

**A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
TR010062**

**4.5 Statement of Common Ground
with North Yorkshire County Council
and Richmondshire District Council**

APFP Regulations 5(2)(q)

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

**4.5 JOINT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH
NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AND
RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010062
Application Document Reference	4.5
Author:	A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project, Project Team, National Highways

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

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground.....	1
1.3	Terminology	1
2	Record of Engagement	3
3	Issues	9

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG") has been prepared in respect of the proposed A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project ("the Application") made by National Highways Limited ("National Highways") to the Secretary of State for Transport ("Secretary of State") for a Development Consent Order ("the Order") under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All Application documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties to it, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared by (1) National Highways as the Applicant and (2) North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and (3) Richmondshire District Council (RDC).
- 1.2.2 National Highways (formerly Highways England) became the Government-owned Strategic Highways Company on 1 April 2015. It is the highway authority in England for the strategic road network and has the necessary powers and duties to operate, manage, maintain and enhance the network. Regulatory powers remain with the Secretary of State.
- 1.2.3 NYCC will be responsible for the new and improved local highway network. RDC are the Local Planning Authority for Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner.

1.3 Terminology

- 1.3.1 In the table in the Issues section of this SoCG:
- "Agreed" indicates area(s) of agreement
 - "Under discussion" indicates area(s) of current disagreement where resolution remains possible, and where parties continue discussing the issue to determine whether they can reach agreement by the end of the examination
 - "Not agreed" indicates a final position for area(s) of disagreement where the resolution of differing positions will not be possible, and parties agree on this point

-
- 1.3.2 It can be assumed that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues section of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to both NYCC and RDC, and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, unless otherwise raised in due course by NYCC and RDC.

2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between National Highways and NYCC and RDC in relation to the Application is outlined in table 2.1.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
17.12.2020	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and A66 Project Team to discuss future engagement, consultation on the Scheme. Meeting included discussions on the programme of the project. It was noted in the meeting that NYCC would welcome a PPA.
08.01.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions around future engagement with both NYCC and RDC.
14.01.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on SoCC, de-trunking and walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH). It was noted in the meeting that NYCC are preparing a draft PPA.
09.02.2021	Online Meeting	Discussions with NYCC and RDC as part of the Heritage Technical Working Group (TWG) (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting includes discussions on the Evidence Plan, project overview, update on report for geophysics, design development and archaeology trenching.
11.02.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on ongoing engagement plans and general design and environmental updates.
16.02.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on highways design. It was noted in the meeting that an outlet centre is being proposed at Scotch Corner.
16.02.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC Highways and the Project Team to discuss Scheme development and principles.
12.03.2021	Online Meeting	Discussions with NYCC/RDC as part of the Heritage TWG (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting includes discussions on the research agenda, designated funds opportunities, design at Brougham and archaeological trenching.
12.03.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC/RDC and the Project Team at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)).

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		Meeting included discussions on the evidence plan, a scheme-by-scheme overview, viewpoints, Landscape Character Assessment, AONB Management Plan and Areas of High Landscape Value.
16.03.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Ecological Impact Assessment TWG. (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on ornithology strategy, bats and red squirrels.
08.04.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on programme updates, future highways design technical meetings and general environment update.
26.04.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC/RDC and the Project Team at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), definition of North Pennine Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) setting, special qualities of the Greta Bridge and Bowes Conservation Areas.
20.05.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on updates to the DCO consultation and TWG's.
24.05.2021	Online Meeting	Discussions between NYCC/RDC and the Project Team to at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on the M6 Junction 40 Penrith, Kemplay Bank Roundabout, Penrith to Temple Sowerby (east and west), Temple Sowerby to Appleby, Appleby to Brough, Bowes Bypass, Cross Lanes to Rokeby, Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor.
08.06.2021	Online Meeting	Discussions between NYCC/RDC as part of the Heritage TWG (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting discussions include research framework, options, evidence and survey strategy and geoarchaeological modelling.
10.06.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on design updates and updates to the project programme.
10.06.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Ecological Impact Assessment TWG. (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on bat surveys (Overview of methods).
28.06.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC Members/Leader, National Highways and Project Team to provide an update on the scheme.
01.07.2021	Online Meeting	Joint Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on the SOCC and PPA and external resourcing for NYCC/RDC.
01.07.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between RDC Leader, National Highways and the Project Team to provide an update on the scheme.
20.07.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on PPA and Mainsgill. It was noted in the meeting that the owners of Mainsgill have been speaking with Council members.
21.07.2021	Online Meeting	Continuation of 20.07.2021.
10.08.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Ecological Impact Assessment TWG. (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on various ecology surveys.
16.08.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on the M6 junction 40 Penrith, Kemplay Bank Roundabout, Penrith to Temple Sowerby (east and west), Temple Sowerby to Appleby, Appleby to Brough, Bowes Bypass, Cross Lanes to Rokeby, Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner.
18.08.2021	Online Meeting	Discussions with NYCC and RDC as part of the Heritage TWG (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting includes discussions on PEI Report findings.
15.09.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between WSP and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on design updates.
28.10.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss project drainage designs. Meeting included discussions on departures, flooding and culverts.
01.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss project development and WCH proposals outside of scope. Meeting included discussions on design standards, signage, de-trunking, operational requirements and specific design updates. It was noted in the meeting that NYCC are happy for designs to be based off of DMRB standards.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
02.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss development of project structures and future requirements. Meeting included discussions around specific structures such as underbridges and overbridges but also covered culverts and laybys.
10.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss project development and principles. Meeting included discussions on ponds, SuDS, water quality and culvert designs.
15.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss Scheme development and WCH proposals outside of scope.
16.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss development of project structures and future requirements. Meeting included discussions on DMRB, lighting and the NYCC technical approval process.
24.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss project development and principles. Meeting included discussions on ponds, SuDS, water quality and culvert designs.
29.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss project development and WCH proposals outside of scope
30.11.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss development of project structures and future requirements. Meeting included discussions on programme update and general design updates.
01.12.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on statutory consultation, LVIA Update and the landscape design approach.
08.12.2021	Online Meeting	Drop-in session between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss any outstanding principles or concerns relating to drainage.
13.12.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss Scheme development and walking, cycling and horse riding proposals outside of scope
14.12.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss development of project structures and future requirements.
17.12.2021	Online Meeting	Monthly Meeting between NYCC, DCC and the Project Team to present and discuss potential WCH proposals and projects to be allocated and supported through designated funds applications.
20.12.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between RDC, NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss the response the statutory consultation.
20.01.2021	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Landscape TWG (Matters discussed at the

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
		Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on LVIA Update and a scheme update.
24.01.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss the present the current work and process on the diversionary impacts during construction. Meeting included discussions on construction compounds, construction traffic and mitigation. It was noted in the meeting that there are local concerns regarding the impact of construction traffic on local roads.
25.01.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and the Project Team to present the current environmental mitigation and the work undertaken on the Project Design Report. Meeting included discussions on the proposed environmental mitigation and a walk through of the Project Design Report.
26.01.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss the current work being undertaken on the A66, looking specifically at the Technology being delivered on the road for operational purposes. Meeting included discussions on retained and proposed technology, retained and proposed operational elements and responses to statutory consultation comments. It was noted in the meeting that NYCC would want to see technology added that would futureproof the network.
26.01.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC and RDC and the Project Team at the regular Ecological Impact Assessment TWG. (Matters discussed in the Technical Working Groups are included within ES Appendix 1.1: Evidence Plan (Application Document Number 3.4)). Meeting included discussions on surveys, construction mitigation methods and design mitigation.
10.02.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on design updates and PPA updates.
22.02.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting Between NYCC and the Project Team to discuss the approach taken towards Socio Economic, Population and Human Health in the Environmental Statement. Meeting included discussions on the scope and methodology of the work, key themes, and the responses to NYCC/RDC consultation.
10.03.2022	Online Meeting	Joint Meeting between NYCC, National Highways and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions. Meeting included discussions on SOCGs and PPA updates.
31.03.2022	Online Meeting	Joint Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team to discuss Project development and ongoing actions.
08.04.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team. The Project team presented the Design Drawings for NYCC and RDC to comment and discuss ahead if finalisation for the DCO.

Date	Form of correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
08.04.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team. The Project team presented the Legislation and Policy Design Statement for NYCC and RDC to comment and discuss ahead of finalisation for the DCO.
08.04.2022	Online Meeting	Meeting between NYCC, RDC and the Project Team. The Project team presented the final Walking Cycling and Horse-Riding proposals for NYCC and RDC to comment and discuss ahead of finalisation for the DCO.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and other forms of consultation and engagement undertaken between (1) National Highways, (2) NYCC and (3) RDC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

3 Issues

Table 3-1 Record of Issue

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
De-trunking of existing A66	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 2.3 – 2.5	NYCC & RDC wants to ensure that the existing A66 is de-trunked at an acceptable standard.	We are committed to ensuring de-trunked sections are acceptable in terms of standard to Local Authorities. We can confirm this has been discussed with the Local Authorities as part of the pre-application process. We will continue this discussion to agree the strategy for de-trunking.	Under discussion	13.06.2022
Active Travel and Improving connections to local communities	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 2.6 – 2.12, 2.13-2.15	NYCC & EDC wants to ensure walking, cycling and horse riding are fully considered to minimise severance, improve resilience, and increase amenity on the de-trunked section of A66.	Information on the Projects walking, cycling and horse-riding Proposal are included within the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Proposal Report (Application Document Reference 2.4). Between Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor 4.8.1 there are five existing locations where WCH routes either terminate or cross the A66. These five locations consist of four bridleways and four footpaths. A new shared bridleway/footway in the verge of the de-trunked A66, running the entire length of the scheme, is proposed to connect the existing bridleways and footpaths together.	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			<p>Improvements are also proposed at both Hutton Magna and West Layton to enable north-south connections to be maintained across the A66 carriageway via underpasses.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with the Councils on these issues and seek agreement that its proposals represent the optimal solution and that active travel arrangements have been appropriately included with its proposals.</p>		
Maximising social and economic benefits	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 2.16 – 2.17	NYCC & EDC wants to ensure the investment in the A66 benefits local communities and economies (helping the levelling up agenda).	<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. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document Reference 2.7) includes a commitment to develop a Skills and Employment Strategy, which will be the responsibility of the Principal Contractor. An essay plan of the strategy is included at Appendix B which covers the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open procurement and supporting local businesses 	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			through the Project supply chain where practicable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspiring the next generation. • Providing opportunities for unemployed and under-represented groups. • Developing local training infrastructure. • Developing a workforce with the right skills. We will continue to engage with the Councils on these issues and seek agreement regarding the measures proposed to maximise social and economic benefits.		
Futureproofing	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 2.18 – 2.19	NYCC & EDC wants to ensure that adequate strategic charging infrastructure is considered and implemented to cater for electric vehicles on or close to the A66.	We welcome your comments regarding future provision for electric vehicle charging across the A66. Whilst this is not currently within the scope of the A66 NTP, this is a matter which we are actively considering as part of the future for the strategic road network (as part of the Net Zero Highways plan: https://nationalhighways.co.uk/netzerohighways/).	Under discussion	13.06.2022
Moor Lane	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 4.0 – 4.1	In response to concerns raised by East and West Layton Parish Council about the connection and use of Moor Lane to the new all movements junction, NYCC	We understand that NYCC do not wish to progress with the closure of Moor Lane as requested by East and West Layton Parish Council. It is National Highways	Agreed	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		consider that if Moor Lane were to be closed to traffic this would force all residents and other road users to use Winston Cross roads to access the A66 and deny users the opportunity to use a far safer all movements interchange as proposed.	understanding that this issue is resolved and may be treated as agreed between the parties		
Scotch Corner Development	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 6.0 – 6.3	NYCC & EDC wants to ensure that NH remain involved in discussions around future development plans at Scotch Corner.	We welcome opportunities for both RDC and NYCC to keep NH updated of any plans for further economic growth and development at Scotch Corner. It is National Highways understanding that this issue is resolved and may be treated as agreed between the parties.	Agreed	13.06.2022
Climate Change Officer RDC	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 7.0 – 7.1	From a sustainable travel point of view, it is essential that safe crossing points are provided for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to ensure that journeys on foot, by bike and on horseback remain attractive options to and from communities to the north and south of the A66. Also, that provision is made for any public transport vehicles making routes across the A66 to be able to do so safely.	Enhancement measures have been incorporated into the design to develop an east-west active travel connection which utilises the de-trunked sections of the A66 during operation. The assessment has also considered how accessibility is impacted during both construction and operation of the Project, to ensure key facilities and services are accessible. Information on the Projects walking, cycling and horse riding Proposal are included within the Walking, Cycling and Horse riding	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			<p>Proposal Report (Application Document Reference 2.4). Between Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor 4.8.1 there are five existing locations where WCH routes either terminate or cross the A66. These five locations consist of four bridleways and four footpaths.</p> <p>A new shared bridle/footway in the verge of the de-trunked A66, running the entire length of the scheme, is proposed to connect the existing bridleways and footpaths together.</p> <p>Improvements are also proposed at both Hutton Magna and West Layton to enable north-south connections to be maintained across the A66 carriageway via underpasses.</p>		
<p>Comments from the Richmondshire Climate Action Partnership</p>	<p>NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 7.2</p>	<p>The main concerns are the crossing points on the sections dualled previously which are not up to the standard proposed now by Highways England in the upgrading of the remaining A66 single carriageway to dual carriageway section.</p>	<p>We continue to engage with the Local Authorities on this issue. We would refer to the opportunity to bid for designated funds for potential works that fall outside of the scope of this project.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>
<p>Noise and Vibration - Construction Noise</p>	<p>NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 8.4 - 8.5</p>	<p>RDC considers a study area of 300m from the closest construction activity, as defined in DMRB LA 111 guidance, to be sufficient to capture any noise sensitive</p>	<p>Chapter 12 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2) has been undertaken in accordance DMRB LA 111. We can confirm a study</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		<p>receptors. RDC would like to see further details on proposed diversion route study areas from the main scheme, where full carriageway closures overnight (23:00-07:00) are required.</p> <p>Any diversion of vehicles, particularly heavy goods vehicles in this rural environment are likely to cause major disruption and/or disturbance to residents residing along diverted routes and must be considered carefully.</p> <p>Given the rural nature of the environment along the proposed route, any change in traffic flow associated with construction, which will involve an increase in the percentage of HGV's, is likely to lead to an increased impact on sensitive receptors identified in the study area.</p> <p>Any forecasts based on traffic speed, flow, and percentage HGV increase, which could all lead to an increase in noise levels along the route must be addressed within the ES.</p> <p>Further clarification on the construction phases of the project is required, including proposed start and end dates for each phase with the proposed working hours. Additional information on the</p>	<p>area of 300m from closest construction activity has been applied.</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document Reference 2.7) confirms that no part of the project can start until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is developed which will include (amongst other requirements) the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of proposed traffic management measures, including phasing plans, route restrictions and speed limits. • Details of planned carriageway and local road closures, including proposed stakeholder and community engagement protocols in advance of closures. • Details of proposed diversion routes, durations of use and proposals for encouraging compliance with designated diversion routes (with consideration for potential noise impacts). <p>The CTMP will include, amongst other commitments, the following commitments during construction of the Project:</p>		

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		<p>likelihood of out of hours working taking place. Whether it would be a regular aspect of the project, or only if the scheme fell behind schedule. Details of the proposed locations of any infrastructure support compounds or depots is also required, to enable RDC to assess the suitability of the proposed locations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion routes to be discussed with the Local Highway Authority in advanced of required closures. • Specific mitigation measures to be developed for diversion routes in relation to noise and vibration, such as monitoring of usage of diversion routes, use of multiple diversion routes for different closures to reduce exposure of individual receptors. <p>Chapter 2 (The Project) of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2) confirms that the planning of the construction phase of the Project is ongoing, and specific details of methodologies will not be finalised until the detailed design is complete. Where construction methodologies are not yet fixed, the EIA considers the full range of approaches that could be taken or considers the worst case for environmental effects. For Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor, a 48 month construction period (proposed to start in 2026) is assumed, with a compound location North of A66 close to Moor Lane, accessed off Moor Lane.</p> <p>Most construction works will be undertaken during standard day</p>		

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			<p>working hours of 07:30 until 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 07:30 until 13:00 on Saturdays. In some instances, it may be essential to undertake works at night or on Sundays and Bank Holidays due to traffic management restrictions, with additional traffic management or closures required for works such as road connections or interface points, bridge beam lifts and deck pours.</p> <p>Where work is required outside of the core working hours, the Principal Contractor(s) will liaise with the relevant Local Authority to agree the procedures for notifying local residents and any site-specific constraints that need to be applied. This process is set out in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document Reference 2.7).</p> <p>We have sought to address the Council's concerns and discussion will continue once the Council have had full sight of the documents referred to above.</p>		
Noise and Vibration - Noise	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 8.12	Paragraph 13.5.7 of the ESR has identified two NIAs along the current route corridor within the district of Richmondshire, namely, DEFRA Important Area 10437	We note the comments in relation to Noise Important Areas. Noise Important Areas (NIA) are locations in England where the top 1% of the population that are affected by the highest noise levels are located,	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		<p>(Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor) and 10127 (Gatherley Moor Farm). RDC does not agree with the assumption that there are only two locations along the route corridor within the district of Richmondshire that are considered an NIA therefore more in-depth information would be required in the ES showing further information as to how the NIAs have been classified and identified.</p>	<p>according to the results of the strategic noise mapping undertaken by Defra, under the terms of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006. We have used the strategic mapping undertaken by Defra for the definition of the NIAs. We will continue to engage with the Councils on this issue and seek agreement that the noise assessment is robust.</p>		
Noise and Vibration - Potential Impacts	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 8.13 & 8.16	<p>The potential noise and vibration impacts identified within Section 13.4 of the ESR are broadly considered acceptable. However, Section 13.6.1 of the ESR identifies potential impacts from noise at sensitive receptors should be considered within a 25m radius. Construction traffic using diversionary routes during night-time hours is likely to be a major factor when considering adverse impacts on sensitive properties, therefore it is recommended that this distance is revised to consider sensitive properties at a greater distance where appropriate. Section 13.6.7 of the ESR acknowledges that vibration generated by the construction of the project has the potential to</p>	<p>Chapter 12 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2) confirms that as required by DMRB LA 111 a diversion route study area of 25m from the kerb line of all diversion routes will be adopted where the Project requires full carriageway closures during the night-time period (23:00-07:00) to enable construction works to take place. However the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document Reference 2.7) confirms that no part of the project can start until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is developed which will include (amongst other requirements) the following:</p>	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		<p>adversely affect vibration-sensitive receptors and that, in line with DMRB LA 111, a construction vibration assessment will be undertaken at the preliminary design stage. Although RDC agrees with his approach, RDC would like to be involved in the preliminary discussions surrounding the methodology of this assessment and the identification of vibration-sensitive receptors.</p> <p>RDC agrees with the description of the likely significant effects outlined in section 13.8 of the ESR. However, it is noted that there is no reference of possible diversion routes and their potential impacts on noise and vibration sensitive locations. It is recommended that this issue is covered in greater detail in the ES.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of proposed traffic management measures, including phasing plans, route restrictions and speed limits. • Details of planned carriageway and local road closures, including proposed stakeholder and community engagement protocols in advance of closures. • Details of proposed diversion routes, durations of use and proposals for encouraging compliance with designated diversion routes (with consideration for potential noise impacts). <p>The CTMP will include, amongst other commitments, the following commitments during construction of the Project:</p>		
Noise and Vibration - Description of the likely significant effects	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 8.16		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion routes to be discussed with the Local Highway Authority in advanced of required closures. • Specific mitigation measures to be developed for diversion routes in relation to noise and vibration, such as monitoring of usage of diversion routes, use of multiple diversion routes for different closures to reduce 	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			<p>exposure of individual receptors.</p> <p>We would therefore seek to work with RDC to develop to approach to diversionary routes and in particular noise mitigation measures as part of the development of the EMP.</p>		
<p>Noise and Vibration - Description of the likely significant effects</p>	<p>NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 8.18</p>	<p>Section 13.8.21 identifies that the section of carriageway at the A1(M) junction 53 Scotch Corner has the potential to be affected from junction improvements and was not assessed in the Options Selection stage of the EAR. RDC would like confirmation that this junction will be assessed as part of the ESR to protect noise sensitive receptors located nearby.</p>	<p>The Scotch Corner junction has been included within the Project study area and assessed in Chapter 12 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES (Application Document Reference 3.2).</p> <p>It is National Highways understanding that this issue is resolved and may be treated as agreed between the parties.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>
<p>Landscape and Visual Impact - Soil Management and Agricultural Land</p>	<p>NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section 11.8</p>	<p>We generally welcome the proposed methodology and approach set out in the PEI Report Chapter 09 Geology and Soils. However, the PEI Report assessment and report is based on existing data (The Provisional ALC maps Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, 1970s). This does not classify land into Grade 3a and Grade 3b to differentiate between the 'best and most versatile' (BMV). A detailed soil survey, assessment and</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils contains an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Factual Soil Report (Appendix 9.5) this includes findings from soil and ALC surveys.</p> <p>It is National Highways understanding that this issue is resolved and may be treated as agreed between the parties.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
		management plan are needed in order to protect and manage site soils, including protection and restoration of ALC best and most versatile land where appropriate.			
	NYCC and RDC Stat Con Response: Section	We have concerns about the large scale of earthworks currently shown on plans which seems very 'engineered' and lacks more natural grading into the existing landform. We also have concerns about the scale and frequency of drainage retention ponds with the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor section, which are numerous and seem excessive. Effort should be made to reduce the scale and frequency of these elements of the scheme and for sensitive design to protect local character and setting.	We will continue discussion with RDC and NYCC on the matter of attenuation ponds into the detailed design stage post-DCO. The Project Design Principles (Application Document Reference 5.11) confirms a number of landscape principles, including principle LI17: New ponds and associated landforms must reflect the character, scale, and shape of the prevailing local topography, avoiding the use of geometric shapes and steep, uniform bank profiles and are to be sensitive to the subtleties of local landforms and context.	Under discussion	13.06.2022
Landscape Design and Improvements at Scotch Corner	A66 . NYCC and RDC Approach to Project Design Principles (25.01.2022)	It would be good to demonstrate the qualitative landscape design around Scotch Corner to see some improved quality in this area as part of the Scheme.	The Scope of works for the Scheme are bound by the impact of the road works being undertaken, and overall improvements of the landscape quality in this area are likely to be out of scope. However, we will continue discussions with NYCC and RDC into detailed design around the matter.	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
Construction Traffic	A66 . NYCC & RDC: Technology and Operations Meeting (26.01.2022)	Keen to establish if there any smart measures that could be used to influence construction traffic, such as vehicle tracking and monitoring, would be supported and would not want to miss the opportunity to build or embed this into the construction ethos. NYCC would be looking to take a hypercautious approach to construction traffic.	This will be a matter for discussion with the Principal Contractor prior to commencement of works in 2024.	Under discussion	13.06.2022
GA Drawings: Browson Bank Farm Balancing Pond and Access Track	North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session	Given the proposed balancing ponds are split between NYCC and National Highways, who will maintain the access?	These are currently shown as a private means of access in National Highways ownership with rights to NYCC to access the smaller pond. This can be discussed and agreed with NYCC at detailed design.	Under discussion	13.06.2022
GA Drawings: Layby Locations and HGVs Facilities	North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session	<p>Are the locations of the laybys fixed and what was the methodology for this?</p> <p>We know there is a need for HGV facilities locally, and there is a need to proactively encourage appropriate places for HGVs to stop overnight.</p>	<p>The location of laybys has been made following the recommendations of Road Safety Audit as identified in Section 9.2 of the Transport Assessment (Application Document Reference 3.7).</p> <p>All responses to the RSA recommendations were taken through a decision log process with the Overseeing Authority. The Overseeing Authority is National Highways for the trunk road network and is the Local Highway Authority for local roads and the</p>	Under discussion	13.06.2022

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
			<p>old de-trunked A66, where it will be adopted.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with Local Authorities along the route in relation to any forthcoming opportunities for HGV rest areas.</p>		
<p>Classification of Roads Plan: Moor Lane (and other Unclassified Road) junctions to the National Highway</p>	<p>North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session</p>	<p>Concern for Moor Lane (and other unclassified roads) what standards will these be built to. Issues previously where the access is to a high standard before hitting a smaller, unclassified road. This may need to be a departure to make this a narrow road.</p>	<p>We would propose something similar to the arrangement at Temple Sowerby. Our assumption is that this junction at Moor Lane would be built to a NYCC Design Standard rather than to DMRB to address this concern.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>
<p>Classification of Roads Plan</p>	<p>North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session</p>	<p>NYCC are happy with the C1108 and the extension of Warrener Lane, but we will seek to confirm with the team to ensure we are happy with this convention prior to those appearing on the schedules.</p>	<p>We will continue to seek confirmation on this matter.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>
<p>Traffic Regulation Order (Speed Limits) Plans: Warrener Lane Speed Limit</p>	<p>North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session</p>	<p>Warrener Lane would that new stretch be at 50mph and will this leave us with an issue as to when the old road is at a 60mph. It is possible that the 50mph limit could start at the new pond access to the west and finish at the eastern end after the new WCH Infrastructure.</p>	<p>We will continue to seek confirmation on this matter.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>
<p>Scotch Corner General Arrangement Plans</p>	<p>North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session</p>	<p>The A1(M) northbound off slip road can be congested and we want to be certain this won't be an issue going forwards.</p>	<p>The additional lane should provide for a higher quantum of traffic to exit the junction / roundabout during each green signal period.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>	<p>13.06.2022</p>

Issue	Document References (if relevant)	North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council Position	National Highways Position	Status	Date
HGV Facilities at Scotch Corner	North Yorkshire CC & Richmondshire DC: Design Drawing Review Session	Can we confirm that the Lorry parking at Scotch Corner is not within scope.	We can confirm that this is not within the scope of this project. We are aware that a separate Team within National Highways are looking at HGV facilities and we will continue to engage with you on opportunities for HGV rest areas in future.	Agreed	13.06.2022
NYCC Policies	Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement review session	Has the NYCC Transport Plan and Strategic Transport Prospectus been looked at as part of this assessment: https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/local-transport-plan https://www.northyorks.gov.uk/strategic-transport-prospectus	We will review these documents and seek to include within Legislation and Policy Compliance Statement, where relevant. It is National Highways understanding that this issue is resolved and may be treated as agreed between the parties.	Agreed	13.06.2022