

I specifically wish to be heard on the level of consultation prior to route selection on the Temple Sowerby to Appleby section. My view is that the route chosen is poorly considered in every way, represents huge environmental damage, irreversible biodiversity loss, loss of prime agricultural land, disturbance and destruction of lives and livelihoods, noise, light and air pollution for the whole village especially the primary school, loss of local amenity and rural connectivity (local route severance). Ironically the whole decision has been justified on avoidance of damage to the SM which is the Roman vicus, which is where the local commoners lived outside the Roman fort and that has taken priority over the lives and future of the villagers. This site has already had houses a silage pit and the A66 built on it! The selected route due to its longer course will almost certainly damage far more archaeology, both known and unknown. NH have used Historic England as a scapegoat for their poor decision making. HE themselves state that it would not be their decision if NH chose to build over some of the Scheduled monument, NH could do this if they chose to. Basically NH know they have made the wrong route selection but they don't want to change it as they have already negotiated deals with landowner and surveyed the route as they had no intention of giving proper consideration to the alternatives. This route will restrict future development of this working village. The only areas that can be developed for housing will be right up against the proposed new road as the rest of the village is either SM or floodplain. There is no need for NH to impose this damage on this area to achieve their objectives. It could be a shorter, quicker, less C intensive, cheaper route with less environmental and biodiversity impact. Surely this needs to be challenged rather than accepted?

I wish to be heard on the wider issue of building a faster A66. This in itself presents more danger, more C emissions, more air pollution (20% more fuel is used driving at 70 mph as opposed to 50mph). NH state that this is about reducing time for HGVs from East to west and west to east. It is known that many HGVs use this 50 mile diversion to avoid the A1 north of Scotch Corner and they go via the A66 only to go back east further north on the M8. Reason being they are less likely to be delayed and distance travelled is less important to them than time. How many HGVs are doing this now and won't it get worse when the route is dualled? Trucks pollute the most and this route encourages more truck miles to be driven. Isn't it time NH reconsider their road infrastructure strategy? They are effectively locking us into higher C emissions, as the more road they build the more it will fill up. Why aren't alternatives to heavy goods transport being considered? NH's policy is to only going to lead to more traffic on the roads by encouraging it "Build it and they will come". This policy is surely not fit for the 21 Century. This whole project started with the assumption that there is a need for dualling and this has not been consulted on. They just predict traffic increases based on a trajectory to 2060 and then use that to justify the need for dualling. NH has consistently ignored the need to improve the existing road with new, safer junctions over the last 40 years or more. Kirkby Thore's junction is a prime example of this failure. Speed is not what is needed but good traffic management along the route and a drive to reduce traffic volumes by diverting HGVs to the A1 (reduce the delays there) and forcing goods onto rail, not just allow traffic volumes to increase. We can't afford to follow a trajectory of increasing road miles to 2060 and beyond as the UK government will fail its legal commitment to reduce C emissions. The UK government is not legally required to keep building more roads and increasing traffic volume and speeds! This is just a way of "growing the economy" and keeping the construction industry in business. PINS should be rejecting projects that are incompatible with UK laws on air quality and carbon emissions.