488, 165489, 165491, 165493, 165555, 165560, 165561, 165729,	Brough Parish Council, Warcop Parish Council, Eden District Council, Cumbria County Council	167221	Size / shape design	Respondents including Brough Parish Council, Warcop Parish Council, Eden District Council and Cumbria County Council raise concerns that Site 2 Eastern Site is considerably smaller than the current site and will not be able to suitably fit the fair. Concerns are also raised of potential unregulated expansion as a result	Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	165730, 165843, 165844, 165845, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166038, 166072, 166073, 166075, 166076, 166078, 166079, 166083, 166086, 166091, 166387, 166391, 166720, 166721, 166722, 166730, 166731, 166734, 167209, 167210, 167211, 167215, 167217, 167396				of the smaller size of Site 2 Eastern Site.	decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
8	165316, 165487,	Brough Parish Council	167221	Size / shape design	Respondents including Brough Parish Council support Site 1	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for Site 1.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	165489, 165491, 165493, 165555, 165556, 165557, 165560, 165729, 165730, 165732, 165843, 165845, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166038, 166072, 166073, 166075, 166076, 166077, 166078, 166079, 166082, 166083, 166086, 166088, 166091, 166093, 166391, 166721, 166729, 166734, 167209,				Central Site due to increased size for the GRT community, and also the ability for the site to expand if needed in the future.	<p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	167212, 167215, 167217, 167396, 167397, 167398						
718		Cumbria County Council		Land suitability	Cumbria County Council supports Site 2 Eastern Site but has concerns over the site size.	<p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
690		Eden District Council, Cumbria County Council		Traffic Management Plan - Appleby Horse Fair	Eden District Council and Cumbria County Council suggest the implementation of a traffic management plan for Site 2 Eastern Site including passing places for traffic.	<p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
33	165418			Traffic, transport and junctions - Cost	Respondent supports Site 1 Central Site as Site 2 Eastern Site would include a well-used bridleway and also seems to have need of a rather complex (and costly) junction beyond the needs of adjacent property.	<p>The access arrangements adjacent to the Site 2 Eastern Site form part of the overall Project and are provided to serve the needs of the local residents in the main. They were included in the autumn 2021 Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
90	165491			Traffic, transport and junctions	Respondent supports Site 1 Central Site due to fewer roads changes.	<p>National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 1 Central Site.</p> <p>Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site.</p> <p>We have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
77	166084	Warcop Parish Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - congestion	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council are concerned about increased congestion from slow moving vehicles and horses accessing Site 1 Central Site.	<p>National Highways acknowledges concerns regarding this matter. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be used by National Highways as environmental mitigation.</p> <p>We do not envisage any increased congestion as the visitors to the fair are already on the highway network for the current Brough Hill Fair.</p> <p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
413	166091, 166720			Traffic, transport and junctions - access	Respondents express concern about increased difficulty of horse-drawn access to Site 1 Central Site and proximity to the A66.	Safe access to Site 1 Central Site for horse-drawn traffic is provided via the new Warcop westbound junction and Station Road. The preferred Site 1 Central Site has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded and nearby businesses.	No
11	165316, 165420, 165487, 165489, 165491, 165493, 165555, 165729, 165731, 165732, 165843, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166038,	Brough Parish Council, Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - Access	Respondents including Brough Parish Council and Eden District Council express concern of poor access to Site 2 Eastern Site for the GRT community, and the unsuitability of some access routes due to small roads and difficult terrain. Respondents also raise poor access in the surrounding area to farms and local residents from the increase in traffic from the fair.	Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166073, 166075, 166078, 166079, 166086, 166729, 167217, 167219, 167396					less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
96	165491, 165493, 165555, 165562, 165729, 165845, 166094, 166391, 166734, 167209, 167217, 167219, 167398		167221	Traffic, transport and junctions - safety	Respondents express concerns about safety for school children from the changes in junction and increased traffic at Site 2 Eastern Site. Additionally, concerns are raised about the safety of horses on the nearby roads particularly: horse racing, slow moving horse-drawn vehicles on the A66, unsuitable road conditions for horses resulting in potential for accidents.	National Highways acknowledges concerns about safety for school children and horses if Site 2 Eastern Site were to be taken forward. Following the supplementary consultation, National Highways will not be selecting Site 2 Eastern Site for the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. Site 1 Central Site has been selected as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
398	166088, 166720, 167209, 167219			Traffic, transport and junctions - proximity	Respondents express concerns about Site 2 Eastern Site. Respondents also raise concerns about proposed junction, stating it is too close to current residences and that the slip road should not be removed.	The access arrangements adjacent to the Site 2 Eastern Site form part of the overall Project and are provided to serve the needs of the local residents in the main. They are not contingent on the relocated Brough Hill Fair site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
97	165491, 165492, 165555, 165561, 165844, 165845, 166082, 166085, 166723, 166724, 167219, 167398			Traffic, transport and junctions - congestion	Respondents highlight concerns of increased traffic from the fair causing congestion in the surrounding villages, residents would also have to take alternate routes adding to further congestion in other areas. Additionally, concern is raised of the suitability of access roads and that horse-drawn vehicles will cause congestion due to the road quality. Comment applies to both sites.	The visitors to the fair are already on the highway network for the current Brough Hill Fair. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year. The land will not be accessible for the remainder of the year to the GRT Community because it will be used by National Highways as environmental mitigation. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
5	165316, 165318, 165493, 165555, 165562, 165729, 165730, 165844, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166038, 166078, 166079, 166086, 166088, 166091, 166391, 166723, 166724, 166725, 167212, 167215,		167221	Traffic, transport and junctions - access	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to existing good access from Station Road, ability to use the Roman road, and access to the A66. Additionally, there are more access points to the site, and these are suitable for horse-drawn vehicles.	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	167217, 167398					the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
41	165420, 166073, 166094, 167209			Traffic, transport and junctions - safety	Respondents support Site 1 Central Site due to the safety of horse-drawn vehicles accessing the site from the A66 and MoD access points. Some also mention the decreased use of horse-drawn vehicles reducing the need for safety.	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
25	165384, 166721			Traffic, transport and junctions - access	Respondents support Site 2 Eastern Site due to the easier access to local amenities and from other main roads.	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 2 Eastern Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of earth bunding and planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	No
362	166084	Eden District Council		Traffic, transport and junctions - congestion	Respondents including EDC support Site 2 Eastern Site due to the proximity to junctions and potential usage of main roads to	National Highways acknowledges your support for Site 2 Eastern Site.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
					reduce congestion at the time of the fair.	<p>Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>The visitors to the fair are already on the highway network for the current Brough Hill Fair. The fair is a modest scale event attended by a small number of people for typically four days each year and therefore it is not envisaged that there will be any additional traffic</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						on the network as a result of relocating the site.	
573	165317, 165419	Warcop Parish Council	167221	Use existing site/land	Respondents including WPC suggest keeping the current Brough Hill site. One respondent references the sacred nature of Site 1 Central Site to the GRT community.	The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
17	165317			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders - access	Respondent is concerned about lack of bridleway access during the fair due to the usage by the GRT community	The PRoW (footpath) is currently outwith the intended site and would remain as part of the A66 Project. Bridleway access in this section will be maintained. Details are shown on the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Application Document 5.19)	No
31	165418, 165555, 165556, 165729, 165730, 165844, 166035, 166036, 166037, 166073, 166093, 166723, 166724, 167215, 167217			Walkers / cyclists / horse-riders - disruption	Respondents express concerns about potential disruption and blockage of local bridleways and paths from tethered horses from the GRT community.	The PRoW (footpath) is currently outwith the intended site and would remain as part of the A66 Dualling scheme. Installing facilities to prevent blockages/ disruption in a hypothetical situation are not feasible. Any blockages caused by tethered horses should be reported to the Police.	No
15	165317, 166730, 167210, 167211			General - suitability	Respondents do not recommend Site 1 Central Site as suitable for the GRT community.	National Highways acknowledges your opposition to Site 1 Central Site. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
4	165198, 165317, 165418, 165489, 165556, 165557, 165560, 165729, 165731, 165843, 165844, 165845, 166035, 166036,		167221	Oppose - general	Respondents oppose the relocation of the Brough Hill Fair to Site 2 Eastern Site.	Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
	166037, 166038, 166078, 166083, 166085, 166087, 166088, 166092, 166093, 166722, 166724, 166725, 166727, 166728, 166729, 166732, 166734, 167209, 167212, 167213, 167215, 167216, 167218, 167219					access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout.	
681	165488	Warcop Parish Council		Oppose - general	Respondents including Warcop Parish Council oppose the relocation of the Brough Hill Fair.	The construction of the A66 will require most of the land that the fair currently uses so a replacement site is necessary. Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	
564	166731			Oppose - general	Respondents do not want Site 2 Eastern Site which they consider is very poor land.	Following Supplementary Consultation, we have selected Site 1 Central Site as the preferred site for the relocated fair. We have chosen this site following the supplementary consultation and decided to take forward Site 1 Central Site because it is more than twice the size of Site 2 Eastern Site, has the ability for better mitigation than Site 2 Eastern Site in terms of planted screening to the upgraded A66 and nearby businesses, has good	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comment	Regard had to consultee comment	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	Land Interests				
						access from Station Road and has less drainage issues than first anticipated. It also maintains the cultural connection to the existing Brough Hill Fair site by being alongside and using part of the old site in the layout. Further details of the proposed remediation works to Site 1 are included in Chapter 7 of the Consultation Report.	

Bowes Bypass - Supplementary Consultation

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
11		Durham County Council		Access - Farm Traffic	Durham County Council express concern related to access and turning circles for all farm related traffic.	National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves in subsequent detailed design stages to develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works. Part 3 of the Right of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19), which link to the drawing sheets, list the private means of access to be stopped up and the proposed new private means of access. This includes to farm land and properties.	No
31	TR0200073			Access - Lack of Detail	Respondents express concern from the lack of detail explaining how access to the western fields at Low Broats to the enclosures is maintained from the new service road	The Project will seek to ensure that any existing accesses are maintained, or reprovided. Access to Low Broats Farm and the adjacent fields is maintained via the proposed East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge and subsequent access tracks. National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves to develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
4	TR0200013			Access - Farm Traffic	Respondents express concern for Bowes Cross Farm stating that any new access would require transit of a busy working farm several times a day. Adding any new legal discussions for such access would be impaired by concerns over health and safety issues that would arise from private vehicles crossing a working farm with machinery and livestock.	The Project proposes to remove direct accesses onto the A66 to provide a significant safety benefit to all users, as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). All direct accesses that are to be closed by the Project will be replaced. These are listed and shown in the schedules and drawings provided in the Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19). Access will be replaced via a new accommodation access to the west that runs parallel to the A66 will maintain connectivity to the trunk road network via the Bowes Junction. National Highways will continue to liaise with the respondent during detailed design to discuss the finer considerations and confirm the design.	No
3	TR0200013			Access - Farm Traffic	Respondents express concern that the current legal arrangement allowing passage over the existing hardstanding of Bowes Cross Farm to access the A66 would become moribund with the closure of the existing Private Means of Access and the resulting	The Project is removing direct accesses onto the A66 to provide a significant safety benefit to all users, as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). All direct accesses that are to be	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>replacement access does not consider all parties.</p>	<p>closed by the Project will be replaced.</p> <p>These are listed and shown in the schedules and drawings provided in the Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p> <p>Access will be replaced via a new accommodation access to the west that runs parallel to the A66 will maintain connectivity to the trunk road network via the Bowes Junction. The closure of the Bowes Cross Farm access, and diversion via the access road to the Bowes junction, will result in a longer journey length from Bowes Cross Farm when travelling to/from the east.</p> <p>At Bowes Cross Farm, a consultee has asked if an existing access to their property along the eastern boundary - via an existing access road - could be reinstated rather than use the new access road, due to the length of the diversion. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders as the Project develops, to discuss the finer considerations and confirm the design..</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
34	TR0200072			Land	Respondent express concern that the extension to the Red Line Boundary to encompass the access to Bowes Cross Farm is taking further land which had been understood to not be required.	<p>The extension of the Order Limits in this location and therefore additional land take, is for the proposed extension of the accommodation access to Bowes Cross Farm; but also, to provide space for the provision of adequate mitigation to eliminate the risk of headlight glare from vehicles using the track and the A66 at night.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with affected parties in the detailed design stage, following the submission of the DCO application, to confirm the design and as part of the land negotiation discussions.</p>	No
5	TR0200013			Access - Alternative Route	Respondents suggest the red line boundary should be extended to include the land required to provide an access to an existing track leading to the Kilmond Wood Quarry access onto the A66. This would avoid the respondent having to travel through Bowes Cross Farm and take a long diversion via the Bowes Junction. They suggest a check of the historical access rights would	<p>National Highways acknowledge the request for the existing access to the property along the eastern boundary - via an existing access road – to be reinstated rather than using the new access road, due to the length of the diversion.</p> <p>The Project is removing direct accesses onto the A66 to provide a significant safety benefit to all users. All direct accesses that are to be closed by the Project will be replaced. Access will be replaced</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
					show that this right of access remains extant.	<p>via a new accommodation access to the west that runs parallel to the A66 will maintain connectivity to the trunk road network via the Bowes Junction. The closure of the Bowes Cross Farm access, and diversion via the access road to the Bowes junction, will result in a longer journey length from Bowes Cross Farm when travelling to/from the east.</p> <p>National Highways do not intend to reinstate the access in question in the manner suggested by the respondent, as this would result in a direct access to the A66 which goes against the safety strategy, as detailed in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document 3.7). National Highways will however continue to engage with all affected stakeholders as the Project develops.</p>	
6	TR0200013			Access/WCH	Respondents suggest that the current public footpath [Bowes Footpath 12] over both their property and Bowes Cross Farm will need to be removed or re-routed once the access onto the A66 via the Private Means of Access is closed. They also	<p>If an existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) is severed by the Project, it will be reconnected via a grade-separated crossing.</p> <p>Bowes Footpath 12 will be redirected via the proposed adjoining accommodation tracks and the East Bowes</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
					suggest that re-routing the footpath away from their property would remove a potential security concern.	Accommodation Overbridge. The diversion will begin at the point at which the footpath currently abuts the A66. We do not intend to divert the footpath further upstream of this point. National Highways will continue to engage with affected landowners.	
22	TR0200074			Access - Farm Traffic	Respondents suggest the specification of the farm access road together with any entrance gateways, cattle grids, and secondary gates for stock movement needs be agreed as soon as possible.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in detailed design to agree, amongst other things, the specification of farm access roads together with any entrance gateways, cattle grids, and secondary gates for stock movement. We will seek to agree such details with landowners promptly as part of the detailed design stage of the Project.	No
19	TR0200075			Access - Farm Traffic	Respondents suggest there is a requirement for further access into the western most fields of Mid Lowfield's from the service road.	The Project will seek to ensure that any existing accesses are maintained, or reprovided. National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves to develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
7		Historic England		Access - Safety	Historic England express support for Bowes Bypass as it works to improve safe access to/from Hulands Quarry and Bowes Cross Farm.	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed for the scheme.	No
16	TR0200073			Compensation/ Land	Respondent suggest early discussions for the settlement of capital compensation.	National Highways is keen to agree the purchase of land without the need to rely on compulsory acquisition. Letters to negotiate have been issued on 28 th March 2022, including to your client, inviting affected landowners to discuss with National Highways the acquisition of the relevant interest as soon as possible within the next 12 months.	No
27	TR0200073			Drainage - Capacity	Respondents express concern regarding the capacity of the drain which will service the outflow of the larger balancing pond at the north of Mid Lowfield's land, as it is already at capacity.	The drainage design is in compliance with the standards set out by the Environment Agency, and as such, is designed not to flood. The proposed balancing ponds will attenuate water during a storm event and slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses to avoid overloading the system and causing flooding downstream. This discharge rate has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Therefore, there will be no increased flood risk as a result	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						of the scheme, including in respect of drains linked to the balancing pond proposed at Mid Lowfield's land. Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the existing network and its capacity, refinements to the design will then be made where necessary. Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of drainage issues and has informed the Project design.	
10		Durham County Council		Drainage Capacity	Durham County Council express concern for drain capacity which will service the outflow of the large balancing pond at the north of Mid Lowfield land.	The drainage design is in compliance with the standards set out by the Environment Agency, and as such, is designed not to flood. The proposed balancing ponds will attenuate water during a storm event and slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses to avoid overloading the system and causing flooding downstream. This discharge rate has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Therefore, there will be no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the existing network and its capacity, amendments will then be made where necessary.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to liaise with affected relevant stakeholders and landowners in the detailed design stage to update them on the design. Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment of the Environmental Statement (Application Document 3.2) sets out the assessment of drainage issues and has informed the Project design.</p>	
40	TR0200072			Land / Environmental Mitigation	<p>Respondents express concern that a considerable part of land for species rich grassland will be taken and this will also impact their client's property. They suggest that any environmental mitigation required is located on less productive agricultural land.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (Application Document 3.2) considers the potential effect of the scheme on agricultural holdings. 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>Ecological mitigation requirements are determined based on the assessment of likely significant effects on both habitats and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>protected species. This assessment and the determination of mitigation requirements is set out in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (Application Document 3.2). The location of ecological mitigation is often specific to the areas inhabited by a protected species or required to provide connectivity, therefore whilst National Highways have sought to minimise the landtake of productive land, it has not always been possible to relocate areas of proposed planting.</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.7) show 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>National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves including</p>	

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						refinement of environmental mitigation proposals).	
39	TR0200072			Environmental Mitigation - Lack of Consultation	Respondents express concern that environmental mitigation is not included within the plans adding they do not believe National Highways are effectively consulting with affected parties as they are not getting the full design to properly consult on.	National Highways considers that appropriate detail regarding mitigation has been provided at every stage of consultation, in order to enable consultees to take an informed approach to their response to consultation. At the statutory consultation environmental mitigation was outlined in the PEI Report and illustrated on the Mapbooks. The 2021 winter update provided further details on areas of environmental mitigation. The areas required for mitigation are principally the same areas as those presented in the autumn statutory consultation material, although the type of mitigation in some instances changed in respect of the ongoing design process, and overall the area of land take required for mitigation has reduced. We will seek to enter into an agreement with landowners for the on-going maintenance of landscape and ecology mitigation. This will form part of the land negotiation discussions.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						The Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Document 2.7) show 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).	
48	TR0200099			Financial/const ruction	Respondents oppose scheme until receiving in writing an undertaking from National Highways to be responsible for all of the associated costs of any diversion of our apparatus, plant and or equipment that may be required as a result of the Order.	Discussions with utility companies affected by the Scheme are ongoing and National Highways is working towards reaching agreed positions with all utility companies. The draft DCO includes Protective Provisions in regard to statutory undertakers.	No
13		Durham County Council		General/Land	Durham County Council express concern for details on liability maintenance adding the current plans do not show as previously any off-set land	National Highways will seek to enter into an agreement with landowners for the on-going maintenance of landscape and ecology mitigation. This will form part of the land negotiation discussions. This is outlined in the Environmental Management Plan, (Application document 2.7) which National Highways will be required to further progress and detail in	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						consultation with Durham County Council prior to the commencement of works.	
9		Durham County Council		General/WCH	Durham County Council express concern on the use of the new footpath [diverted Bowes Footpath 12] and ask for confirmation the new footpath to be diverted will be intended for footpath use only	<p>Bowes Footpath 12 which meets the A66 at Bowes Cross Farm will be diverted via the adjoining accommodation accesses and the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge.</p> <p>The route will provide a right of way for those accessing the Bowes Cross Farm, East Lowfield Farm, Mid Lowfield Farm, Low Broats Farm, High Broats Farm and the proposed balancing ponds; this route will also be walkers. Equestrians will only have a right of way over section of East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge as this will be a Local Authority road.</p> <p>Equestrians will not be permitted to use the accommdation tracks.</p>	No
55			TR0200099	General - Lack of Detail	Utility company expressing concern that due to the level of detail available at this stage they will continue to object until such time as they are satisfied that their statutory duty is not compromised and all their claims	Discussions with utility companies affected by the Scheme are ongoing and National Highways is working towards reaching agreed positions with all utility companies	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
					for costs associated with impact on their interests are met.		
14		Durham County Council		Access-Residential	Durham County Council express concern there is no means of access to the enclosures off the extended local road of The Street and the connected access tracks.	The Project will seek to ensure that any existing accesses are maintained, or relocated. National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves in subsequent stages to develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works.	No
53		Natural England		General - Support	Natural England express support for Bowes Bypass scheme to be guided, alongside other considerations, by minimising the impact on the AONB	National Highways acknowledges the support expressed. The ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visuals (Application Document 3.2) demonstrates how potential impacts on the North Pennines AONB have been assessed, avoided and mitigated.	No
50		Natural England		Consultation - Further Consultation	Natural England commenting that the North Pennines AONB Partnership should be consulted on all matters relevant to their remit	National Highways can confirm that the North Pennines AONB Partnership were given the opportunity to comment on documents relevant to this round of supplementary consultation. The AONB Partnership were also a member of the Landscape Technical Working Group for the Project and have been consulted	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						regularly on all aspects of the Landscape and Visual assessment (refer ES Appendix 1.1 Evidence Plan, Application Document 3.4)	
12		Durham County Council		General - Support/ Crossings	Durham County Council express support for revised arrangements at Low Broats in respect of crossing bridge	National Highways acknowledge the specific support expressed for this element of the Scheme.. National Highways will continue to liaise with affected landowners regarding details of accommodation works as the Project progresses to the next stage of development.	No
8		Durham County Council		General - Support/ Access	Durham County Council express support for the inclusion of the extended local road of The Street and associated accommodation access tracks to the east of the scheme, but add further information is needed in regards to road specifications and fencing	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Project. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders as the scheme is developed further which will include more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works as well as specification of road build-up and fencing.	No
46	TR0200099			General- Oppose	Respondents oppose the scheme noting as a statutory utility company standard is to object to the development consent order once submitted	National Highways have carried out preliminary engagement with all utility companies commensurate with the stage of the Project. Further engagement will take place at the next phase of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary work.	
47	TR0200099		TR0200099	General/Design	Respondents suggest National Highways engage with Northern Power engineers and the Design Team Manager if not already done so and there may be a re-charge for the engineers time reviewing the proposals.	National Highways have carried out preliminary engagement with all utility companies commensurate with the stage of the Project. Further engagement will take place at the next phase of the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary works.	No
54		Natural England		General/Design	Natural England support changes in bridge design for moor beck and cringle beck as it will reduce the risk of adverse environmental impact but add any further changes should be consulted on.	National Highways note the support expressed and will continue to engage with Natural England as is documented in a Statement of Common Ground.	No
52		Natural England		General-Support/ Access	Natural England support removal of the Appleby access as it will reduce large-scale engineering and therefore reducing any adverse impacts	National Highways note the support expressed and will continue to engage with Natural England as is documented in a Statement of Common Ground.	No
44	TR0200098			General/Design	Respondent suggests the Project should also look into providing more resilience on the A66 to mitigate against the impacts resulting from adverse weather (snow) between Stainmore and Bowes.	National Highways acknowledges the response; however, this response does not apply to the Bowes Bypass Scheme supplementary consultation subject matter.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						We are, however, committed to continued engagement with all affected stakeholders and this will continue throughout the DCO process and into the next stage of project development. As part of this, the design team will continue to liaise with the relevant local National Highways Operations team to discuss resilience on the A66, including in relation to weather conditions.	
45	TR0200099			General- Lack of Detailed Information	Respondents express support for the Hulands Quarry scheme stating Northern Powergrid welcome engagement with National Highways on the proposal, however due to the level of detail available at this stage continue to object to the proposals until such time our engineers are satisfied that our statutory duty is not compromised.	National Highways have carried out preliminary engagement with all utility companies commensurate with the stage of the Project. Further engagement will take place at the next phase of the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary works in accordance with The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.	No
51		Natural England		Information/EIA	Natural England suggest that a revised PEI Report should reflect increased discharge into Troutbeck and that Habitats Regulation Assessment will need to ensure it has no adverse impacts on River Eden SAC.	National Highways acknowledge the response and direct the respondent to ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and Water Environment (Application Document 3.2) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Application Document 3.5 and 3.6) which assesses the impact of	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>the Project on this watercourse and the River Eden SAC in detail. More specifically, Section 1.5 of the HRA Stage 2 Statement to Information Appropriate Assessment reports the assessment of impacts on the River Eden SAC.</p> <p>The proposed changes were assessed for their environmental impact, and it was concluded that there was no change to the effects, or their significance, reported in the PEI Report. A revised report was therefore not produced. Additional environmental information was provided in the supplementary consultation brochure to highlight localised differences in the environmental effects that could occur as a result of the change.</p>	
42	TR0200072			Modified Design-Recalculate Soil Usage	Respondents express concern as a new Topsoil / Laydown / Storage Area is proposed on land at Mid Lowfield Farm which would take a building on the outer perimeter of this land, out of operation. Respondent requests calculations to be re-done.	National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in the next phase of scheme development to agree, amongst other things, details of accommodation works and temporary storage areas. In this case, the area shown is indicative and was drawn to match field boundary lines; the intention is not	Yes

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						to take the building in question for use as a topsoil storage area. The Land Plans (Application Document 5.13) submitted with the DCO application illustrate the land requirements. National Highways are committed to ongoing engagement with landowners.	
36	TR0200072			Modified Design- Access/ Footpath	Respondents suggest an underpass as opposed to a bridge for the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge. The client/tenants may need to run livestock from north to south and a bridge would cause safety issues.	The bridge as opposed to an underpass is deemed to be the best engineering solution taking into account the existing A66 road levels and drainage considerations. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in the next phase of scheme development to agree, amongst other things, the finer details and specification of the proposed bridge, which will include consideration of suitable parapet details to allow safe passage of livestock where appropriate.	No
23	TR0200074			Modified Design- PRoW	Respondents suggest any revised Right of Way [Bowes Footpath 12] must be re-routed south of Low Broats land ownership. This is due to the fields being used for stocking and grazing cattle, which do not mix well with horses	Bowes Footpath 12 will be redirected via the proposed adjoining accommodation tracks and the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge; adequate boundary treatment will be provided along resulting fields.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>The route will provide a right of way for those accessing the Bowes Cross Farm, East Lowfield Farm, Mid Lowfield Farm, Low Broats Farm, High Broats Farm and the proposed balancing ponds; this route will also be walkers. Equestrians will only have a right of way over the section of East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge as this will be a Local Authority road. Equestrians will not be permitted to use the accommdation tracks. National Highways will continue to liaise with all affected landowners in detailed design to address any further concerns.</p>	
35	TR0200072			Modified Design- Access	<p>Respondents suggest having the access road close to the proposed A66 to avoid creating an unnecessary wide verge. A simple T junction is suggested.</p>	<p>The alignment of the proposed extension to The Street and the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge has been designed to provide the most efficient engineering design to gain the height needed to cross the A66, whilst also ensuring it is nagivable by all vehicles expected to use it. Please refer to the Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						National Highways will continue to liaise with the affected landowners during detailed design to review opportunities to reduce the overall footprint.	
21	TR0200074			Land / Environmental Mitigation / Modified Design- PRoW	Respondents express concern about the environmental mitigation offset land which is not illustrated on current proposals and presumes offset land is still required from High Broats and Hulands Farm, adding that they would like to avoid losing land for environmental mitigation due to its poor position and future difficulties in managing that land. The respondent would like to ensure that both the offset land and any rights of way removed and placed south of their field boundary.	<p>The land take required for environmental mitigation (offset land) has been updated following Statutory Consultation, which may be the plans the respondent is referring to.</p> <p>Land for environmental mitigation is now required between the proposed access to High Broats Farm and the improved A66; subsequently south of the proposed High Broats Farm boundary. Please refer to the Environmental Mitigation Maps (Application Reference 2.8) for updated drawings showing the illustrative environmental mitigation proposals.</p> <p>The proposed diversion of Public Right of Way, Bowes Footpath 12, will also be within the highway boundary and land owned and maintained by National Highways.</p> <p>Please also refer to the Rights of Way and Access Schedules (Application Document 5.19).</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
56			TR0200099	Objection/const ruction	Respondents suggest objection can be satisfied if National Highways confirm in writing they will be responsible for all of our associated costs of any diversion of our apparatus, plant and or equipment that may be required as a result of the Order.	National Highways have carried out preliminary engagement with all utility companies commensurate with the stage of the Project. Further engagement will take place at the next phase of the Project to establish any detailed requirements for diversionary works. The draft DCO includes Protective Provisions for the protection of infrastructure of Statutory Undertakers.	No
38	TR0200072			Requests further information Access	Respondents express concern as to how wide the access road to Bowes Cross Farm will be, who will own it and who will be liable to maintain the access road.	The current proposals are for a 4m wide access track with 1m grassed verges either side; passing places will also be provided. Maintenance liability will be shared between all parties that the track provides access for. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in the next phase of scheme development to agree, amongst other things, the specification of access roads and any associated maintenance agreements.	No
20	TR0200075			Requests further information	Respondents express concern at a lack of detail to the specific design of the fencing and access to the balancing ponds.	The detail and specification of gates, fencing and access is not usually confirmed at this stage. This will be confirmed at detailed	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
				Design and access		design. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders as the scheme is developed further which will include more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works as well as design and specification of fencing.	
17	TR0200075			Requests further information Access	Respondents express concern about the access tracks at Mid Lowfield Farm and East Lowfield and wants further information/ to discuss the liability for maintenance of the road.	Maintenance liability will be shared between all parties that the track provides access for. National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves and agree accommodation works (including maintenance agreements where required).	No
18	TR0200075			Requests further information Drainage	Respondents express concern on the capacity of balancing ponds and wants further information/ to discuss how the outflows ability to cope with the overflow and balancing pond normal flow water can be assured.	The drainage design is in compliance with the standards set out by the Environment Agency, and as such, is designed not to flood. The proposed balancing ponds will attenuate water during a storm event and slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses to avoid overloading the system and causing flooding downstream. This discharge rate has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						<p>Authority. Therefore, there will be no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the existing network and its capacity, amendments will then be made where necessary.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to liaise with affected stakeholders in detailed design to update them on the design.</p>	
41	TR0200072			Requests further information Drainage	<p>Respondents express concern regarding drainage and would like more information, adding that some fields have shallow land drains and that they need to be well connected. The respondent wants to understand where the ponds will be drained as they are concerned this may lead to flooding on nearby properties, noting flooding is not an issue at present.</p>	<p>The drainage design is in compliance with the standards set out by the Environment Agency, and as such, is designed not to flood. The proposed balancing ponds will attenuate water during a storm event and slowly release it back into the existing network of pipes, ditches and watercourses to avoid overloading the system and causing flooding downstream. This discharge rate has been agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Therefore, there will be no increased flood risk as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Further drainage surveys will be carried out in detailed design to confirm the existing network and</p>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						its capacity, amendments will then be made where necessary	
30	TR0200073			Requests further information Land	Respondents express concern regarding liability for maintenance and wants more detail as the supplementary consultation plans do not show (as previously) any off set land has this been removed?	National Highways will seek to enter into an agreement with landowners for the on-going maintenance of landscape and ecology mitigation. This will form part of the land negotiation discussions. The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Application Document Annex B1 of 2.7) sets out the first iteration of the document and provides a framework for achieving the implementation, monitoring, maintenance and management of landscape and ecological mitigation. It will be further progressed and consulted on as a requirement of the DCO.	No
28	TR0200073			Requests further information Access	Respondents express concern regarding there being adequate access and turning circle for commercial vehicles/farm traffic at Bowes Cross Farm. The respondents would like finer detailed drawings.	National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves in subsequent stages to develop more detailed plans for access arrangements and accommodation works at Bowes Cross Farm to ensure all vehicles and machinery are accommodated for.	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
26	TR0200073			Requests further information Footpaths/WC H	Respondents express concern related to the diversion of footpaths (Bowes Footpath 12) and wants written confirmation that the footpath that is being diverted from the north around by the service bridge and along the new southern service road to the yard at Bowes Cross is intended to be a footpath only (akin to its current use).	<p>Bowes Footpath 12 which meets the A66 at Bowes Cross Farm will be diverted via accommodation accesses on the north and south side of the A66 cross the A66 via the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge. This route will be segregated from adjacent fields with suitable boundary treatments provided.</p> <p>The route will typically be a combined footpath and private means of access track providing accessing the Bowes Cross Farm, East Lowfield Farm, Mid Lowfield Farm, Low Broats Farm, High Broats Farm and the proposed balancing ponds. The sections of Footpath 12 diversion over the bridge and along the northern side of the A66 to the east of High Broats Farm, will sit within the highway boundary and as such be designated as footways.</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>	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
43	TR0200072			Requests further information Accommodation works	Respondents express concern they may require accommodation works but until they see the final design they cannot list what these are.	National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves and agree accommodation works (including maintenance agreements where required).	No
29	TR0200073			Requests further information Land	Respondents express support for the crossing bridge East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge but would like specifications for the new multiuser road and details of intended walls and fences, together with any off-set land.	<p>National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the East Bowes Accommodation Overbridge.</p> <p>National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in detailed design to agree and confirm, amongst other things, the specification of roads, access tracks and boundary treatments.</p> <p>For any environmental mitigation, National Highways will seek to enter into an agreement with landowners for the on-going maintenance of landscape and ecology mitigation. This will form part of the land negotiation discussions.</p>	No
24	TR0200074			Requests further information - Access / design	Respondents support the crossing over the A66 to the east of Stone Bridge but would like confirmation that the roads and bridge can carry heavy goods vehicles.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the Project. All accommodation tracks and associated structures will be designed in accordance with current national design standards	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						that ensure they are capable of accommodating design traffic (which will include HGV & agricultural vehicles).	
25	TR0200073			Requests further information	Respondents support the inclusion of the service road to the southside of the eastern section of Scheme 7 accessing Bowes Cross Farm. They require further information regarding the intended roads specification and fencing intentions against the adjoining agricultural land.	National Highways acknowledge the support expressed for the proposed accommodation road. National Highways will continue to engage with all affected stakeholders in the next phase of scheme development to agree, amongst other things, the specification of access roads and fencing.	No
37	TR0200072			Requests further information - Noise and visual	Responds express concern on the lift in noise and light pollution and asks for the height of the embankment to be provided between the A66 and the extended accommodation track to Bowes Cross Farm	In relation to the comment raised, the decision to propose a potential bund/embankment between the A66 and the extended accommodation track to Bowes Cross Farm is undetermined and will be confirmed in detailed design; therefore, the exact details are not yet available. Nevertheless, National Highways are aware of the potential light and noise pollution from the A66, along with a potential safety risk from headlight glare from vehicles either on the A66 or the accommodation track, therefore, adequate mitigation measures will	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
						be confirmed in the detailed design which will look to address these concerns.	
15	TR0200073	Durham County Council		Utilities	Durham County Council express concern related to the water supply at Low Broats being retained and maintained for watering of stock and potential redevelopment	National Highways will continue to liaise with affected parties as the scheme evolves and agree accommodation works which will include consideration of the water supply mentioned in this response.	No
2	TR0200013			Safety- PRoW	Respondents express support for the closure of the existing Private Means of Access and central reservation crossing as it will improve road safety at Bowes Cross Farm	National Highways acknowledge the support for the closure of the existing PMA and central reservation crossing at Bowes Cross Farm.	No
57		Environment Agency		Environment – development of landfill site	The Environment Agency (EA) making suggestions in relation to the re-development of the historic landfill site at Hulands Quarry. They suggest that National Highways should: 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in 'Land contamination: risk management' when dealing with land affected by contamination 2. Refer to EA's Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information they require in order to assess risks to controlled	Contamination is addressed in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (Application Document 3.2). The chapter includes a review of the Project against the relevant policy and guidance as is noted by the Environment Agency. National Highways commits to following national guidance, and the documents referenced by the Environment Agency have been used to inform the assessment. The Environmental Management Plan (Document 2.7) includes commitments for how land	No

Row ID	Stakeholder type			Topic	Summary of consultee comments	Regard had to consultee comments	Matter relevant to a design change?
	Local Communities and general public	Key Stakeholders	S42(1)(d)				
					<p>waters from the site – suggesting that the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health</p> <p>3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed</p> <p>4. Refer to the contaminated land pages on gov.uk for more information</p>	<p>contamination will be appropriately dealt with during construction. National Highways continues to engage with the Environment Agency as is set out in a Statement of Common Ground.</p>	
58		Durham County Council		Engineering – standard-Construction	Durham County Council suggesting that all works should be constructed to a minimum of Durham County Council Highway Standards or DMRB	National Highways acknowledges this request. All works on the Strategic Road Network (new A66 Dualling) will be constructed to DMRB Standards. All works on DCC’s network, will be constructed to DCC standards.	No