

The issues I wish to be heard on are the process for route selection from Temple Sowerby to Appleby and the inadequate research and consultation carried out prior to, during and after the route selection process.

We are the most effected landowner on this section, possibly on the whole project, and the level of consultation has been wholly inadequate at every stage.

We believe that the route selected is the wrong route for multiple reasons but also that the alternatives were not considered early enough in the process and NH had no intention of doing a U-turn on their preferred route as they were already over-committed to it. They rushed in to do early "deals" with landowners who showed interest in selling and did many surveys but never on the alternative routes, so how could they know which route was better? They avoided and discussions or consultations with us even though we were the most affected landowner!

NH's approach needs to be challenged.

Since NH have selected their route, they have again failed to properly engage with us at every stage, declining information requests under FOI despite stating they would be "open and transparent" from the outset. We still don't know what land they intend to acquire temporarily and permanently. They have areas for biodiversity off-setting which they want us to manage but can't provide any indication of what may be required other than referring us to generic grassland management. They have stated in an email to us that they would start a river restoration project on our land that isn't part of the land identified for acquisition. How can this be?

They have stated that they will manage an adjacent land area (they call The Mire which is actually called The Moss) to improve the situation for wading birds, stating that the impact will be "minimal" with no understanding or acknowledgement that the proposed route will cause light and noise and air and water pollution for the birds and they propose to destroy another wintering site on the northern side of Kirkby Thore! The same birds move between these two sites all winter (c400 lapwing, c50 golden plover, both s41 species) and then most move to the Pennines to breed within the Special Protection Area. Without a winter roost site where will they go? This impact has not been properly assessed and mitigation is not possible when you destroy a preferred roost site, it's just lost from the landscape. We have made these points repeatedly, but they just ignore them without seeking to understand what the impact will be. Where is their ornithologist assessment? Have they consulted on this specific issue with Natural England who are responsible for the North Pennines SPA and the s41 species? How can they assess the impact on a population of birds that is only protected in their upland breeding area but rely on these lowland areas in winter for their survival? Once made aware of this issue they should have investigated it rather than ignore it.

Specific to the proposed route through our land: They have failed to provide assurance of any mitigation for noise, light and air pollution. When asked why we couldn't have earth bunding to reduce the impact they stated that it would require more material and additional land to grade into the landscape! This may represent a little more cost but it's miniscule in comparison to the additional cost they will incur by selecting their preferred route over the direct route.

NH have consistently failed to provide us with details that we need to be able to make informed decisions on their initial "offer". Their offer has been lacking in clarity with no specific maps or details on timings of payment. This has led us to the conclusion that they don't actually know what they want or need. Surely they should know this at this stage in the process? It is apparent that all land owners are being treated the same way along the route.

We urge PINS to make NH reconsider their route selection and present evidence of an informed assessment of the preferred route against the direct route having collected data on both routes rather than just their preferred route. How can they know their route is the best option if they haven't properly assessed the others? Their route option selection process was full of bias and needs to be thoroughly scrutised. One example is the modelling on the orange route was modelled on short span bridge which it could never be and the wider span 150m or more was never modelled. This led to bias when comparing it with the 300m span over the Troutbeck at

Sleastonhow.