

Scheme 6: A66 Dualling project Appleby – Brough section

Reply to NH response, Examination Library Reference REP1-087

I note from NH Post Hearing Submission (REP1-006) that In relation to the MoD land, Ms Corso Griffiths outlined that while the promoted route does involve incursions onto MoD land, the impact of the incursion in relation to the central section has been discussed with the DIO (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) on behalf of the MoD, who recognise that the proposal as presented in the application minimises the impact on MOD's operations.

I accept Ms Corso Griffith's explanation that land further north of the incursion into the central section has wider operational and land implications for MoD and DIO as well as substantial AONB incursion.

However, I am not convinced that adequate consideration has been given to the merits of moving the suggested alignment of the new A66 northwards in the eastern section of scheme 6 in the area covered by Sheets 4 & 5 of the General Arrangements Drawings (APP-014). This is not to suggest a 'northern route' taking a wide sweep into the AONB, but to ask again for a look at continuing the incursion into the AONB from the areas covered by Sheet 4 continuing into the area covered by Sheet 5. Also to ask why in the area covered by Sheet 4 the new A66 has not utilised the 'old' A66 for the northern carriageway so that what is now shown as the new A66 southern carriageway is not utilised as the new 'B' road giving local access, which could then be continued into the area of Sheet 5, thus simplifying several access arrangements.

The current scheme requires the old A66 to be rebuilt in one section in the area covered by Sheet 4, and for a narrow strip of the AONB to be utilised for this, so why has this not been continued? All the reasons given for the incursion into the AONB and for the need to discuss land acquisition with DIO are equally valid as the road continues eastward towards Brough, especially as there is far less MOD infrastructure in this next section. In addition, if the engineering maps are consulted (APP-329, sheet 5 of 15, sheet 6 of 15) it can be seen that the variations in gradient and the embankments/ cutting required are significant; it is possible that the land immediately to the north of the old A66 in the eastern section offers a simpler option.

Incidentally, the 'orange' route which was offered as an alternative to the 'black' route was not the same as the suggestions above, which have not at any time been offered for consultation. It seems to me that once it became clear that some incursion was necessary, and the case for doing so was developed so that it is capable of agreement, a more cohesive plan for the whole of this section should have been considered, looking at the land immediately to the north of the old A66, especially given that numerous amendments are now being suggested in order to mitigate the problems arising from the original development plan.

In summary, I am not yet convinced that the response I received in pages 5-10 PDL11 adequately addresses my questions above, neither does the Post-Hearing Submission (REP1-006) Agenda item 2.2 fully explain why no alternative route north of the existing A66 with a small incursion into the land owned by the MOD and into the AONB in the eastern section of Scheme 6 was properly considered, especially as so many reasons, which are equally valid in this section, have been given as to why the promoted route must do so in other places.