

### **Durham County Council reference number: 20032071**

### **Durham County Council's Response to Examination Document PDL-013**

DCC's RR dated 31 August 2022 (Examination Document RR-073) summarises the Council's position regarding Schemes 7 and 8. Appendix 1 (contained in the same document) sets out questions which the Council has raised.

In Examination Document PDL-013 'National Highways Procedural Deadline Submission – 6.5 Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4' has sought to address in the document.

DCC does not propose to respond to each of National Highways responses as listed in Table 5-1 of document PDL-013. Instead DCC consultee comments are provided to that document under the headings set out in Appendix 1 of RR-073 previously provided.

An additional point which DCC would like to raise has come about as a result of its response to the Durham County Council Response to Issue Specific Hearing 2 Supplementary Agenda Additional Questions ISH2.CE.01 regarding Cumulative effects.

### **Durham County Council Consultee responses**

#### **Highways**

DCC's Highways Development Management has continuing input to the DCO process. DCC welcomes continuing discussions with NH and note the response to the RR from the applicant.

There is however a need for the Applicant to continue liaising with DCC regarding the ongoing and final highway design of the scheme in relation matters such as, new or amended local highways, departures from standard, detrunking, stopping-up, construction works, traffic signing and legacy matters to include diversion routes, abnormal load routes and winter maintenance. It is expected that matters relating to changes to the highway network will be captured in a Side Roads Order (Highways Act 1980). DCC looks forward to continuing discussions regarding these matters as well as considering the fine grained detailed modelling in relation to the impact upon The Sills as agreed at the Issue Specific Hearing on 30 November 2022.

#### *Page 7 Legal*

Reference is made to CCC as opposed to DCC.

DCC welcomes discussions with HE regarding side roads orders etc.

#### *Page 9 Design Engineering and Construction*

The Council welcomes ongoing discussions with HE regarding design engineering and construction.

---

#### *Page 22 Population and Human Health*

Matters raised by the Council's Public Health Team should be considered and if necessary addressed in Annex B13 Construction Traffic Management Plan from which detailed proposals will be developed by the contractor in conjunction with Highway Network Management Section (HNMS) (Strategic Highways). It is important that the contractor engages HNMS at the earliest opportunity to allow for timely and meaningful discussions to take place.

#### *Page 24 Noise and Vibration*

The mitigation of these pollutants affecting receptors may be partly addressed through the CTMP with the judicious use of "Routes to Site (for construction traffic) and diversion routes associated with road closures during construction. Early engagement with DCC HNMS should be instigated by the contractor.

#### *Page 44 Item 31 and Generally*

DCC HNMS should be involved in discussions relating to "the Construction Management Plan to be developed by the appointed contractor to ensure construction vehicles avoid these areas" (Barnard Castle area). Early engagement with the HNMS should be instigated by the contractor.

#### *Page 46 Item 35*

Temporary traffic management measures during the construction phase must be discussed and agreed with DCC HNMS. It should also be noted that the contractor will need to comply with the requirements of the council's Road and Street Works Permit Scheme in respect of road works on the local highway network. A policy document for the RSWPS may be made available to the contractor.

### **Access & Rights of Way**

It is not considered that NH has clarified satisfactorily that the east-west links will be designed and clearly identified as being for the users of walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. By doing so they would address any potential future bridleways which might be applied for and that would join or intersect with the A66.

### **Cultural Heritage**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to cultural heritage.

### **Archaeology**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to archaeology.

### **Landscape & Visual Impact**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to landscape and visual impact.

### **Drainage & Coastal Protection**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to drainage and has ongoing discussions with NH.

### **Ecology**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to ecology

## Contaminated Land

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to contaminated land.

## Population and Human Health

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to population and human health.

## Air Quality

DCC commissioned AECOM to provide comments on Air Quality and these were included in the Council's RRs (Examination Document RR-073). AECOM has provided DCC with feedback on the responses provided by NH. AECOM's initial comments on the ES, the National Highways response, and AECOM's comments on their response is set out in table format below. It is understood that the numbering system used in the Air Quality topic contained an error at the response to Point 12 and from then on, the numbered responses are slightly out of sync. AECOM has therefore made reasonable assumptions as to which responses NH has provided comment on and contained these in the table below.

Although reference should be made to the below table, the key points outstanding are as follows:

- Applicant is not considered to have monitored to derive a suitable air quality baseline. Specifically, no air quality monitoring was undertaken at Barnard Castle and assessment assumptions do not offset the uncertainty in baseline conditions at this location. It appears that an assumption was made that air quality was good in this area and therefore was approved to be screened out of the construction traffic assessment on this basis.
- There are a number of methodological assumptions in the assessment that we consider not to represent a reasonable worst case. Therefore, it is not clear whether reasonable worst case assumptions would materially affect the conclusions of the assessment. Such methodological assumptions include:
  - not utilising monitoring data to factor Defra air quality background data,
  - using an adjustment factor of less than 1 (essentially reducing the model predicted concentrations);
  - relying on an RMSE of 12.6  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , where guidance states that a model with an RMSE value of 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  or more should be revisited in order to make improvements to the model. Guidance also states that an RMSE value of 4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  or less is the ideal,
  - relying on an adjustment factor based on monitoring data from only two monitors to adjust a large rural study area – one of which may or may not have used un-annualised automatic monitoring data for verification,
  - worst case traffic data in the transport chapter for the construction phase was not used in AQA due to the uncertainty around the likelihood and duration of traffic impacts within Barnard Castle causing that area to be screened out of the assessment,
- Construction phase road traffic emissions assessment was not screened considering speed data.
- It should be confirmed whether the traffic data of the peak construction period (2025) has been used to represent 2024 in the air quality assessment. If so, this is considered appropriate as future emission predictions will be more cautious. If not, this is a limitation of the assessment and recommended to be re-assessed to ensure the maximum impacts of the construction phase have been assessed.
- From the applicant's response to point 46, it is not clear if Note 1 of Section 2.1 of the DMRB LA105 guidance document has been adhered to for the determination of the

ARN or TRA. If not, this means that the A1, north of junction 59, which has a change in AADT of +1380 (when northbound and southbound carriageways are combined), has not been screened into the assessment. As such, suitable evidence has not been provided that the Durham City AQMA will not experience a significant effect as a result of the scheme. If Note 1 of Section 2.1 of the DMRB LA105 guidance document has not been adhered to, this also raises the possibility of other road links being incorrectly screened out of the assessment.

- Clarity requested on what the applicant means on short term diversions for construction phase traffic in Barnard Castle (Point 29).
- The current version of DMRB LA 105 guidance does not require the consideration of NOX impacts or concentrations at sensitive nature conservation habitats. It is therefore not considered appropriate that annual mean NOx concentrations have been used in the assessment to screen whether or not impacts on designated ecological sites are reported.

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
Baseline		
<p>Baseline NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 have been presented in Appendix 5.3 Air Quality Baseline Monitoring. No Scheme specific PM10 or PM2.5 monitoring has been undertaken and it is noted that there is no nearby existing PM10 or PM2.5 monitoring in the study area within DCC. These three pollutants have been assessed for both construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>Preamble, no response necessary.</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>DCC air quality baseline has not been reported specifically to inform the baseline appreciation however considering the distance to the DCC air quality monitoring locations, this is not considered a material issue.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>Four months of NO2 monitoring was undertaken for the Scheme between November 2021 to February 2022 at 16 NO2 locations in triplicate; four of these locations were in DCC (AQM 5, 6, 7 and 8). DCC were not consulted on the locations or given the opportunity to provide insightful, local feedback on the locations where monitoring would be useful. Based on the level of impact indicated by document 3.7 Transport Assessment in both construction and operational phases, it would have been useful to monitor at a sensitive receptor location along the A67 in Barnard Castle, near the river bridge, where a number of dwellings are located at locations nearby the road edge.</p>	<p>The NO2 monitoring locations were informed by the findings of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and were undertaken at locations where the preliminary assessment identified the likelihood of significant effects. The comments provided, relating to monitoring locations in Barnard Castle, are noted.</p>	<p>We have outstanding concern of potential air quality impact at sensitive receptors in Barnard Castle due to lack of project monitoring data. Monitoring data in Barnard Castle would be helpful to understand the air quality impact risk and assist inform key method points the assessment has taken.</p>
<p>It is not noted in Appendix 5.3 Air Quality Baseline Monitoring whether post-scheme monitoring is also proposed. This should be confirmed.</p>	<p>Post-scheme monitoring is not proposed at the current time due to the absence of likely significant effects in the area .</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>Data from the NO2 monitoring survey was noted to be annualised to 2019, the model base year, for AQM1 to AQM14, however not for AQM15 and 16; neither of</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no re</p>	<p>Applicant is requested to please respond to this point.</p>

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
<p>these locations are in DCC. AQM 5 is adjacent to the existing A66, AQM 6 is more than 250m from the A66 at Rokeby, AQM 7 is adjacent to the B6277, and AQM 8 is to the south of the B6277 Lartington Lane. The backcasted adjusted annual mean NO2 monitoring results for monitors in DCC ranges from 2.6 µg/m3 to 10.2 µg/m3 and therefore below the annual mean objective of 40 µg/m3. The highest concentrations were recorded at AQM 5, adjacent to the existing A66; the unadjusted concentration is noted to be 16.3 µg/m3, showing that the adjustment has reduced the concentrations at this location by almost 40%.</p>		<p>The initial comment was intended to highlight that the adjustments had decreased concentrations. These monitors have been relied on for verification, and so robustness of these adjustments is important to impact significance.</p>
<p>There is no discussion of appropriateness of the method to adjust monitoring results in light of the Covid-19 pandemic and the changing traffic patterns associated with government lockdowns and post-lockdown trends. This should be provided.</p>	<p>The baseline monitoring survey and data annualisation were carried out in line with the guidance in LAQM TG16. Supplementary guidance published by Defra in April 2021 for use in reporting 2020 data, which were affected by the activity restrictions associated with Covid-19 lockdown measures, indicates that the diffusion tube sampling and data annualisation methodology in LAQM TG16 remain valid. No further guidance has been issued for 2021/22 data; consequently, the approach is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>A recognition of the current uncertainties following the Covid-19 pandemic would be considered best practice in this situation and a cautious approach to any future prediction would be sensible.</p>
<p>The air quality documents reviewed make reference to the influence of Helm Wind between December and April. There is no discussion around the baseline monitoring being undertaken during this period and whether the method of results adjustment or final results presented are representative of annual conditions or whether this should be seen as a limitation of the air quality assessment.</p>	<p>Baseline air quality monitoring was undertaken at locations along the A1(M), A66 and M6. Helm Wind has been reported to occur along the western side of the Pennines around Cross Fell, leading to reports of localised high winds in this area. No adjustment has been made to the monitoring data, gathered throughout the study area, to account for this infrequent and localised phenomenon nor is a methodology provided in LAQM TG16 for doing so. Meteorological data from both Warcop and Leeming are considered sufficient to account for this potential difference in both long-term and short-term meteorological conditions. The project specific monitoring was also undertaken during November – February and therefore the data accounts for the time-period when this phenomenon occurs. Whilst there may be very localised variations in short-term meteorological conditions, the overall conclusions</p>	<p>The applicant has recognised the limitations of this method choice due to localised variations in meteorological conditions. No further comment.</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
	of the assessment against an annual average are not likely to materially change.	
<p>NH3 Scheme specific monitoring was additionally undertaken during the same period at 13 of the 16 locations of NO2 monitoring. The same four locations are within DCC (AQM 5 to 8). The NH3 monitoring results for the monitors in DCC ranges from 1.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 3.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>; again the concentration at AQM 5 was the highest. There is no provided discussion around representativeness of this data to the assessed base year of 2019.</p>	<p>Roadside NH3 measurements in the UK are limited although national predictions of mid-year (3-year average) averaged background NH3 concentrations, taken from the Concentration Based Estimates of Deposition (CBED) model, are available on a 1km x 1km basis. To address this uncertainty, project specific monitoring was undertaken. Whilst no adjustment was made for concentrations to NH3 (or indeed recognized guidance to do this, particularly around the effects of Covid-19 pandemic), the data collected are considered to be representative to provide an insight to NH3 levels across the study area, which otherwise would have been absent from the assessment.</p>	<p>The risk remains that ammonia concentrations relied on may be lower than actual.</p>
<p>There is no source of background nitrogen deposition rates used in the assessment provided in Appendix 5.3 Air Quality Baseline Monitoring. As per LA 105, this should be included in any reporting.</p>	<p>Background nitrogen deposition rates for the ecological sites identified in the assessment were taken from Air Quality Information System (APIS) at the time of ES drafting and assessment, as set out in Chapter 5 Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP- 048) (Current Baseline - paragraph 5.7.3).</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>Defra annual mean background pollutants concentrations have been used in the assessment for 2019 and future year 2029; in grid square contribution from major road sector emissions have been removed from the background NOx estimates. This is reasonable. A comparison between Defra modelled and local authority background NO2 monitoring data has been made; this showed that Defra backgrounds were slightly lower than local authority monitored data however there is no discussion on this other than the difference is small (1 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and concentrations are below the objective, nor any consideration discussed of factoring the Defra predictions using the monitoring. Given the low levels of predicted model result concentrations, this will not likely materially affect the conclusions.</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p>There are a number of methodological assumptions in the assessment that we consider not to represent a reasonable worst case. Therefore, it is not clear whether reasonable worst-case assumptions would materially affect the conclusions of the assessment.</p> <p>An assessment taking into account a reasonable worst case here would have used the monitoring data to inform the background pollutant concentrations.</p>
<p>There was very little on verification provided in the PEIR. Baseline data from ten sites from local</p>	<p>Model verification factors used in the assessment are reported in Table 4 of Appendix 5.4 Air Quality</p>	<p>It is understood that the same adjustment factors have been used to</p>

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
<p>authorities and one National Highways monitor (total 11 sites) are presented in Table 1 of Appendix 5.3 Air Quality Baseline Monitoring; it is understood that seven of these 11 sites have been used to verify the roads model. It would be useful to provide discussion of whether the seven monitors have been used to verify both the construction and operational phase assessments, and the appropriateness of the chosen method to verify each model domain.</p>	<p>Assessment Results (Document Reference 3.4, APP-153) and have been applied to the predicted road NOX concentrations, used in both the construction and operational phase assessments, as stated in section 5.4.1.8. Tables 2 and 3, also in Appendix 5.4 (Document Reference 3.4, APP-153), provide details of which sites were used to derive the verification factors for the urban (Table 2) and rural (Table 3) road links based on site typology in the construction and operational phase assessments, as stated in section 5.4.1.8. Tables 2 and 3, also in Appendix 5.4, provide details of which sites were used to derive the verification factors for the urban (Table 2) and rural (Table 3) road links based on site typology.</p>	<p>adjust the construction phase and operational phase dispersion modelling results despite the model domains for each assessment differing. A discussion on the limitations of relying on the same method for both assessments should be provided given the stated different traffic data sets, and model domain extents.</p> <p>It is understood that the rural zone adjustment factor has been applied to the assessed receptors within DCC's jurisdiction. It is not considered a reasonable worst case to use an adjustment factor lower than 1 to adjust any dispersion model outputs and also rely on an RMSE of 12.6ug/m<sup>3</sup>. This is not considered a robust assessment and is recommended to be re-assessed.</p>
<p><b>No DCC monitoring or National Highways monitoring within DCC boundaries has been used to verify the model outputs against measured data. It is further understood that none of the Scheme-specific monitoring has been used for verification. Discussion would be useful in this instance to present how representative the verification is of receptors within DCC.</b></p> <p><i>At this point it has been assumed that the applicant's numbering system has been disrupted and is incorrect. Comments have therefore been addressed from this point on, on this basis.</i></p>	<p>12 and 13. There are no DCC monitoring locations adjacent to the ARN (as noted by the Interested Party in comment (2) above which they acknowledge is not a material issue). Available data from a National Highways air quality monitoring station have been used for model verification. Several administrative areas are covered by the assessment study area which is predominantly rural in nature with pockets of urban settlements; overall, air quality is good. In addition to National Highways air quality monitoring data, the model was verified using local authority monitoring data from representative roadside locations adjacent to the ARN. As noted above in response to item (13), site typology was considered and two separate verification factors, one for urban and another for rural road links (and receptors), were derived and applied. Where possible, sites with ≥75% data capture were used; where this condition could not be met, in one instance, this has been noted. The verification using the rural zone for use</p>	<p>A reasonable worst-case and robust assessment should be undertaken. It is not considered a reasonable worst case to use an adjustment factor lower than 1 to adjust any dispersion model outputs, given the ADMS software's tendency to underpredict. Relying on an RMSE of 12.6ug/m<sup>3</sup> is not considered robust, based on the guidance referenced in the ES chapter, and it is recommended that the modelling and verification that informed the assessment of construction and operational phase impacts is revisited. It is also not considered a limitation of the assessment to not use more monitoring data locations. Should DCC not monitor in this area, project specific monitoring should have been</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
	<p>with DCC receptors is considered to be representative as the site typology, setting and traffic were not considered to be materially different and therefore did not warrant an alternative approach or verification factor. The best monitoring data available in the study were also used. Due to the generally low background concentrations in the study area rural locations, an alternative rural factor would however unlikely change the conclusions of the assessment.</p>	<p>undertaken to sufficiently obtain a reliable baseline of air quality. This is not considered to have been presented.</p>
<p>The verification is understood to have been undertaken in two zones: rural and urban. It is further understood that the rural zone is to the east using met station RAF Leeming used two monitors to verify; and the urban zone is to the west using met station Warcop Range used five monitors to verify. It is not clear the boundary of the urban/rural receptors assessed, however it is assumed that those within DCC boundary fall within the rural zone. One of the two rural monitors is understood to be the automatic National Highways monitoring station at the A1M southbound at Leeming which only achieve a data capture of 56% in the baseline year of 2019; it should be outlined whether the data used from this station was annualised and whether the used data is considered representative.</p>		<p>The applicant has not answered the request to outline whether the data used from automatic National Highways monitoring station at the A1M southbound at Leeming was annualised. This has informed the adjustment factor used in the assessment and it is requested that the comment is responded to.</p>
<p>The rural verification zone of two monitors has a bias adjustment factor of 0.632 and an RMSE of 12.6 <math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>; this is well outside the RMSE of 10% of the objective (4 <math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math> for annual mean NO<sub>2</sub>) recommended by LAQM TG16. <b>Discussion is required to explain how the results at sensitive receptors presented in DCC and the rural zone as a whole are reliable in this instance. This is considered a potentially material consideration, particularly in light of the presented slight adverse (albeit concluded not significant) effects at receptors in DCC boundary.</b></p>	<p>The suitability and representativeness of the verification for use with DCC receptors is set out in the response for item 12 above. The verification factor was derived using available monitoring data collected at representative rural roadside locations with 200m of the ARN. While the RMSE derived does not meet the criteria given in LAQM TG16, the use of two verification points, as opposed to one, reduces uncertainty in the assessment and improves the representativeness of the model verification (as noted above in response to item 13), it is therefore not perceived to be a risk to the assessment findings. No likely significant effects were identified within DCC and any change in verification method is unlikely to material change this conclusion. This is particularly relevant when considering the approach</p>	<p>It is not considered reliable to only use two monitoring locations for verification in an assessment, especially when applied to such a large area and when the agreement with monitoring data post-adjustment is very poor. An RMSE of 12.6<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math> is considered very poor and could be representative of several things, including the poor data capture at the automatic monitor used for verification, if no annualisation was undertaken. It is additionally not considered appropriate to use an adjustment factor of less than 1; a reasonable worst-case adjustment</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
	followed in- line with DMRB LA105 (rather than EIA specific significance criteria), which determines significance only at locations with predicted concentrations above the relevant air quality standard, in this case 40µg/m <sup>3</sup> for nitrogen dioxide, which is unlikely to occur for DCC receptors.	factor should be used, despite the likelihood of the assessed receptors to exceed the air quality objective, or not.
27 monitoring locations are noted to have been excluded from verification, and the reader of Appendix 5.4 Air Quality Assessment Results is directed to Table 1 for the reasons for exclusion. Table 1 only includes reasons for 19 monitors; none of the 19 sites are within DCC. The eight remaining monitors excluded from verification should be presented alongside the 19 in Table 1. It would be useful to discuss the use of the scheme specific monitoring for verification in light of the poor RMSE, where these are located at site types acceptable for verification as per LAQM TG16.	The comment on the exclusion of monitoring locations is noted. Scheme specific monitoring data are set out in Environmental Statement Appendix 5.3 Baseline Air Quality Baseline Monitoring (Document Reference 3.4, APP-152). A detailed review was undertaken on a project level alongside National Highways, in relation to the gathered data and its use for comparison against the formal verification. The data was not used formally in the assessment verification due to the short-time period, however the two verification factors were considered to perform reasonably well and had a high level of agreement to one another. Overall, National Highways concluded that it was unlikely for there to be any material changes to the conclusions of the assessment.	We disagree that the two verification factors perform well, in light of the RMSE of 12.6 µg/m <sup>3</sup> and how that contradicts the Defra guidance referred to in the ES chapter. This point is not considered to have been addressed on reliability of the results. A reasonable worst case assessment of impacts at sensitive receptors should be presented.
Construction phase dust		
The PEIR stated that construction phase dust monitoring and post consent air quality monitoring may be required, subject to findings of the final ES. A qualitative assessment of the impact of nuisance dust arising during construction is noted to have been undertaken, using standards set out in Section 2.56 of DMRB LA 105. Sensitive receptors within 200m of dust producing activities have been identified within Figure 5.3.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
Following a review of the sections of the project (Schemes 7, 8 and 9) in DCC, there are a large number of sensitive receptors nearby the construction activity at Bowes village and a number in the vicinity of the A66. Three ecological sites assessed fall in DCC's boundary: Rokeby Park, Mortham Wood (ERIC LWS) and Graham's Gill Jack-Wood Ancient Woodland and Steven Band Road Verge (NEYEDC LWS). There	The assessment of construction dust was undertaken for the specific areas on the A66 where works will be undertaken (i.e., Scheme 7, 8 and 9, etc.) for example, where there is a proposed upgrade from single to dual carriageway; change in alignment or new infrastructure bypass /road/ junction). These are illustrated in the Environmental Statement Figure 5.3 Key for the 'Order Limits' (Document Reference 3.3, APP-061) . It is	This is understandable, and the response confirming that all sensitive receptors within 200m of the Work boundaries have been included in the assessment is appreciated. No further comment.

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
<p>would appear to be a number of residential dust sensitive receptors in DCC not identified in Figure 5.3 which should be considered in Table 5-8 of the Assessment of likely significant effects from construction dust in Chapter 5 Air Quality.</p>	<p>acknowledged that identifying all sensitive receptors in the Figure 5.3 is difficult due to the multiple layers on the drawings, however all sensitive receptors within 200m of these Work boundaries, in-line with DMRB LA105, were identified using the up-to-date Address Point data available at the time of drafting and included in the assessment (and Table 5-8 in Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048)); of which these are highlighted in Figure 5.3.</p>	
<p>There is no discussion provided in the documents reviewed of existing levels of baseline dust. For example, Hulands Quarry within DCC is an existing source of emissions; this would be useful to be considered in the assessment.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Dust from mineral workings is unlikely to extend beyond 400m from its source. It is anticipated that the site operator will be using a combination of good site practice and industry best practice mitigation measures, secured through a planning condition. This will be agreed with the local regulator, to limit any dust arising. Consequently, no significant adverse effect would be expected.</p>	<p>Noted. It is recommended that the EMP include that communication will be sought with Hulands Quarry to reduce any potential cumulative effects. No further comment.</p>
<p>At the scoping stage, as shown in the Scoping Opinion Appendices, it was requested that mitigation measures be included for non-road mobile machinery. Further assessment has been screened out of the ES chapter however in the Environmental Management Plan Annex B4 Air Quality and Dust Management there are measures listed in Section B4.6. The use of ultra-low sulphur diesel, electric plant and hydrogen plant is noted to be considered and used where practicable. This should be confirmed with DCC prior to construction commencement.</p>	<p>Duly noted, the use of ultra-low sulphur diesel, electric plant and hydrogen plant will be considered prior to construction commencement.</p>	<p>Noted. Use of ultra low sulphur diesel electric plant and hydrogen plant should be confirmed with DCC prior to construction commencement. No further comment.</p>
<p>The Project is considered to have a large construction dust risk potential due to potential impact to receptors and consequently mitigation measures are noted to be required to reduce the frequency and intensity of potential dust impacts. Best practice dust mitigation measures are proposed in the EMP; the Chapter states</p>	<p>Duly noted, dust mitigation measures will be refined through the development of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.7, APP-019) which will be developed through the DCO Process in consultation with DCC, where required.</p>	<p>Noted. The applicant has confirmed that final dust mitigation measures will be agreed with DCC. No further comment.</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
that this will reduce the impact to a negligible level through the use of 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. Final dust mitigation measures should be agreed with DCC.		
There are a number of human health and ecological receptors relevant to the construction phase air quality impacts in DCC. It is recommended that the EMP refers to 'Figure 5.3 Air Quality Construction Phase Assessment' so that receptor locations identified are considered within the refinement of the EMP.	Duly noted, the EMP will refer to the relevant figure which identifies receptor locations that could be affected by construction phase impacts (this acknowledges that Environmental Statement "Figure 5.3 Air Quality Construction Phase Assessment" (Document Reference 3.3, APP-067) may be superseded through design development).	Noted. The applicant has confirmed the EMP will reference the receptor figure. No further comment.
No monitoring other than visual inspection is committed to. Following reviews of recent Planning Applications, DCC are aware that DDG monitoring at receptors adjacent to the A66 at Hulands Quarry has had historic exceedances of dust deposition limits. This location should be considered for monitoring.	Duly noted, final monitoring locations will be reviewed through the continued development of the EMP and the design.	Noted. DCC should be provided with final monitoring locations and communication with Hulands Quarry should be made. No further comment.
Should air quality monitoring be undertaken, the air quality samples are noted to be possibly sent to an accredited laboratory; this should be committed to.	Duly noted, if air quality monitoring is undertaken, samples will be sent to an accredited laboratory.	No further comment.
<b>Construction phase traffic assessment</b>		
It was noted at the PEIR stage that no construction phase road traffic was available for assessment. The PEIR stated that an assessment of such emissions will be undertaken as part of the EIA and reported in the Environmental Statement (ES). ADMS Roads modelling is understood to have been undertaken for limited sections of the scheme – between M60 Junction 40 to Brough and between east of Bowes, to Scotch Corner. This Affected Road Network is understood to be determined based on changes of 1000 AADT or more and/or changes of 200 AADT or more as a result of the construction phase; the chapter does not make reference to speed bands factoring into the determination of the construction phase traffic ARN	Construction traffic data provided for the Project were limited to vehicle movements only based on the anticipated construction programme and phasing. No speed banding data was available to consider and assess as part of the Air Quality study	Applicant has confirmed that limited construction traffic data limited the scope of the assessment. The construction phase traffic assessment is therefore understood to be not meeting all of LA 105 guidance. The applicant should confirm whether speed bands are predicted to change with the scheme's construction phase.

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
therefore it is assumed that this is not a part of the criteria used; this is not following LA 105 guidance.		
It is not clear whether AADT has been used for the construction phase assessment, or whether traffic data provided was split by the four periods required by LA 105 at detailed air quality assessment stage of morning (AM), inter peak, evening peak (PM) and overnight period (OP). This should be clarified and if AADT has been used, reasons provided as to why this is considered acceptable and any limitations associated with this method choice.	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) was used in the construction phase traffic assessment to maintain consistency with the operational phase assessment. Consistent with the guidance in DMRB LA105, a proportionate approach was taken to the speed pivoting process. AADT was used because, as noted in the guidance, the possibility of exceedances of air quality thresholds was considered to be low. This is reflected in the assessment's findings as set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048).	The possibility of exceedances is understood to be assumed to be low, however a representative baseline through the use of air quality monitoring is not considered to have been undertaken, as noted in comments above. The monitoring data availability in the DCC area and the absence of monitoring in Barnard Castle should have informed the locations of the scheme-specific survey. The screening of the Barnard Castle area out of the assessment is considered a limitation.
Construction years are between 2024 and 2029. With reference to Figures 11-2 and 11-3 in Chapter 3.7 Transport Assessment of the ES, the peak construction traffic from workers and wagons per month is understood to be in April/May 2025 and the overall busiest year for construction will be 2025. 2024 is understood to have been assessed. The year of traffic modelled, or a method to explain how the consultant has assessed the worst-case impacts of the scheme, and the chosen year of emissions factors should be explained.	The overall busiest construction year was forecast to be 2025; however, to be consistent with the noise assessment, the air quality assessment is based on 2024.	The maximum year of construction is understood to be 2025 and this is understood to not have been assessed. It should be confirmed whether the traffic data of the peak construction period has been used to represent 2024 in the air quality assessment. If so, this is considered appropriate as future emission predictions will be more cautious. If not, this is a limitation of the assessment and recommended to be re-assessed to ensure the maximum impacts of the construction phase have been assessed.
There is no detail on the methodology provided in the Environmental Statement Appendix 5.2 Air Quality Assessment Methodology for the dispersion modelling assessment of construction traffic, in the same level of detail as for the operational phase assessment. This should be provided to understand the construction phase traffic data and TRA, model input parameters, verification process and choice of met station data. If these parameters are the same as for the operation phase traffic emissions assessment of effects, then this should be stated, and justification of the method	The construction traffic assessment methodology followed the same approach used for the operational modelling, except for the level of detail in the traffic data, i.e., no speed band information (as acknowledged above in response to item 24).	Justification of the method provided in relation to the construction phase affected road network remains outstanding.

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
<p>provided in relation to the construction phase affected road network.</p>		
<p><b>With reference to Figure 5.3 Air Quality Construction Phase Assessment, the construction phase ARN only falls within DCCs boundary on the A66 to the east of Barnard Castle leading to Scotch Corner. There appears to be no ARN east of Bowes at Scheme 7 Bowes Bypass and also no ARN to the west of Scheme 8 Cross Lanes to Rokeby. One of two construction compounds is noted by the Air Quality Chapter to be in Bowes, amongst other locations. It is understood that the construction traffic impact assessment in this area does not fall into the ARN and has been scoped out of requiring assessment on local air quality, possibly due to the criteria for AADT and HDV flow changes provided in Paragraph 5.6.4 of the Chapter not being exceeded. Explanation as to why these sections would not be materially affected by the scheme should be provided to suitably scope out these sections of construction within DCC, particularly in light of Bowes construction compound being in this location. A table similar to that provided for the operational phase traffic Table 5-10 would be useful. The other construction compound locations should be confirmed and agreed with DCC prior to construction commencing.</b></p>	<p>Data provided for the Project and the construction traffic movements were screened in-line with the criteria in LA105 (where available). The worst-case scenario of the peak-averaged daily construction traffic were used and the ARN identified based on the changes in vehicle flows, as set out in the assessment as set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048). The location of construction compounds will be reviewed through the continued development of the design.</p>	<p>Confirmation required on whether the peak averaged daily construction traffic stated to be used was for 2025 or 2024. Question not considered to have been suitably answered on why roads adjacent to Bowes construction compound does not cause an increase of more than 1000 AADT, when roads further east of the compound do. Table of data requested is outstanding.</p>
<p><b>Explanation should also be provided as to how Barnard Castle does not fall within the ARN for the construction phase. Following a review of Chapter 3.7 Transport Assessment it is apparent there is at least a 2,000 two-way AADT increase at A67 Barnard Castle Bridge in both Scenario C and D. It is additionally noted that Scenarios C and D combined are for a length of more than two years.</b></p>	<p>The data highlighted in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7, APP-236) is based on a worst-case unlikely scenario for potential local short-term diversions, with no assumed mitigation in-place. As such, given the uncertainty around likelihood and duration, following discussion at a Project level, they were not considered appropriate to be included within the Air Quality Assessment. are based on a worst- case unlikely scenario for potential local short-term diversions, with no assumed mitigation in-place. As such, given the uncertain around likelihood and duration, following discussion at a Project level, they</p>	<p>It should be made clear whether the mitigation is built in. It is standard practice for a reasonable worst case to be first considered, and then assessment of residual effects following mitigation.</p> <p>Worst case traffic data and impact appears to have been presented in the Transport Chapter but not in the Air Quality Chapter's air quality assessment. Consistency between transport and air quality chapters</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
	<p>were not considered appropriate to be included within the Air Quality Assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.7.4 of the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7, APP-236) states:  “The impacts identified within this will help inform the potential issues that may arise during construction such that mitigation can be considered and implemented where possible. The project team will monitor the journey times on the A66 to ensure excessive delays are not occurring due to the works. If delays on the A66 are causing inappropriate local routes to be used then the project team will consider if any adjustments can be made to the TTM (Temporary Traffic Management) with the aim of reducing the delays.”</p> <p>Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Document Reference 2.7, APP-033) provides an extended essay plan for the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for the Project. It will be completed on an iterative basis by the Principal Contractor (PC) as the Project progresses through detailed design and will set out the proposed Temporary Traffic Management (TTM) measures for implementation during the construction of the Project. Major local businesses and other stakeholders that are likely to be impacted by the proposed traffic management will also be consulted regarding this CTMP. This will ensure that a comprehensive, detailed Traffic Management Plan is available and understood by all parties prior to commencing the works on site. The CTMP will be developed to ensure that the following key objectives are considered and addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety of the travelling public, non-motorised users and roadworkers to ensure that no person is injured either working within or travelling through the site on the strategic road network</li> <li>• Clarity of temporary traffic management schemes to ensure that the CTMP is built around the customers and stakeholders</li> <li>• Minimising delays to travellers on both trunk and local roads</li> </ul>	<p>should be made and where this is not possible, reasons provided for inconsistency. It does not appear that a reasonable worst case assessment been undertaken. <b>It is considered that the assessment is missing a significant risk that needs to be assessed unless a concrete mitigation can be determined. Clarification is requested on what short term is, in the context of the diversions.</b></p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting the needs of the relevant Local Highway Authorities</li> <li>• Addressing the needs of key local stakeholders</li> <li>• Maintaining adequate access for the emergency services and all affected properties during the construction works</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Following a review of Figure 11-1 in Chapter 3.7 Transport Assessment, it would appear that some of the construction phase scenarios will have similarities. It should be confirmed in the Air Quality Chapter how long the construction phase as a whole will be in areas of DCC and evidence provided as to how this has informed the screening and ARN determination.</b></p>	<p>Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7, APP-236) Figure 11-1 sets out the indicative construction programme per scheme, with works around Bowes and then Rokeby and Cross Lanes Junction being Scheme 7 and 8 respectively, showing two-year construction programmes. All worst-case construction traffic movements were reviewed against DMRB LA105 criteria and included in the ARN where the criteria were triggered.</p>	<p>Statement against item 29 above does not correlate to the statement that all worst case construction traffic movement were reviewed. Worst-case construction traffic movements have not been assessed according to Point 29. Clarification is required.</p>
<p>A particular concern is noted to be if construction-related vehicles affected or diverted local traffic within locations with sensitive receptors close to the routes for the compounds approaching the AQO. As noted in EMP Annex B13 Construction Traffic Management Plan (Application Document 2.7), the Construction Traffic Management Plan to be developed by the appointed contractor will ensure construction vehicles avoid these areas.</p>	<p>Duly noted, the CTMP will be developed by the appointed contractor to ensure construction vehicles avoid areas where there are sensitive receptors close to routes used by construction traffic and air pollutant levels are approaching their respective AQOs</p>	<p>Considering the points made in relation to a suitable air quality baseline having not been achieved, it is not likely that the appointed contractor will be able to develop the CTMP. Will the A67 route through Barnard Castle be avoided as a construction traffic route?</p>
<p>There are predicted annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> changes across the scheme at human health receptors of more than 0.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> but no exceedances of the AQO in the first year of construction 2024 across the entire project assessed receptors. There are two human receptors (HSR 64 and HSR 65) assessed in DCC for the construction phase modelling of impacts. The impact is 0.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> at both assessed receptor locations in DCC, with total predicted concentrations below 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. No exceedances of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> AQOs are predicted. No significant adverse effects are therefore determined.</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>Of the three designated habitats presented within Figure 5.3 in DCC, only one (Rokeby Park and Mortham Wood (ERIC LWS)) is reported on, however it</p>	<p>There does appear to be a drafting error in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048) Paragraph</p>	<p>Error noted by applicant. The current version of DMRB LA 105 guidance does not require the consideration of</p>

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
<p>would appear that transect receptor points have not been modelled. This does not align with the requirements of LA 105 guidance. At the distance of 7.5m from the road edge, there is a 24% increase in nitrogen deposition compared to the critical load for this site. Chapter 5 Air Quality does not reference this site in the discussion, although there may be an error in Paragraph 5.10.17 which refers to Lightwater Alluvial Forest part of the River Eden and Tributaries SSSI, located outside of DCC. This should be checked and confirmed. Chapter 6 of the ES Biodiversity is however noted by Chapter 5 Air Quality to conclude that there will be no likely significant effects at designated habitat sites.</p>	<p>5.10.17, where Rokeby Park LWS should have been referenced with a change of 24% against the critical load of 10, with a change in 2.4 kg N/ha/yr. No further transect receptor locations have been included as the predicted change in annual mean NOX at these locations is considered to be imperceptible (&lt;0.3µg/m3), in-line with DMRB LA105.), in-line with DMRB LA105.</p>	<p>annual mean NOx and annual mean NOx concentrations should not be used to screen whether or not impacts on designated ecological site are included in any air quality assessment, or not.</p>
<p>Graham's Gill Jack-Wood Ancient Woodland and Steven Band Road Verge (NEYEDC LWS) do not have receptor points or transects marked on Figure 5.3, nor results reported in Table-8. Reasons for not reporting impacts on these two designated habitats should be provided.</p>	<p>The impacts at these receptors have not been reported or illustrated as the predicted change in annual mean NOX at these locations is considered to be imperceptible (&lt;0.3µg/m3), in-line with DMRB LA105. This approach is set out in sections 5.5.7 to 5.5.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048).</p>	<p>The current version of DMRB LA 105 guidance does not require the consideration of annual mean NOx and annual mean NOx concentrations should not be used to screen whether or not impacts on designated ecological site are included in any air quality assessment, or not.</p>
<p>With reference to Chapter 2.7 Environmental Management Plan Annex B4 Air Quality and Dust Management, construction phase traffic mitigation is proposed to include implementation of active traffic management measures. Of the active traffic management measures, it is noted in Paragraph B4.4.2 that there are a number currently being considered. It is therefore understood that no measures have yet been finalised. These should be agreed with DCC. Those listed as potential measures include limiting the use of speed reductions, i.e., through applying higher safe speeds, or limiting the amount of traffic management that is used in areas where the new route is being built adjacent to the existing A66. Reactive traffic management measures would be employed as a last</p>	<p>Duly noted, as the detailed design progresses, the EMP and Annex B4 will develop based on further detailed construction information through the DCO Process.</p>	<p>Active traffic management measures to be agreed with DCC.</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
resort, to stop traffic from using the least suitable diversion routes.		
The construction phase of the Project is noted to not impact compliance with the air quality limit values.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
Cumulative effects due to construction traffic from the cumulative proposed developments, if they occur at the same time as the Project, as well as dust and PM10 generated by construction activities, is noted by Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects to potentially lead to significant adverse effects if adequate mitigation is not implemented. The EMP is noted to ensure that adequate mitigation is in place.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
Operational phase assessment		
The opening year was recognised to have not been assessed appropriately in the PEIR, but that the correct opening year of 2029 would be assessed in the ES; this has now been done.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
A compliance assessment using Pollution Climate Mapping (PCM) has been undertaken and none of these are within DCC.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
It is not clear whether AADT has been used for the operational phase assessment, or whether traffic data provided was split by the four periods required by LA 105 at detailing air quality assessment stage of morning (AM), inter peak, evening peak (PM) and overnight period (OP). This should be clarified and if AADT has been used, reasons provided as to why this is considered acceptable and any limitations associated with this method choice.	Consistent with the guidance in DMRB LA105, a proportionate approach was taken to the speed pivoting process. AADT was used in the operational phase assessment because, as noted in the guidance, the possibility of exceedances of air quality thresholds was considered to be low. This is reflected in the assessment's findings.	Methodological point that period flows have not been used based on unlikely exceedances of AQOs. Considering the above points made in relation to the absence of a reliable air quality baseline, this may require revisiting.
A met station sensitivity assessment was welcomed by DCC at the PEIR stage. Two met stations are noted to have been used in the assessment for the ES, representing east and west study areas Warcop Range and RAF Leeming, for 2019. Leeming has been used in modelling for DCC. There is no discussion other than distance from the scheme as to how representative these two datasets are for the entire scheme, or consideration of alternatives such as Durham Tees Valley Airport. Chapter 5 Air Quality notes that the use of observations from Warcop Range ensure that the	Meteorological data for the eastern side were taken from RAF Leeming based on distance to the scheme as pointed out, but also due to the proximity of the ARN which would be considered and assessed in the modelling, particularly the A1(M), where potential likely significant effects were identified at sensitive receptors in the PIER. A National Highways continuous automatic monitoring station is also located at Leeming, which was included for model verification following the PIER findings. For these purposes, Leeming was considered to be the most appropriate and no other sites were	Response noted, although the point made about automatic continuous monitor is queried in Point 13 above, as it is currently not clear whether this site with low data capture (less than 75%) has been annualised as per guidance.

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
Helm Wind is accounted for in the model, however explanation should be provided as to whether this is important to be considered in the eastern model domain.	considered necessary to include. Helm wind is discussed in the response to item (7) above.	
An increase of 7,727 AADT is noted by Chapter 5 Air quality to be predicted at A66 near Bowes in 2029 as a result of the project, where traffic flow is noted to increase on A66 but flow is improved. However Table 7-1 of the Transport Assessment states this value is 6,300 AADT increase. The difference should be explained.	The difference is due to the fact that the increase of 7,727 AADT noted by Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048) refers to Bowes Bypass to the east of the proposed east facing slips. The 6,300 AADT forecast increase noted in the Transport Assessment refers to Bowes Bypass to the west of the proposed east facing slips.	Response welcomed. No further comment.
With reference to Figure 5.4 Operational Phase Air Quality Assessment, the ARN falls within DCCs boundary on the A1M to the east of Newton Aycliffe, along the A66 from Scotch Corner in the east to Bowes and the border of DCC in the west, the B6277 to Barnard Castle and Rutherford Lane.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
No AQMA is noted to be impacted by the scheme. The scoping report noted that the nearest ARN to the Durham City AQMA was 20km to the south and the TRA did not extend to this far north and was screened out at scoping stage. Paragraph 5.2.3.5 of the Environmental Statement Appendix 5.2 Air Quality Assessment Methodology notes that any potentially affected links not within the TRA have not been modelled as there is less confidence in them. The exclusion of wider areas of potential traffic changes is noted in Appendix 5.2 as appropriate for the Project due to the large difference between reported concentrations and the air quality objectives. This is considered reasonable.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	No further comment.
Paragraph 5.5.7 of the Air Quality Chapter states: "It is important to recognise the limitations of models and to use the outputs appropriately. For instance traffic flows of less than a 1,000 AADT are not used in assessment as they are below the confidence that can be attributed to a traffic model. In the same way that changes of less than 1% of the AQO for NO <sub>2</sub> (40 µg/m <sup>3</sup> - therefore the criterion is 0.4µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) and NO <sub>X</sub> (30 µg/m <sup>3</sup> - therefore the	The AADT change criterion is taken from Note 2, section 2.1 in DMRB LA105. The NO <sub>2</sub> change criterion is also quoted from section 2.90, item 2 in DMRB LA105. For NO <sub>X</sub> , the Environment Agency <sup>2</sup> and the Institute of Air Quality Management <sup>3</sup> use an identical air pollutant change criterion approach in their respective guidance to determine perceptibility and the need for further assessment.	The current version of DMRB LA 105 guidance does not require the consideration of annual mean NO <sub>x</sub> and annual mean NO <sub>x</sub> concentrations should not be used to screen whether or not impacts on designated ecological site are included in any air quality assessment, or not.

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022																																						
<p>criterion is 0.3µg/m<sup>3</sup>) are considered to imperceptible and not considered further in assessment.” This should be expanded on with further explanation.</p>																																								
<p><b>DCC request information on the predicted changes in traffic flows on the A1 (M) northbound into DCC boundary to the east of Newton Aycliffe. It is noted that in the TA that the increase in traffic flows along the scheme route is 7,400 but that on the A1M NB and SB the total change is only 5,500 suggesting that over 1,900 AADT do not use the strategic road network but are dissipated onto the local road network. Information should be provided of the flow change as AADT on all of the links off the Scotch Corner junction to understand how traffic is expected. It would be useful to understand if the ARN ends due to changes in traffic flow/composition/speed, or whether this is due to the ending of the TRA and to see the location of the calibration/validation data used and reported in the Transport Assessment. This is of importance to DCC, in particular at the Durham City AQMA. There is additionally no mention of air quality in the Transport Assessment with reference to the determination of the TRA; this should be jointly agreed.</b></p>	<p>National Highways propose to discuss the information below with Durham County Council during the meeting we are currently organising with the Head of Transport and Contract Services at DCC. Figure 8-27 within the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 3.7, APP-236) shows the increase in traffic flows at Scotch Corner Junction. The 2044 design year AADT flow increases within the figure are clarified within the Table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="907 579 1541 1121"> <thead> <tr> <th>Road</th> <th>Direction</th> <th>AAADT Change</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A1 North</td> <td>NBD</td> <td>+1300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SBD</td> <td>+1100</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Middleton Tyas Lane</td> <td>EBD</td> <td>+250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WBD</td> <td>+150</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A1 South</td> <td>SBD</td> <td>+1800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NBD</td> <td>+1600</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A6055 (South of A6055/A6108 Junction)</td> <td>SBD</td> <td>+10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NBD</td> <td>+220</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A6108 (Barracks Bank)</td> <td>WBD</td> <td>-72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EBD</td> <td>-39</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A66</td> <td>WBD</td> <td>+4500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EBD</td> <td>+4800</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A6055 North of A1 Northbound On-slip Roundabout</td> <td>NBD</td> <td>-3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SBD</td> <td>+79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Further detail of traffic flows at the boundary of County Durham around Newton Aycliffe are provided in the Table below.</p>	Road	Direction	AAADT Change	A1 North	NBD	+1300	SBD	+1100	Middleton Tyas Lane	EBD	+250	WBD	+150	A1 South	SBD	+1800	NBD	+1600	A6055 (South of A6055/A6108 Junction)	SBD	+10	NBD	+220	A6108 (Barracks Bank)	WBD	-72	EBD	-39	A66	WBD	+4500	EBD	+4800	A6055 North of A1 Northbound On-slip Roundabout	NBD	-3	SBD	+79	<p>Traffic data received is appreciated. <b>Please confirm that Note 1 of Section 2.1 of DMRB LA 105 has been adhered to, and the network’s road link carriageways have been suitably combined for the determination of the ARN and TRA? Following a review of the second table provided in this point, it doesn’t appear to have been screened as such due to &gt;1000 AADT on the A1 North, when considering 700+680 = 1,380. This highlights that this needs to be considered further and that the Durham City AQMA could potentially be affected. Question of what other roads have not been assessed in the network not been assessed on this basis?</b></p>
Road	Direction	AAADT Change																																						
A1 North	NBD	+1300																																						
	SBD	+1100																																						
Middleton Tyas Lane	EBD	+250																																						
	WBD	+150																																						
A1 South	SBD	+1800																																						
	NBD	+1600																																						
A6055 (South of A6055/A6108 Junction)	SBD	+10																																						
	NBD	+220																																						
A6108 (Barracks Bank)	WBD	-72																																						
	EBD	-39																																						
A66	WBD	+4500																																						
	EBD	+4800																																						
A6055 North of A1 Northbound On-slip Roundabout	NBD	-3																																						
	SBD	+79																																						

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022																		
	<table border="1" data-bbox="913 204 1563 454"> <thead> <tr> <th>Road</th> <th>Direction</th> <th>AADT Change</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A1 North</td> <td>Nbd</td> <td>700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sbd</td> <td>680</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">A68</td> <td>Ebd</td> <td>-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wbd</td> <td>-150</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">B6725</td> <td>Nbd</td> <td>+3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sbd</td> <td>+6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="902 475 1574 1082">           The Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 3.8, APP-237) Appendix C Transport Model Package discusses the TRA. Paragraph 3.3.1 states:            “The study area and the model’s geographical extent will include the same area as the PCF Stage1and 2 A66TM model, however, the Transport Reliability Area (TRA) has been extended further north and south at either end of the A66 along the M6 and A1(M). This has been revised considering impacts from the scheme identified within PCF Stage 2 forecasting.”            The impacts noted above are based on the classifications noted in paragraph 2.1 of DMRB LA105 Air Quality, namely:            1) annual average daily traffic (AADT) <math>\geq 1,000</math>; or            2) heavy duty vehicle (HDV) AADT <math>\geq 200</math>; or            3) a change in speed band; or            4) a change in carriageway alignment by <math>\geq 5m</math>.            The change in flows due to the scheme within the Durham City AQMA do not exceed these thresholds.         </p>	Road	Direction	AADT Change	A1 North	Nbd	700	Sbd	680	A68	Ebd	-100	Wbd	-150	B6725	Nbd	+3	Sbd	+6	
Road	Direction	AADT Change																		
A1 North	Nbd	700																		
	Sbd	680																		
A68	Ebd	-100																		
	Wbd	-150																		
B6725	Nbd	+3																		
	Sbd	+6																		
<p data-bbox="215 1096 869 1420">           There are nine human health sensitive receptors assessed in DCC (HSR 57 to HSR 65) for the operational phase. There are no predicted exceedances at human health receptors of any pollutant reported in the chapter, and so no new exceedances as a result of the scheme would be expected within DCC. Results are confirmed to not be presented on a scheme by scheme basis and that the discussion for region 1 in Chapter 5 Air Quality is presents the impact of the overall scheme on the A66 region including the section of the scheme within DCC.         </p>	<p data-bbox="902 1096 1417 1120">Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p data-bbox="1597 1096 2067 1216">Applicant requested to confirm if receptor is the same receptor reported in the PEIR to have a very different impact.</p>																		

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
<p>The largest human health impact as a result of the scheme is reported to be +0.9 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, within the DCC boundary at Highly Sensitive Receptor 60 within the Cross Lanes to Rokeby section adjacent to the A66, south of Barnard Castle, to the east of the B6277 junction with the A66. At this location, concentrations are predicted to increase from 9 ug/m<sup>3</sup> in DM 2029 to 9.9 ug/m<sup>3</sup> in the DS scenario, where an increase of 3,603 AADT is predicted for the A66. It is not clear whether this receptor is the same receptor which was reported in the PEIR to have an increase of +4.0 ug/m<sup>3</sup> in annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> at a residential property adjacent to the A66 at Cross Lanes, however the predicted impacts would appear to have dropped significantly in DCC compared to the PEIR stage.</p>		
<p>There are improvements in air quality predicted at three of the nine receptors assessment with the largest improvement predicted to have an impact of -0.6 ug/m<sup>3</sup> at HSR 62 and 63 where the proposed A66 alignment moves further away from the HSRs at Rokeby.</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p>No further comment.</p>
<p>There are no human health sensitive receptors selected and modelled for each ARN link within DCC; this would have provided an understanding of impact of each ARN link. For example, the B6277 is a section of ARN within DCC and a residential property north of Thorsgill Beck has not been included in the dispersion modelling. Receptors are noted by the chapter to have been selected to represent the scale of impacts associated with the project.</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p>We would have expected to see more receptors than included in the assessment as per LA 105. For example, the B6277 is a section of ARN within DCC and a residential property north of Thorsgill Beck has not been included in the dispersion modelling. At least one receptor per ARN link is requested to be included to ensure the air quality impact is robustly assessed.</p>
<p>The greatest air quality constraint from the scheme at the PEIR stage related to impacts on nature conservation sites, where there were potential concerns and risk of significant effects with nitrogen deposition and ammonia concentrations. This was noted to be considered in greater detail within the ES. Ammonia was requested to be included at scoping stage however ammonia results at each receptor are not presented. It is noted in Paragraph 5.2.3.20 of Appendix 5.2 Air Quality Assessment Methodology that the National</p>	<p>Reviewer statement, no response required.</p>	<p>Ammonia results at each receptor not presented and are requested to be.</p>

DCC response 31.08.2022	Applicant response 16.11.2022	DCC response 24.11.2022
Highways tool has been used to account for ammonia emissions impact on deposited nitrogen.		
There are nine designated ecological sites (Rokeby Park and Mortham Wood (ERIC LWS), Graham's Gill Jack-Wood Ancient Woodland, Steven Band Road Verge (NEYEDC LWS), Bowes Moor SSSI, North Pennine Moors SPA and SAC, Mill Wood Ancient Woodland, Thorsgill Wood Ancient Woodland) plus a number of Ancient Trees within 200m of the ARN within DCC, with reference to Figure 5.4. Results are not presented for all of these sites in Appendix 5.4, or transect locations shown in Figure 5.4.	Transect locations are shown in Environmental Statement Figure 5.1: Cumulative Zones of Influence (Document Reference 3.3, APP-144). Results are only presented where the predicted change in NOX exceeds 0.3µg/m3 (1% of the critical load). This is noted on all the sheets within Environmental Statement Figure 5.4: Air Quality Operational Phase Assessment (Document 3.3, APP-068). The reasoning is given in sections 5.5.7 to 5.5.9 of Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048).	The current version of DMRB LA 105 guidance does not require the consideration of NOX and annual mean NOx concentrations should not be used to screen whether or not impacts on designated ecological site are included in any air quality assessment, or not.
Rokeby Park and Mortham Wood LWS nitrogen deposition is predicted to increase by 13.7% against the critical load whilst North Pennine Moors SPA and SSSI and Bowes Moor SSSI have a maximum increase of 17.6% against the critical load. Stephen Bank Road Verge LWS experiences a beneficial change due to the scheme. No other results of designated sites in DCC are reported. Chapter 5 Air Quality notes that: "These changes cannot be considered to be insignificant as defined in DMRB LA 105. Further discussion of the impacts of the Project on nitrogen deposition at these locations is included in Chapter 6: Biodiversity (section 6.10 Assessment of Likely Significant Effects)". The Biodiversity chapter considers the impact to Rokeby Park and Mortham Wood LWS as slight adverse (not significant) effect. The impact to North Pennine Moors SPA and SSSI and Bowes Moor SSSI in the Biodiversity chapter notes that blanket bog is the only qualifying feature that may be impacted by changes in nitrogen deposition at this location and it is predicted that a slight adverse (not significant) effect would occur.	Reviewer statement, no response required.	Confirmation required that the blanket bog qualifying feature noted by the Biodiversity chapter has been assessed and reported.
<b>Given the poor RMSE derived from the verification exercise, discussion should be provided on how robust and reliable the results presented are, particularly in light of the impacts to designated ecological sites.</b>	Please refer to the response to item 14 (above).	See response in above points.

<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 24.11.2022</b>
There is no section in Chapter 5 Air Quality describing outcomes against relevant policies such as the County Durham Plan, other than NPSNN in Paragraph 5.10.84.	The outcomes relevant to regional and local are mapped in Table 5-3 in Chapter 5 Air Quality of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048)	No further comment.
The operational phase traffic data is noted to include traffic associated with other developments, therefore the air quality impact assessment is noted to be inherently cumulative.	Comment duly noted	No further comment.

## **Noise and Vibration**

DCC has no additional comments to make in relation to noise and vibration.

## **Climate**

DCC commissioned AECOM to provide comments on Climate chapter of the ES and these were included in the Council's RRs. AECOM has provided DCC with feedback on the responses provided by NH. AECOM's initial comments on the ES, the National Highways response, and AECOM's comments on their response is set out in table format below following the numbering system used by NH.

---

	<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 30.11.2022</b>
55	<p>Paragraph 7.5.15 states that the “assessment of operational phase emissions from vehicles using the highways infrastructure draws on existing traffic modelling information from earlier stages of the Project, as explained in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Application Document 3.8)”. This document does not seem to be available on the PINS website. The same paragraph states that “This information is used to calculate emissions... associated with the Traffic Reliability Area”. The chapter then goes on to list the scenarios for which user GHG emissions have been quantified.</p> <p>Can the applicant please confirm that the “traffic modelling information from earlier stages of the project” that has been used to quantify road-user GHG emissions is the correct traffic dataset to be defended at examination, and that this data is consistent with the traffic data used to inform the air quality assessment and noise assessment chapters of the ES? It is noted that the Air Quality chapter of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report was informed by a traffic dataset based on 2031, not the year of opening 2029.</p>	<p>Traffic data within the climate chapter aligns with the data used in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5: Air Quality (Document Reference 3.2, APP-048) as outlined in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 3.8, APP-237). Both assessments at PEIR were informed by traffic data for 2031, however this data was updated for the ES assessment for the 2029 opening year, and this updated data for 2029 forms the basis of the road user emissions quantification. Both assessments at PEIR were informed by traffic data for 2031, however this data was updated for the ES assessment for the 2029 opening year, and this updated data for 2029 forms the basis of the road user emissions quantification.</p>	<p>Confirmation of the traffic data set used to inform the calculation of road-user GHG emissions is welcomed. No further comment.</p>
56	<p>Can the applicant please provide details on how the Traffic Reliability Area (TRA) referred to was defined. We are interested to know whether or not the potential for climate change impacts was a consideration when the TRA was defined?</p> <p>Paragraph 7.6.5 states that the TRA “was determined based on the regional screening criteria set out in DMRB LA 105”.</p>	<p>The Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report Appendix C Transport Model Package (Document Reference 3.8, APP-239) discusses the TRA. Para 3.3.1 states:</p> <p><i>“The study area and the model’s geographical extent will include the same area as the PCF Stage 1 and 2 A66TM model, however, the Transport Reliability Area (TRA) has been extended further north and south at either end</i></p>	<p>It remains unclear why the ES referred to regional screening criteria – presumably in error. The use of local air quality criteria to determine the physical extent of TRA to determine an appropriate study area for greenhouse gas calculations is not directly linked to relevant guidance. Typically greenhouse gas study areas for</p>

	<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 30.11.2022</b>
	<p>DMRB LA 105 does not include regional screening criteria. Can the applicant confirm how the TRA was defined?</p>	<p><i>of the A66 along the M6 and A1(M). This has been revised considering impacts from the scheme identified within PCF Stage 2 forecasting”.</i></p> <p>The extent of the geographic zone included in the TRA is informed by the road link screening criteria noted in para 2.1 of DMRB LA 105 Air Quality, namely:  1) annual average daily traffic (AADT) <math>\geq 1,000</math>; or  2) heavy duty vehicle (HDV) AADT <math>\geq 200</math>; or  3) a change in speed band; or  4) a change in carriageway alignment by <math>\geq 5m</math>.  NOTE 1 The AADT and HDV criteria are applied to the sum of carriageways and not individual carriageways.  NOTE 2 The 1,000 vehicles and 200 HDVs represent the lowest threshold above which the traffic model can represent change in traffic conditions to a reasonable level of confidence.</p> <p>While these criteria support the definition of the physical extents of the TRA, they were not applied when identifying links within that geographic extent for the GHG assessment – i.e. all road links within the spatial extent of the TRA were included in the GHG assessment (but the air quality criteria supported definition of the outer boundary of the TRA).</p> <p>The TRA definition is provided in LA 105 and is provided within Table 5 of Environmental Statement Appendix 7.1: Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Document Reference 3.4, APP-176). This states the TRA reflects the widest road network the traffic modelling is considered verified /reliable. A more detailed discussion of the development of the TRA is provided in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report referred to above.</p>	<p>highways schemes are larger than TRAs to try and capture wider changes in routing that a scheme may cause, often the full extent of a traffic model is utilised for this task. Can National Highways review whether any changes in traffic and so greenhouse gas emissions are being missed and as such whether a realistic worst case is not being presented for the scheme.</p>
57	<p>Paragraph 7.5.15 and Table 5 of Appendix 7.1 confirm that Version 11 of the Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) published by Defra was used to quantify CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the road traffic dataset.</p>	<p>There was direct instruction from National Highways to use the speed band factors from the Emission Factors Toolkit v.11 from DEFRA. NH speed band tool version 4.2 was used which includes the EFT v11 emissions within it.</p>	<p>Confirmation is welcomed that the DMRB version of the EFT was utilised. No further comment</p>

	<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 30.11.2022</b>
	Can the applicant provide explanation as to why the National Highways version of the Emission Factor Toolkit (Version 4.3) was not used to quantify CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, given that the A66 project is a highways scheme and the use of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges methodologies elsewhere?		
58	<p>Paragraph 7.5.16 states that the “emissions drawn from the traffic modelling are provided in carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) not carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)”.</p> <p>Version 11 of the EFT published by Defra provides direct CO<sub>2</sub> tailpipe emissions and indirect CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from electric vehicle charging. Can the applicant confirm whether or not the road-user GHG values reported in Chapter 7 and Appendix 7.1 of the ES include the indirect CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, as well as tailpipe emissions.</p>	The road user GHG calculation includes emissions associated with electric vehicles within the speed band calculations and as such are included in the total emissions reported in the ES (Document Reference 3.2, APP-044 to 059).	Confirmation is welcomed. No further comment
59	<p>Table 7-10 of Chapter 7 presents the annual road-user CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions for the 2019 baseline, 2029 Do-Minimum (opening year without the proposed scheme) and 2044 Do-Minimum (future year without the proposed scheme) scenarios, as well as Do-Minimum CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions over a 60-year appraisal period. Table 7-23 of Chapter 7 presents the equivalent, but for the Do-Something (opening and future years with the proposed scheme). Table 7-23 also provides the changes between Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios. Table 4 of Appendix 7.1 provides “operational emissions” associated with “vehicles using the highway infrastructure” for Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios.</p> <p>The operational values provided for the Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios, and the difference between Do-Minimum and Do-Something values reported in Table 4 of Appendix 7.1 do not match those reported in Table 7-10 and Table 7-23 within Chapter 7. Can the applicant provide clarity on why the values reported in Table 4 of Appendix 7.1 differ from the road-user values reported in Chapter 7 of the ES?</p>	Table 4 in Environmental Statement Appendix 7.1: Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Document Reference 3.4, APP-176) has the incorrect values for Operation emissions from Road Vehicles (B9). The correct values are presented in the main ES chapter in Table 7.10 and 7.23.	Noted. No further comment.

	<b>DCC response 31.08.2022</b>	<b>Applicant response 16.11.2022</b>	<b>DCC response 30.11.2022</b>
60	Nowhere within Chapter 7 or Appendix 7.1 does there appear to be reference to vehicle kilometres travelled. Vehicle kilometres travelled is a useful metric to provide context for changing GHG emissions. It would be useful if the applicant could provide the vehicle kilometres travelled for the scenarios reported in Table 7-10 and Table 7-23 of Chapter 7 and Table 4 of Appendix 7.1.	Chapter 5.6 in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 3.8, APP-237) discusses the overall change in modelled vehicle distance both with and without the Project. The network performance statistics are based on assigned traffic in the SATURN assignment model. Tables 5-26 to 5-31 of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (Document Reference 3.8, APP-237) show the network statistic scenario values including modelled travel time, distance, speed and total trips. The Report found that the inclusion of the Project increases total distance travelled (by all modelled vehicles) marginally as drivers are prepared to travel further to take advantage of the increased speed and reliability as a result of the links provided by the Project.	It would have been useful for the response to provide the vehicle kilometres travelled that relate specifically to the road-user GHG calculations in terms of scenario, study area and fleet mix. Whilst Document Reference 3.8, APP-237 does appear to provide a lot of useful information, it does not appear to provide vehicle kilometres travelled values directly relating to the road-user GHG numbers reported in Chapter 7 or Appendix 7.1. If it does, please provide reference to the appropriate section and table.  The additional information provided as to why road-user GHG emissions increase as a result of the scheme in operation is welcomed.

## **Development Plan Policy for County Durham**

DCC has no additional comments to make. Policy compliance is considered in DCC's Local Impact Report.