

Ref: TR010062

Mr Richard Allen (Lead Panel Member for the Examining Authority)
c/o Bart Bartkowiak (Case Manager)
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Directorate
Temple Quay House, Temple Quay
Bristol - BS1 6PN

Monica Corso Griffiths A66 Head of Design and DCO 5<sup>th</sup> Floor 3 Piccadilly Place Manchester M1 3BN

14 February 2023

Sent by email to:

A66Dualling@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Mr Allen,

A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project: Application for Development Consent ("DCO application")

## Submission made by the Applicant at Deadline 4

Further to the Rule 8 letter dated 8 December 2022, please find below a list of documents which form part of the Applicant's submission at Deadline 4 of the Examination of the DCO application:

**1.** Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions (Document Reference 7.24).

## **Additional Submissions**

As discussed at the first round of hearings and/or confirmed by the Applicant at Deadline 1,2 and/or 3, and/or submitted in response to comments made by Interested Parties, the following other documents are also submitted and comprise the remainder of the Applicant's submission at Deadline 4. We have outlined in the table below a brief summary of the reason for the submission in each case:

| Document<br>Reference | Document Title               | Reason for Submission  |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1.7 (Rev 4)           | Application Document Tracker | An updated version of the Application Document Tracker submitted at Deadline 3 to reflect the status of documents at Deadline 4. |



| 2.7 (Rev 2) | Environmental Management Plan<br>Annex C3 Scheduled Monuments | It was identified in Historic                                   |
|-------------|---|---|
|             | Method Statement (Clean)                                      | England's Written Representation submitted at Deadline 1 (REP1- |
| 2.7 (Rev 2) | Environmental Management Plan                                 | 026, Appendix 3) that the                                       |
| 2.7 (100 2) | Annex C3 Scheduled Monuments                                  | scheduled monument known as                                     |
|             | Method Statement (Tracked)                                    | Brougham Fort is conflated with                                 |
|             | member etatement (Traenea)                                    | another scheduled monument                                      |
|             |   | known as "Settlement 1/3 mile                                   |
|             |   | (540m) ENE of Brougham  |
|             |   | Castle". Revision 1 of the Annex                                |
|             |   | C3 Scheduled Monuments  |
|             |   | Method Statement referred to                                    |
|             |   | both as 'Brougham Roman fort                                    |
|             |   | (Brocavum) and civil settlement                                 |
|             |   | and Brougham Castle" and these                                  |
|             |   | were given record number 02-                                    |
|             |   | 0002.   |
|             |   | This document has therefore                                     |
|             |   | been updated in Revision 2 to                                   |
|             |   | reflect that these are two                                      |
| 2.2 (Day 2) | Figure and all Chatages and Figure                            | separate scheduled monuments.                                   |
| 3.3 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Figure                                | This revision is submitted to                                   |
|             | 10.9 Viewpoint Photomontages                                  | address a point raised by the Friends of the Lake District who  |
|             |   | identified in their written                                     |
|             |   | representation submitted at                                     |
|             |   | Deadline 1 (REP1-067) that                                      |
|             |   | Photomontage 4.7A had not been                                  |
|             |   | included. This Figure has                                       |
|             |   | therefore been updated in                                       |
|             |   | Revision 2 to include this                                      |
|             |   | photomontage. Importantly, this                                 |
|             |   | does not affect the assessment.                                 |
|             |   | Photomontage 4.7A has been                                      |
|             |   | provided to demonstrate the                                     |
|             |   | mitigation effects of the landform,                             |
|             |   | effectively screening the junction                              |
|             |   | close to the British Gypsum                                     |
|             |   | Works from Sandersons Croft.                                    |
|             |   | This is a Type 3 Visualisation as                               |
| 1           |   | I the echeme model is hidden by                                 |
|             |   | the scheme model is hidden by the landform.                     |



| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix 5.4 Air Quality Assessment Results (Clean)   | After the submission of the Chapter 5 Air Quality Assessment with the DCO application, an   |
|-------------|---|---|
| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix 5.4 Air Quality Assessment Results (Tracked) | error was identified within the ES Appendix 5.4 AQ Assessment Results. The error related to the incorrect transposition of data from the construction phase modelling results calculations into the final summary reporting tables. This correction has no material impact on the assessment and the overall conclusions remain unchanged. In their Written Representation (REP1-021), Durham County Council also requested to see the NOx concentrations at the ecological receptors, to identify how the receptors for nitrogen deposition levels had been screened. This has been added in the two new tables shown in the revised document. |
| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix<br>8.10 Impact Assessment Table<br>(Clean)   | Historic England identified that the asset counts did not match the numbers in the headline text  |
| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix<br>8.10 Impact Assessment Table<br>(Tracked) | of Revision 1 of this document. The Applicant reviewed the numbers and provided Historic England with revised headline counts to assist the preparation of their Written Representation, and which were referenced in Historic England's Written Representation (REP1-026) submitted at Deadline 1. The Applicant has therefore made this correction in Revision 2 of Appendix 8.10 submitted at Deadline 4 to ensure the correct headline counts are reflected in the submission   |



|             |                                    | do ou mo o mto i limpo o mto in the it |
|-------------|------------------------------------|--|
|             |                                    | documents. Importantly, the            |
|             |                                    | content of the tables remains          |
| 2.4(5.2)    |                                    | correct.                               |
| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix   | Submitted following the                |
|             | 10.6 Schedule of Visual Effects    | Applicant's commitment stated in       |
|             | (Clean)                            | 7.8 Applicant's Response to            |
| 3.4 (Rev 2) | Environmental Statement Appendix   | Written Representations made by        |
|             | 10.6 Schedule of Visual Effects    | other Interested Parties at            |
|             | (Tracked)                          | Deadline 1 (REP2-017),                 |
|             |                                    | submitted at Deadline 2, and to        |
|             |                                    | now include the assessment of          |
|             |                                    | Viewpoint 4.22.                        |
| 7.25        | Tree Loss and Compensation         | Submitted following the                |
|             | Planting Report                    | Applicant's commitment stated in       |
|             | <u> </u>                           | 7.3 Issue Specific Hearing 2 ISH2      |
|             |                                    | Post Hearing Submissions               |
|             |                                    | (including written submissions of      |
|             |                                    | oral case) (REP1-009), as              |
|             |                                    | outlined under Agenda Item 3.5.        |
| 7.26        | Statement of Significance of Human | Submitted following the                |
| 7.20        | Health Effects                     | Applicant's commitment stated in       |
|             | Ticaliti Elicots                   | 7.9 Applicant's Comments on            |
|             |                                    | Local Impact Report (REP2-             |
|             |                                    | 018),submitted at Deadline 2, in       |
|             |                                    | which it was identified under          |
|             |                                    |  |
|             |                                    | Section 2.8 that the Human             |
|             |                                    | Health aspect of the assessment        |
|             |                                    | in Chapter 13 of the                   |
|             |                                    | Environmental Statement did not        |
|             |                                    | assess the likely significant          |
|             |                                    | effects (as per DMRB LA 112).          |
|             |                                    | The findings of the                    |
|             |                                    | Supplementary Statement do not         |
|             |                                    | alter the assessment findings or       |
|             |                                    | mitigation requirements outlined       |
|             |                                    | in the Environmental Statement.        |
| 7.27        | Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 | The Applicant has reviewed the         |
|             | Submissions                        | submissions made by Interested         |
|             |                                    | Parties at Deadline 3 and has          |
|             |                                    | responded to those submissions         |
|             |                                    | where new matters have been            |
|             |                                    | raised or where clarification of a     |
| L           |                                    |  |



|      |                                  | point would be beneficial. Where  |
|------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|      |                                  | a matter has been addressed       |
|      |                                  | previously it is not responded to |
|      |                                  | in the document.                  |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations Technical | Submitted following the           |
|      | Note                             | Applicant's commitment stated in  |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations: View A   | the Applicant's Deadline 1        |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations: View B   | Submission – 7.3 Issue Specific   |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations: View D   | Hearing 2 (ISH2) Post Hearing     |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations: View E   | Submissions (including written    |
| 7.28 | Viaduct Visualisations: View F   | submissions of oral case) (REP1-  |
|      |                                  | 009), as outlined under Agenda    |
|      |                                  | Item 3.1. To clarify, please note |
|      |                                  | that Viewpoint C has now been     |
|      |                                  | removed, please refer to the      |
|      |                                  | Viaduct Visualisations Technical  |
|      |                                  | Note for further details.         |

If you have any queries, please do contact me at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,



Monica Corso Griffiths Head of Design and DCO A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project

Email: A66NTP@nationalhighways.co.uk

Tel:

