

**Principle Area of Disagreement Statement**

**North Yorkshire County Council and Richmondshire District Council**

The principle issue in question	The brief concern held by North Yorkshire County Council and Richmondshire District Council which will be reported on in full in WR / LIR	What needs to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• change, or</li> <li>• be included, or</li> <li>• amended</li> </ul> so as to overcome the disagreement	Likelihood of the concern being addressed during Examination
Highway Design	Improvements made between the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor section have the potential to deliver significant benefits to journey times that will free up the existing A66 to support all local users and journeys. The Council expects that clear and effective junction configurations should be developed, not just on the newly dualled section but also the existing junctions on the route. We consider that the scheme should see greater junction safety and legibility.	To be developed through ongoing detailed deign	Likely
Highway Design	The Council requires a clear strategy for the establishment of alternative/diversion routes. It is therefore important that detailed consideration is given to official diversion and “rat-run” routes to support both the construction and	Development of a full traffic management and construction traffic management plan is needed	Likely

	operational period of the route and that, where necessary, upgrades are delivered on the local road network to support this. Currently within the DCO submission there are no traffic management details included for the scheme.		
Highway Design	A clear and detailed strategy is required for the section of the A66 that is to be “de-trunked”. It is assumed that any “de-trunked” sections of the existing A66 do not include a maintenance backlog, and that commuted sums will be provided by National Highways to support future up keep. We also consider that transferred sections of the route should be subject to enhancements where these are considered to best reflect their new role, for example improved junction arrangements or the introduction of improved facilities for non-motorised users.	The continued development a clear de-trunking strategy is required.  Continued discussion as to commuted sums and enhancements is required	Likely
Highway Design	The scheme should seek to improve north-south connectivity where the existing PRow network has been severed by the A66 in the past. The Council supports an offline route strategy for walking and cycling between M6 and A1(M) as an	The continued development of the walking, cycling and horse riding strategy is required	Likely

	<p>important endeavour for this scheme, that will bring a meaningful benefit for local communities and other road users. In particular we consider that the scheme should seek to support delivery of a Scotch Corner to Penrith “off A66” route suitable for walking and cycling. This would include enhancements along the de-trunked section of the A66.</p>		
Highway Design - Drainage	<p>A drainage review should consider the combining of drainage ponds to reduce costs / land take, along with rationalising of the maintenance of the drainage ponds to be owned by the Council. The current drainage strategy submitted as part of the DCO, gives concern to NYCC, over the existing flooding of the A66 which is to be de-trunked and therefore the responsibility of the Council. This issue remains unresolved.</p>	<p>Continued work on the drainage strategy submitted with the DCO application</p>	Likely
Landscape and Visual	<p>The Authority is satisfied that the DCO Application includes an adequate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) subject to inclusion of selected illustrations (elevations, cross sections and photomontages) to help explain</p>	<p>The development of the design principles.</p> <p>Inclusion of illustrations.</p> <p>These issues need to be picked up and secured through further</p>	Likely

	<p>significant effects and illustrate key features of the scheme in a wider context (such as the proposed overbridges). The Application should also include an explanation of the design principles in order to demonstrate good design.</p>	<p>iterations of the draft Environmental Management Plan (dEMP)</p>	
Landscape and Visual	<p>The Applicant states that the Structures have undergone an aesthetic review to ensure they comply with the overarching design aspirations (ES 10.9.4). Reference is also made to a Project Design Principles document (PDP) (Application Document 5.11). However, this review or PDP document are not clear or evident in the Application.</p>	<p>Evidence of the review should be provided as part of ongoing development of the dEMP</p>	Likely
Landscape and Visual	<p>The Authority would wish to see an outline landscape strategy (incorporating mitigation) secured through the DCO and would welcome an opportunity to continue to work with the Applicant on detailed aspects of the landscape and visual mitigation, to ensure an appropriate response.</p> <p>The Authority would also wish to see further information and clarification for long-term</p>	<p>Continued work with the applicant to develop the landscape strategy secured through the dEMP and DCO</p>	Likely

	<p>maintenance and management of proposed landscape mitigation including responsibilities and how landscaping is secured as a permanent element of the scheme through the Order.</p>		
Ecology	<p>The ES identifies that a residual adverse effect remains in relation to barn owl during the operational phase of the development. The authority wishes to work with the applicant to identify appropriate mitigation to minimise the residual effect as far as possible.</p>	Continued work with the applicant and development of the dEMP	Likely
Ecology	<p>In relation to Biodiversity Net Gain, the authority welcomes the use of the metric and whilst it is not yet mandatory we would advocate for 10% net gain across area based, linear and river habitats.</p>	Continued work with the applicant and development of the dEMP	Likely
Cultural Heritage	<p>Various measures have been taken to limit the impact of the proposal on the Scheduled Monument at Carkin Moor by restricting the width of the easement and limiting the amount groundwork. The Cultural Heritage chapter states that a Historic Environment Mitigation Strategy will be produced within the EMP. This strategy will set out the methodology for recording both</p>	Continued work to develop the mitigation strategy	Likely

	known and unknown heritage assets of archaeological interest.		
Local Planning Authority	Work is ongoing to understand the scope and timing of additional Town and County Planning Act application to run alongside the DCO application. The Authority welcomes these discussions.	Continued discussions to understand the scope of TCPA applications	TCPA will be out of scope of the DCO. The discussions on the compound TCPA application will develop alongside the DCO application.
Noise and Vibration	The assessment of noise and vibration levels in the relevant chapter of the ES can be broadly agreed with. It is important that all aspects of the scheme are considered fully.	Continued work to develop mitigation strategies within the dEMP	Likely