

A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project

TR010062

8.2 Change Application: Consultation Report

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 8

24 March 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure)
Rules 2010**

A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project
Development Consent Order 202x

8.2 CHANGE APPLICATION: CONSULTATION REPORT

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010062
Application Document Reference	8.2
Author:	A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Team, National Highways

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 1	24 March 2023	Change Application

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Approach to consultation and engagement on the Change Application	3
3.	Consultation Responses and Feedback	17
4.	Conclusion	67

APPENDIX A: List of Persons Consulted

APPENDIX B: Press Notices

APPENDIX C: Notices and covering letter sent to consultees

APPENDIX D: Site notices, location plan and photographic evidence

APPENDIX E: National Highways website promotion of the Proposed Changes

APPENDIX F: Social Media Promotion of the Proposed Changes

APPENDIX G: Consultation responses received by the Applicant

APPENDIX H: Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

- 1.1.1. This Consultation Report (the “Report”) relates to an application (“the Change Application”) being submitted by National Highways (“the Applicant”) to the Secretary of State for Transport (through the Planning Inspectorate) for proposed changes to an application for a development consent order (“DCO”) under the Planning Act 2008. The application for development consent (“the DCO Application”) for the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 19 July 2022. The examination commenced on 29 November 2022 and is currently underway.
- 1.1.2. If made by the Secretary of State for Transport, the DCO would grant development consent for the Applicant to construct, operate and maintain a high quality dual two-lane carriageway between M6 junction 40 at Penrith and A1(M) at Scotch Corner, and which is referred to in the DCO Application as the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project (“the Project”).
- 1.1.3. Since the DCO Application for the Project was submitted, the Applicant has continued to engage and negotiate with a range of stakeholders including those identified by Section 42(1) of the Planning Act 2008. This has included those with an interest in land affected by the Project (including those with an interest in land which is proposed to be subject to powers of compulsory acquisition (“Affected Persons”)) and with other Interested Parties, such as Cumbria County Council, Eden District Council, Durham County Council, North Yorkshire County Council and Richmondshire District Council in their capacity as the hosting authorities, and with statutory environmental bodies.
- 1.1.4. As a result of the Applicant’s ongoing engagement and negotiations, the Applicant consulted on 32 potential proposed changes to the DCO Application between 28 January to 27 February 2023. Details of those proposed changes subject to the consultation are set out in the Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure at Appendix H of this Report.
- 1.1.5. This Report supports the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1) that the Applicant has submitted to the Examining Authority (“the ExA”) (appointed by the Planning Inspectorate) to accept into the examination of the DCO Application (TR010062) for the Project.

1.2. Purpose of this document

- 1.2.1. This Report supports the Change Application by providing information on the proposed changes consultation, in that it sets out:
 - the consultation carried out in respect of the proposed changes, including justification for the scope and approach of that consultation;
 - the responses received to the consultation; and

- how the Applicant has had regard to the responses received and how they have informed the Change Application that has been submitted, including proposed changes that are not being taken forward.

- 1.2.2. The Applicant's objective, in compiling this Report and in consulting on the proposed changes, has been to ensure that the ExA and interested parties are provided with evidence that the Applicant has carried out appropriate and proportionate consultation in relation to the changes and that responses received have been considered in compiling the Change Application. This is in line with consultation guidance in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 16 (Version 3 March 2023) ("AN16"): *Requests to change applications after they have been accepted for examination.*
- 1.2.3. This Report supports the case to enable the ExA to decide on whether the proposed changes may be accepted for inclusion in the examination of the DCO Application. Should the ExA require any further information in support of this request, the Applicant will endeavour to provide it as soon as possible in response to any request for such information.
- 1.2.4. The Change Application (Document Reference 8.2) provides full details on the background to the changes, explaining exactly what changes are proposed and why they are needed. Furthermore, an Environmental Assessment "Addendum" document (forming part of the Change Application) sets out the findings of additional environmental assessment work in the context of the assessment reported in the Environmental Statement ("ES") which was submitted as part of the DCO Application ("the original ES").

2. Approach to consultation and engagement on the Change Application

2.1. Overview

2.1.1. This section of the Report sets out the Applicant's approach to the consultation and engagement activities related to the Change Application.

2.1.2. It provides details of the following:

- A review of relevant legislation and guidance underpinning the Applicant's approach to the consultation process (Section 2.2);
- When the proposed changes consultation took place (Section 2.3);
- Who the Applicant consulted as part of the proposed changes consultation (Section 2.4); and
- How the Applicant undertook the proposed changes consultation (Section 2.5).

2.2. Legislation and guidance

Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of application for development consent

2.2.1. The Applicant has had regard to paragraphs 109 to 115, Changing an application post acceptance of the 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent' (DCLG, March 2015) (the "Examination Guidance") during the proposed changes consultation process. The Applicant also notes that at paragraph 109 the Examination Guidance states that "*the Government recognises that there are occasions when applicants may need to make material changes to a proposal after an application has been accepted for examination*" and that this is the case here.

2.2.2. Paragraph 113 of the Examination Guidance notes that "*in considering a proposed material change to an application and before making a procedural decision about whether and how to examine the changed application, the ExA will need to ensure it is able to act reasonably and fairly, in accordance with the principles of natural justice and in doing so, there will be a number of factors to consider such as:*

- *whether the application (as changed) is still of a sufficient standard for examination;*
- *whether sufficient consultation on the changed application can be undertaken to allow for the examination to be completed within the statutory timetable of 6 months; and*

- whether any other procedural requirements can still be met.”
- 2.2.3. The natural justice point refers specifically to the *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1982) 43 p & CR 233, where it was held that anyone affected by amended proposals should be provided with a fair opportunity to have their views on those amendments heard and properly taken into account. This principle has informed the Applicant’s approach to the proposed changes consultation, which has sought to provide an opportunity for all those potentially affected to be informed and comment about the proposals, and for those comments to be taken into account.
- 2.2.4. Paragraph 114 of the Examination Guidance goes on to state that “*It is expected that applicants will discuss the implications of any changes they wish to make with relevant statutory consultees and notify the Examining Authority at the earliest opportunity. This should allow the Examining Authority to accommodate any appropriate consultation on the change within the six-month examination period.*”
- 2.2.5. The Applicant notified the ExA about the likelihood of an application for proposed changes being submitted at the Preliminary Meeting held on 29 November 2022. Furthermore, the following correspondence between the Applicant and the ExA has informed the approach to the consultation about changes and the Change Application:
- Letter from Applicant to the ExA on 16 December 2022 informing the ExA of its intention to submit a request for proposed changes to the DCO Application (the “Change Notification Letter”) (REP1-008)
 - Rule 9 Letter from ExA on 6 January 2023 (PD-008)
 - Letter from Applicant to the ExA on 17 January 2023 setting out planned consultation dates (REP2-042)
 - Rule 9 Letter from ExA on 26 January 2023 (PD-009)
- 2.2.6. The advice received from the ExA has informed the Applicant’s approach to the consultation.

[Advice Note Sixteen: Requests to change applications after they have been accepted for examination \(Planning Inspectorate, March 2023 Version 3\)](#)

- 2.2.7. The purpose of the Advice Note is to provide information to applicants about how to request a material change to an application after it has been accepted and before the close of the Examination.
- 2.2.8. Figure 1 of the AN16 provides a summary of how to make a request to make a change to an accepted DCO application with a process of six steps. These are:
- Step 1 Applicant decides to request a change to an application which has already been accepted for examination and informs the ExA in writing*

(the Change Notification), including the relevant information set out in Figure 2.

Step 2 ExA provides advice to the Applicant about the procedural implications of the proposed change and about the need, scale and nature of consultation that the Applicant may need to undertake.

Step 3 To the appropriate extent, the Applicant carries out consultation about the proposed change. This step may be initiated earlier in order to potentially save time and inform the Applicant's approach.

Step 4 Applicant makes formal request to the ExA to change the application (the Change Application) by providing the relevant information set out in Figure 2.

Step 5 ExA makes a Procedural Decision on whether or not to accept and examine the changed application, and confirms how it will be examined.

Step 6 Where the ExA has decided that the changed application can be examined, the examination proceeds in consideration of the changed application. Where the ExA has decided that the changed application cannot be examined, the Applicant will need to decide how to proceed (see paragraph 2.1 of this Advice Note).

- 2.2.9. The ExA has confirmed that the Applicant's Change Notification Letter (see paragraph 2.2.5 above) constitutes Step 1 and has also confirmed that its Rule 9 Letter to the Applicant dated 6 January 2023 (PD-008) constitutes Step 2 and the ExA is content with the nature and extent of the consultation proposed. This Report documents this consultation process, as required by Step 3, and provides the material required as part of Step 4 of the process. It should be noted that as at the dates of the letters discussed in this paragraph, version 2 of AN16 was in force, but the Applicant considers that the revisions to these steps as set out in version 3 do not alter the position reached as a result of these letters.
- 2.2.10. Figure 2b of the Planning Inspectorate's AN16 sets out the information to include in a Change Application to make a change to an application after it has been accepted for examination. Of relevance to this Report and the consultation process are the following points:
- 6. If the proposed change results in any new or different likely significant environmental effects, provision of other environmental information and confirmation that:*
- A. the effects have been adequately assessed and that the environmental information has been subject to publicity. Whilst not statutorily required, the publicity should reflect the requirements of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and applicants should also submit copies of any representations received in response to this publicity with the change request.*
 - B. any consultation bodies who might have an interest in the proposed changes have been consulted (reflecting the requirements of the EIA*

Regulations). Applicants should submit copies of any responses received from consultation bodies with the Change Application. Applicants should identify those consultation bodies who were consulted on the proposed changes but not on the original application.

7. Where consultation has been carried out (either voluntarily, at the direction of the ExA or pursuant to the requirements of the CA Regulations) a Consultation Report must be provided. The Consultation Report must confirm who has been consulted in relation to the proposed change, explain why they have been consulted, and include the Applicant's consideration of the content of the consultation responses received. Copies of any consultation responses received by an applicant should also be included in the Consultation Report as an annex.

- 2.2.11. Consultation and publicity has been undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations (see sections 2.4.3 and 2.5.3 of this Report for more information).
- 2.2.12. Paragraph 2.3 of AN16 emphasises the need to provide an opportunity to comment in regard to all changes, stating: *"In the interests of fairness, it will normally be necessary for applicants to consult on a proposed change to an application. The ExA will advise the Applicant about the need, scale and nature of consultation that may need to be undertaken in response to the Applicant's Change Notification (see paragraph 3.2 of this Advice Note)".* The proposed changes consultation included 32 changes, some of which the Applicant considered likely to be material and the majority of which the Applicant considered to be non-material. The proposed changes consultation process included the same approach to the consultation methods and activities for all of the changes that have been included, with one consultation process that detailed all 32 proposed changes. Feedback was invited via the same channels on all changes.
- 2.2.13. Paragraph 3.3 of AN16 sets out that *"...Before making any Change Application (see Step 4 of Figure 1) the Applicant should have carefully considered the need to consult on the proposed change, taking account of any procedural advice provided by the ExA in response to the Change Notification (see Step 2 of Figure 1) and the provisions of the CA Regulations. The ExA will provide advice about who it considers should be consulted, but as a starting point the Inspectorate recommends that applicants should consult all those persons prescribed in the PA2008 under section 42 (a) to (d) who would be affected by the proposed change (giving a minimum of 28 days from the receipt of the information for responses). If a targeted approach to the identification of those affected by the request to change the application is adopted then detailed justification should be provided why it is deemed unnecessary to consult all of the prescribed persons ...".* Section 2.4 of this Report details who was consulted directly on the proposed changes, included those identified under Section 42 (1)(a) to (d). Appendix A to this Report sets out all those consulted as defined by Section 42(a), (b) and (d) of the Planning Act 2008. The approach to following the Compulsory Acquisition Regulations is set out in paragraph 2.2.18.

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations)

- 2.2.14. Whilst not a strict statutory requirement, environmental information that forms part of the Change Application should be subject to publicity in a way that reflects the requirements of the EIA Regulations (AN16, Figure 2b, paragraph 6A) and that consultation bodies who might have an interest in the proposed changes have been consulted (again, in a way that reflects the EIA Regulations).
- 2.2.15. National Highways assessed each of the proposed changes in the context of the likely significant environmental effects previously reported in the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the DCO application, to ascertain whether any of the proposed changes, either individually or cumulatively, would give rise to any new or different likely significant effects, beyond those previously reported in the Environmental Statement. The outcome of this work for each proposed change comprised the environmental information which National Highways consulted on. This information is included in the Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure that is provided in Appendix H of this Statement.
- 2.2.16. The environmental information which forms part of the Change Application refines, develops and verifies the information previously consulted on, and largely reflects the conclusions presented during the consultation process. As such, consultees have been given a chance to comment on these conclusions in line with the EIA Regulations. It is therefore considered that the environmental information forming part of the Change Application has been adequately publicised and consulted on.
- 2.2.17. In line with the guidance in AN16, any consultation bodies¹ which might have an interest in the proposed changes have been notified in a way which reflects EIA Regulations. As a result, the Applicant set a deadline for receipt of responses being not less than 30 days following the date on which the notice is last published (Regulation 20(3) of the EIA Regulations)). Further details are set out in section 2.4.3 and 2.5.3 of this Report.

The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 (the CA Regulations)

- 2.2.18. The Applicant reviewed whether notices were required for the proposed changes, in particular in relation to Regulations 7 and 8 of the CA Regulations for compulsory acquisition of the additional land. The ExA's Response to the Applicant's Response to the Rule 9 Letter (PD-009) advised that the Applicant was required to carry-out the non-statutory

¹ As defined by Regulation 3 (1) (a), (b) and (c) of the EIA Regulations the consultation bodies, in regard to the Project, are defined by Schedule 1 to the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) and the local authorities defined by Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008.

consultation before a written material change request was made. On this basis, formal notice under the CA Regulations was not required as part of this consultation.

Examining Authority Rule 9 letters

- 2.2.19. The ExA's Rule 9 letter to the Applicant dated 6 January 2023 (PD-008) recommended, reflecting the requirements of point 7 of Figure 3 of AN16, that the Applicant submits a Consultation Statement confirming who has been consulted in relation to the proposed changes. AN16 was updated after the Rule 9 letter had been issued, and this reference should now relate to point 7 of Figure 2b (see section 2.2.10).
- 2.2.20. In seeking to accommodate the procedure and timescales stipulated in both ExA's Rule 9 letters (PD-008 and PD-009), the Applicant set timescales for the proposed changes consultation including:
- the consultation on the proposed changes to run from Saturday 28 January to 11:59pm on Monday 27 February 2023, allowing a 31-day consultation period (to accommodate the requirements of the EIA Regulations) and time for the Applicant to address all of the requirements associated with the subsequent production of a consultation report in accordance with the Inspectorate's AN16 and having regard to the related requests made in the ExA's Rule 9 letter; and
 - the Applicant's Change Application (including this Report) to be submitted after the consultation is concluded to provide a complete package of information for the ExA to make its timely decision and also to allow the Applicant the opportunity to review comments received and make any necessary changes before submission.

Best Practice guidance and principles of approach

- 2.2.21. National Highways approach to consultation and engagement is underpinned by the Government's Consultation Principles (Cabinet Office, 2018) which explains that consultation is only one part of the engagement, which should be an ongoing, two-way process. The importance of front-loading engagement with key stakeholders and local communities is recognised as well as the need for continued discussions throughout design development. National Highways has therefore engaged with stakeholders throughout the development of the Project, up to the Project's DCO Application in June 2022, post submission of the DCO Application and through the Examination process. Consultation on the proposed changes is an extension of that activity.
- 2.2.22. This approach has enabled National Highways to fully consider matters identified by those directly impacted or with an interest in the proposals, throughout the development of the Project. Our ongoing discussions with

stakeholders have, in part, shaped the design changes proposed set out in this consultation.

- 2.2.23. National Highways adopted an inclusive and generous consultation approach to ensure that they did not preclude the opportunity for comments from all persons and parties who would have wanted the opportunity to comment on a change to the submitted DCO application, or on a proposed change itself. This is in line with paragraph 2.3 of AN16.

2.3. When was the Proposed Changes Consultation held?

- 2.3.1. The Applicant carried out a consultation in accordance with the legislation and guidance set out above, on the following proportionate basis:

- A consultation period running from **28 January 2023 to 11:59pm on 27 February 2023**, allowing consultees a period (exceeding 30 days) within which to consider the Applicant's Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure (Appendix H).
- A deadline for **receipt of responses to be submitted to the Applicant was published as 11:59pm on 27 February 2023**.

- 2.3.2. The proposed changes consultation was held for 31 days which encompassed the statutory period of 30 days and had an allowance to account for hard copies arriving by post. As nearly all consultees have been engaged by the Project in previous stages, and with prior notice of the consultation commencing, the Applicant considers the 31-day consultation period to be a proportionate and adequate amount of time for consideration of the consultation material and for the submission of a response.

2.4. Who was consulted on the Proposed Changes?

- 2.4.1. In satisfaction of the request made in the ExA's Rule 9 letter and in accordance with AN16 and the EIA Regulations, the proposed changes consultation included consultation with the following groups of consultees.

Prescribed consultees

- 2.4.2. All persons identified in the Planning Act 2008 ("the 2008 Act") under section 42(1)(a) to (d) who would be affected by the proposed changes, including any section 42 persons not originally consulted on the DCO Application but who may now be affected by the proposed changes. In addition, the Applicant has also had regard to whether or not there may be any persons who may be affected by the proposed changes but who are not yet participating in the Examination of the DCO Application and identified as an interested party.

- **Section 42(1)(a)** consultees are those prescribed persons defined in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Application: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations

2009 ("APFP Regulations"). All of those consultees prescribed under Section 42(1)(a) were consulted, as set out in Appendix A to this Report. National Highways consulted all such prescribed parties, not just those that the proposed changes are relevant to/and or affected by.

- **Section 42(1)(b)** consultees are the local authorities, as defined in section 43 of the 2008 Act. National Highways consulted all the relevant local authorities, as set out in Appendix A to this Report.
- **Section 42(1)(d)** are persons within one or more of the categories set out in section 44 of the 2008 Act. All Affected Persons within the existing DCO limits, plus the additional new landowners that could be impacted by the proposed changes, were consulted. To take a proportionate approach, the only exception to this were those persons within the DCO Order limits of Schemes 8 and 11 where there were no changes proposed within the DCO Order limits of these schemes. See Section 5 of Appendix A to this Report for a list of Affected Persons consulted as part of this consultation.

EIA Consultees

- 2.4.3. Regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations defines 'consultation bodies' as those defined by Schedule 1 of the APFP Regulations and local authorities defined by Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008. These consultees are therefore captured in the Prescribed Consultees noted above².

Local communities, interest groups and the wider public

- 2.4.4. Local communities, including those deemed to be within the vicinity of the land concerned, were consulted. This included those living within 2.5km of the areas to be dualled along the entire length between Penrith and Scotch Corner (see maps in section 3 of Appendix A).
- 2.4.5. The proposed changes consultation was open to all including the wider public and various outreach methods were utilised to invite participation in the consultation (see Table 1).
- 2.4.6. National Highways also emailed to our Community Liaison Group members and held an awareness raising sessions with them on 23 January 2023.
- 2.4.7. The A66 NTP Project runs a series of focus groups: environmental interest; emergency and public services; business, freight and ports and walking, cycling and horse riding. The focus groups were also notified

² It should be noted that no person has been notified to the applicant under regulation 11(1)(c) of the EIA Regulations, meaning no such person was consulted at the same time as the 'consultation bodies'

about the consultation by email. This was followed up with an online session (2 February 2023) for the project team to explain the proposed changes and answer their feedback.

2.5. How the Applicant consulted on the proposed changes

2.5.1. A range of consultation techniques were used that reflect the consultee types, the requirements of the consultation (including under the EIA Regulations) and best practice methods to support an inclusive approach.

Publicity of the Change Application

2.5.2. The Applicant used several methods as listed in the table below to raise awareness of the Change Application and provide an opportunity for all to respond. These methods reflected the requirements of Regulation 20 of the EIA Regulations (e.g. in respect of the publication of a formal notice in certain newspapers).

Table 1: Publicity of the Change Application

Publicity of the Change Application	Information provided	Date
Notices in newspapers	Formal notice of the consultation in two national and five local newspapers. Details within Appendix B.	Posted for two successive weeks before the start of the consultation. Schedule in Appendix B.
Site notices	Formal notice of the consultation placed on site in and around the proposed changes. The same locations were used from previous stages of the Project. Details within Appendix D.	In place by the 27 January and maintained during the consultation period.
Posters	Poster setting out the principle of the consultation, the consultation period and the drop-in events, deposit points and contact details for the team were displayed in local venues including the event locations. See Appendix A – section 4.	Posters sent out 13 February 2023, to arrive at local venues and displayed 15/16 February 2023.
National Highways website and social media pages	Promotion of the consultation on the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project web page. This also contained a link to the Citizenspace web page which allowed members of the public to leave their feedback digitally. The pages featured in other promotions including a press release and project specific social media. There was a total of 14 social media posts (seven on Twitter and seven on Facebook, with the announcement video being viewed over 3,600 times) on project specific feeds, raising awareness and encouraging people to have their say. Details in Appendix E and F.	Posts in the lead up to, during and at the end of the consultation (19 January to 27 February 2023)

Publicity of the Change Application	Information provided	Date
Press release	Promotion of the consultation for the proposed design changes in national and local publications	News & Star / The Cumberland News 18 January ³ and 1 February 2023 ⁴ BBC ⁵ and ITV ⁶ websites 30 January 2023 New Civil Engineer 18 January 2023 ⁷

Prescribed consultees and EIA Consultees

- 2.5.3. All prescribed consultees and consultation bodies under the EIA Regulations were issued a covering letter enclosing a formal notice of the consultation reflecting the requirements of Regulation 20 of the EIA Regulations. The letter also enclosed a summary of the proposed changes. Appendix C includes a copy of the letter and the enclosed documents.
- 2.5.4. This covering letter was issued on 28 January 2023 titled: Notification of Consultation on Proposed Changes to an Accepted Development Consent Order Application: The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). The letter was sent to the consultees listed in Sections 1, 2 and 5 of Appendix A to this Report.
- 2.5.5. In addition to the written notifications, the Applicant delivered presentations (via Teams online) to the Local Authorities and Strategic Environmental Bodies on 10 and 11 January 2023. These presentations outlined the changes and the methods for consultation.
- 2.5.6. The Applicant also sent an email to all land agents including links to the proposed changes consultation website on 13 January 2023.

Local communities, interest groups and the wider public

- 2.5.7. A leaflet was sent out on 12 January 2023 to approximately 15,000 consultees that lived within 2.5km of the areas to be dualled along the entire length between Penrith and Scotch Corner (see maps in section 3, Appendix A). The Applicant has also utilised various other channels to communicate the consultation more widely to the communities most impacted and to those with a specific interest in the change. This includes members of our focus groups for example, walking, cycling and horse riding (WCH) groups where their provision is amended compared to the DCO Application (see paragraph 2.4 above).

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

2.5.8. The Applicant also conducted sessions with the Project’s Community Liaison Groups on 23 January 2023 to raise awareness of the commencement of the proposed changes consultation and explain the proposed changes relevant to their local area.

Public Consultation Events

2.5.9. National Highways held four public drop-in sessions (see Table 2) as part of the consultation. These were held in venues that are accessible for all and suitable for these events and face to face meetings. They were also chosen as they are close the proposed changes and therefore within easy reach for the most impacted communities and landowners. More events were held on the western end of the route as it was proportionate to the number of proposed changes in each location. Details of these events were included in notices and publicity for the consultation.

2.5.10. These sessions can be a useful way for direct sharing of project information and opinions between the Project team and members of the public, in particular those impacted by the changes. They also provided an opportunity to hold meetings with directly impacted landowners to discuss the proposed changes further with the Project team.

Table 2: Public Consultation Event times and locations

Date and times	Drop-in event locations
30 January, 3pm-7pm	Gilling West Village Hall, High St, Gilling West, Richmond DL10 5JJ
31 January, 3pm-7pm	Kirkby Thore Memorial Hall, Kirkby Thore CA10 1UE
1 February, 3pm-7pm	Warcop Village Hall, Appleby-in-Westmorland CA16 6NX
6 February, 3pm-7pm	Penrith Methodist Church, Wordsworth St, Penrith CA11 7QY

2.5.11. All events were accessible, proportionate in terms of the number of events held and their sizes in consideration of the scale of the proposed design changes, and close to impacted communities.

2.5.12. At the events, A1 panels showing the proposed changes compared to the DCO submission designs against enlarged project plans were available, in addition to hard copies of the consultation material, feedback forms and freepost envelopes, and a feedback box. A range of disciplines from the Project team attended the events, including the members of the National Highways delivery team, delivery integration partners, stakeholder team, design team and district valuers office. This ensured as many as possible of the questions and issues raised could be answered on the day. This enabled attendees to have a good understanding of the proposed changes and their impact.

2.5.13. The events were well attended, with 95 attendees at the Gilling West event, 163 attending the Kirkby Thore event, 115 attending the Warcop

event and 101 attending the Penrith event. A summary of matters raised at these events is included in Section 3.

Deposit Points

- 2.5.14. At the two existing deposit points for the DCO Application (Penrith Library, St Andrews Centre, Churchyard, Penrith, CA11 7YA, and The Witham, 3 Horse Market, Barnard Castle, DL12 8LY), hard copies of the consultation brochure, the associated environmental information and feedback forms, along with freepost envelopes were made available to take away throughout the consultation period. The Applicant ensured these were regularly topped up throughout the consultation period.

Consultation Materials

- 2.5.15. Table 3 summarises the materials provided as part of the proposed changes consultation, which were available to all consultees. The materials ensured that sufficient and clear information was available to enable people to respond in an informed manner.
- 2.5.16. Included in all consultation information was full details to enable stakeholders to access the materials. This included copies of the materials or links to the website, information on the deposit points and contact details for the team to request hard copies or alternative formats.
- 2.5.17. All of the material on the proposed change consultation was made available on a dedicated A66 Northern Trans-Pennine proposed change consultation webpage. This information also included all the details of the drop-in sessions and contact details for the team should stakeholders have any further questions.

Table 3: Consultation Materials

Document	Overview
Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure (See Appendix H)	<p>Single document covering all proposed changes. It details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The locations of the proposed changes (so readers can identify those that may be close or of particular interest to them) • Explanation of the plans (including a single key) • Explanation and cross reference to the Environment Appendix • Glossary • How to respond to the consultation • Explanation of each change, including proposed drawings/illustrations compared to the DCO submission design for ease of reference • Each change had a clear reference number to assist with matching feedback received to each change • What happens next • How to keep in touch and contact the project team
Environment Appendix (See Appendix H)	<p>Single document covering all proposed changes. The tables in this appendix set out where the Applicant thinks there is potential for the proposed change to give rise to a new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the original ES submitted as part of the DCO Application. The purpose of this is to give an understanding of the potential risks of new or different likely significant effects which could arise from these changes.</p>

Document	Overview
Feedback form or online version	Clear feedback form to ensure that all comments are captured and linked to each proposed change.

Receipt of consultation responses

- 2.5.18. Responses to the consultation could be submitted via the project Citizenspace web page, email to changeconsultationA66NTP@nationalhighways.co.uk, Freepost to A66 Northern Trans-Pennine, at consultation events and at the DCO Application project deposit points. These methods of response were publicised through the consultation publicity and materials.

Process for registering and considering the consultation responses

- 2.5.19. All feedback received through the consultation was acknowledged, registered, and coded to each relevant design change. This included comments received through the online and offline consultation feedback forms and those received by email and letter.
- 2.5.20. These comments were then collated and passed to the relevant teams and specialists within the project team to have regard and to inform decisions on what would be included in the Change Application. This is evidenced in section 3 of this report.

2.6. Ongoing engagement

- 2.6.1. Each of the proposed changes has been proposed and progressed by the Applicant through engagement and consultation with relevant affected persons and / or interested parties, with the aim of meeting their needs and addressing their stated concerns. In the interests of fairness and transparency, the Applicant consulted with statutory bodies, host local authorities, and local people with a potential interest in the proposed changes. They did this by offering the opportunity to engage with the Applicant and comment on the proposed changes; for example, by attending one of the four consultation events or holding a one-to-one meeting, in addition to providing written feedback on the individual changes using the feedback forms provided.
- 2.6.2. Additional engagement was carried out as follows:
- Meetings were held with landowners and their agents during the consultation period and engagement has been ongoing with the local authorities and the SEBs through a number of touch points, meetings or workshops.
 - The most impacted landowners were also contacted by phone or email through the Public Liaison Officers and meetings were held to explain the rationale for the proposed changes and to garner feedback. Emails and phone messages included contact details to

allow for further engagement with the Public Liaison Officers on request and where possible.

- Dedicated meetings were held with the community liaison groups and the focus groups to outline the changes and to encourage feedback within communities and special interest groups.

3. Consultation Responses and Feedback

3.1. Overview of the feedback received

- 3.1.1. In total, 184 responses⁸ were received on the proposed changes consultation. These were received via CitizenSpace, email, post and feedback from the consultation events. This includes four responses received after the deadline, which the Applicant has also considered⁹.
- 3.1.2. All responses received and considered are included in Appendix G, alongside any attachments provided by consultees. In addition, Table 4 highlights the themes raised at the public consultation events.
- 3.1.3. The 184 responses contained 345 comments that were then associated with either a specific design change or identified as project wide matter. Of these:
- 93 responses were in favour of the design change(s)
 - 126 responses were not in favour of the design change(s)
 - 126 responses did not state whether they were in favour or not of the design change(s)
- 3.1.4. The following sections provide an overview of:
- the individuals that commented on the proposed changes;
 - a summary of what was raised by the consultees; and
 - how the Applicant has had regard to these matters.
- 3.1.5. The sections are based on the following structure:
- specific design changes that have been submitted in the Application (Section 3.3),
 - project wide matters relevant to the consultation (Section 3.4),
 - specific design changes that have not been submitted in the Application (Section 3.5).

3.2. Comments made at the public consultation events

- 3.2.1. Formal feedback was collected via the consultation feedback forms. Table 4 summarises the themes of the discussions and verbal feedback received by the project team at the events from landowners, local community and other interested parties.

⁸ This figure includes where respondents submitted the same response via multiple methods, such as via email and hard copy, and where separate responses were submitted by the same respondent, such as to provide comments on different design changes.

⁹ This includes EM59 which was received just after the consultation closed, and EM60 which was agreed could have an extended deadline. The two other responses received after the consultation deadline were EM61 and EM62.

Table 4: Public Consultation Events Themes Raised

Event	High-level themes
<p>Gilling West 30 January</p>	<p><u>Site-specific</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of discussion was about DC-29 and DC-32 • A few queries were raised about DC-28 • Concerns were raised on DC-29 around the Walking Cycling and Horse Rider (WCH) diversion and private access track due to removal of the underpass. No significant issues raised by the WCH focus group • Objection to DC-29 because of additional land-take • Support for DC-30 • No issues were raised during discussions at the events for DC-31 • Discussion around DC-32 <p><u>General comments on the Project</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions around start on site and phasing
<p>Kirkby Thore 31 January</p>	<p><u>Site-specific</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the removal of the underpass for DC-26 and DC-18 • General concern with changes to WCH routes • Landowner concerns about walking / cycling diversions and impact on their land • Appreciation on the reduced speed limit and barn being saved for DC-13 • Welcome changes to Green Lane, Priest Lane and Main Street because of reduced impact on land-take and farm operations • Objection from a landowner to the closure of Green Lane to WCH traffic and re-routing option • Objection from a landowner to Priest Lane underpass rerouting <p><u>General views on the consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queries relating to promotion of feedback forms <p><u>General comments on the project</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in when decisions will be made • Questions around start on site and phasing • Interest from attendees in all schemes across the Project • Concern about traffic being worse through the village in some locations (not related to a proposed change) • Observations made around use of the access road to the sewage works
<p>Warcop 1 February</p>	<p><u>Site-specific</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about changes to the Langrigg junction, junction closure, access provision and balancing ponds' location for DC-25 • A landowner objection to the lengthened access to the AONB from Low Broomrigg with the proposed underpass (DC-25) • A landowner objection to the retention of Lightwater cottages (DC--07) (DC05) • A landowner objection to the arrangement at sewage treatment work (DC-08) • • Agreement from landowner on junction change • Concerns about construction noise on the yoga centre (DC-20/22) • A landowner was generally positive about the changes proposed for Scheme 6

Event	High-level themes
Penrith 6 February	<p><u>Site-specific</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about safety of school children (DC-11) • Interested in plantation at DC-11 • Concerns about disruption related to construction (noise / dust) and sewage issues at Wetheriggs (DC-05) • A landowner objects to replacement open space (DC-05) • Happy with the change whilst concerned with closure of the underpass (DC-26) • Happy with the left in left out access (DC-18) • Concerns about potential flooding (DC-18) • A landowner raised concerns over WCH connectivity (e.g. lack of dedicated provision for horse-drawn vehicles) but a separate provision for Private Means of Access (PMA) and WCH is not necessary – all schemes

3.3. Comments on proposed changes submitted in the Application

3.3.1. Following the consideration of the feedback from consultation and engagement, the Applicant considers that for these proposed changes, the benefit of the changes outweighs any disbenefits. This includes any issues raised by affected parties during the consultation. The following design changes identified below are being taken forward:

- DC-01 - Change in speed limit west of M6 Junction 40
- DC-03 - Reorientation of Kemplay Bank Junction
- DC-04 - Separation of, and greater flexibility for, shared public rights of way and private access track provision
- DC-05 - Removal of junction for Sewage Treatment Works (and private residence) from A66, and provision of an alternative access from B6262
- DC-06 - Increase in vertical Limits of Deviation (LoDs) local to Shell pipeline
- DC-08 - Inversion of the mainline alignment at the junction at Center Parcs
- DC-09 - Flexibility to reuse the existing A66 carriageway
- DC-11 - Earlier tie-in of Cross Street to the existing road
- DC-13 - Realignment of Main Street
- DC-14 - Realignment of Sleastonhow Lane
- DC-15 - Realignment of Crackenthorpe Underpass
- DC-17 - Cafe Sixty Six - revised land plan
- DC-19 - Realignment of cycleway local to Cringle and Moor Beck
- DC-20 - Update to LoDs on Eastbound connection to local road

- DC-21 - Amendments to Order limits within Ministry of Defence land
- DC-22 - Realignment of Warcop Westbound Junction
- DC-23 - Realignment of de-trunked A66 to be closer to new dual carriageway at Warcop
- DC-24 - Re-use of existing A66 (north of Flitholme)
- DC-25 - Remove Langrigg Westbound Junction, revision to Langrigg Lane link, and shortening of Flitholme Road
- DC-26 - Revision to West View Farm Accommodation Bridge and removal of West View Farm underpass
- DC-27 - Construction of noise barrier south of Brough
- DC-28 - Realignment of local access road to be closer to new dual carriageway east of Bowes
- DC-30 - Realignment of maintenance/footpath adjacent to Waitlands Lane
- DC-31 - Realignment of Warrener Lane

3.3.2. This section provides an overview of the comments received on these proposed changes, and the Applicant's reasoning as to why each change is being taken forward. The rationale for making each of the proposed changes and the benefits they provide is set out for each design change in section 3 of the Change Application report.

DC-01 Change in speed limit west of M6 Junction 40

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
11	5	4	2
Responsees			
Paul Newbury (CE001)		Neil (CS004)	
Deidre Cullen (CS013)		Penrith Town Council (CS013)	
Dr John R Walters (CS018)		Robert Birtwell (CS023)	
Lake District National Park Authority (CS032)		Colin Thorns (CS061)	
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Plant Enquiries Team (EM032)	(Vodafone)
Transport Action Network (EM054)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were raised in respect of the appropriateness of a 30mph speed limit, with one suggestion proposing 50mph if a reduction were required. Matters relating to the enforcement of any change in the speed limit was raised as a concern, with lower speeds noted in comments as aiding traffic and pedestrian safety. • Some specific matters were raised in relation to the impact on a utility provider’s apparatus and their requirements. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change amending the suggested 30mph limit to 50mph in the DCO Application. This will provide a level of consistency in the speed limits on the A66 on the approaches to the M6 Junction 40 roundabout from the east and west. The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project, including a formal independent Road Safety Audit. In addition, the Applicant intends to engage with the emergency service providers, police enforcement teams, and utility providers as part of the development of the detailed design.</p>			

DC-03 Reorientation of Kemplay Bank junction

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
9	3	1	5
Responsees			
Penrith Town Council (CS013) Mr J Dent (CS022) David Simmons (CS034) Robert Birtwell (CS037) Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Sport England (CS039) Plant Enquiries Team (Vodafone) (EM032) Ullswater Community College (EM014) Natural England (EM041)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments raised in respect of the proximity of the proposed change to Thacka Beck and the potential need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). • Concerns about the viability of the playing fields at Ullswater Community College to the north-west of the junction, both in the temporary case as well as in the permanent, post construction state. • A number of design-related concerns raised in respect of drainage design, traffic modelling and performance of the junction (particularly in relation to local movements and signal timings), and both concern and support for the resulting pedestrian movements in and around the junction. Disruption due to construction was raised both in terms of traffic and pedestrian movements/safety, and this included acknowledgement that the construction period would be shorter with the proposed change. • Some specific matters were raised in relation to the impact on a utility provider’s apparatus and their requirements. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will reduce disruption during construction of the Kemplay Bank junction without compromising the operation of it once complete. The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project, including a formal independent Road Safety Audit and preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (that will be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP)). Ongoing engagement is required in respect of traffic modelling detail in order to demonstrate modelling outputs and confidence to Local Authorities in particular that the junction at Kemplay Bank will function adequately.</p> <p>The principles of the drainage design are unaffected by the proposed change. Detailed design will develop the solution further in relation to the size, shape and location of attenuation ponds. In addition, the Applicant intends to engage with utility providers as part of the development of the detailed design.</p>			

Further design development during and post-consultation has confirmed that there is no risk of potential new or different effects on Thacka Beck and therefore there is no requirement to amend the HRA.

The Applicant will continue to engage with Ullswater College and Sport England regarding the marked pitch and surrounding land (beyond the DCO Order limits) with the intention that these facilities will remain functional during and post construction. Through engagement with Sport England, the Applicant will follow plans to undertake a ball strike assessment with the expectation that mitigation measures will be provided, such as catch nets around the pitch, to retain the marked pitch and prevent ball strikes within the highway.

DC-04 Separation of, and greater flexibility for, shared public rights of way and private access track provision

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
8	1	3	4
Responsees			
Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)		Barbara Gravenor (CS054)	
Winderwath Settled Estate (CS068)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
British Horse Society (EM024)		Cumbria & Lakes Joint Access Forum (EM025)	
Natural England (EM041)		Winderwath Settled Estate (EM058)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments raised in respect to the proximity of the proposed change to the Lightwater watercourse and the potential need for an HRA. • There were differing views on aspects of this proposed change with comments in support as well as feedback challenging the separation of PMA and walking/cycling facilities in relation to potential safety concerns. Questions were also raised as to why the length of shared track to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs has not been considered in a similar manner to that on the north where it is proposed to separate pedestrians/cyclists from PMA. • Comments were also raised in relation to the surface material, standards and widths, and objection as to the lack of provision for horse-riders. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it increases flexibility to provide two separate routes to be developed, splitting the walking and cycling provision from farm and estate traffic. The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project that will include the specification of the tracks (e.g. surface material, standards and widths). The Applicant will continue to engage with user groups via the established Community Liaison Groups and Technical Working Groups as well as individual landowners.</p> <p>Assessment work undertaken and reported in the ES Addendum Volume II: has confirmed that there is no risk of potential new or different effects on the Lightwater watercourse and therefore there is no change to the outcome of the HRA.</p> <p>Following a review of the feedback received and consideration of the design implications, the Applicant seeks further flexibility to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs to enable the separation of the footpath and PMA alongside moving it northwards to be closer to the A66 dual carriageway. The amendment will align with the principles adopted on the north side of the dual carriageway on this scheme.</p> <p>Across the Project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the route.</p>			

In the case of DC-04, provision for horses is not proposed nor does the change impact upon any existing horse-riding provision at this location. This is in accordance with Table 1 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding (WCH) Proposals APP-010.

DC-05 Removal of junction for Sewage Treatment Works (and private residence) from A66, and provision of an alternative access from B6262

Total Comments	Response to "Are you in favour of the change?"		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
24	3	14	7
Respondee			
Peter Ballingall (CE005)		Tracey Birkett (CS007)	
The Ramblers - Penrith Group (CS015)		Mrs A Ballingall (CS021)	
Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)		Robert Birtwell (CS037)	
Gordon M. Rigg (CS038)		Allan W Jenkinson (CS043)	
English Heritage Trust (CS045)		Historic England (CS051)	
Cameron Robinson (CS063)		United Utilities (CS064)	
Mr and Mrs Thompson (CS065)		Winderwath Settled Estate (CS068)	
John Harvey Slack (CS071)		D Robinson (CS099)	
Tracey Birkett (EM005)		Brougham Parish Council (EM013)	
Mr G Wilcox (EM020)		British Horse Society (EM024)	
Cumbria & Lakes Joint Access Forum (EM025)		Natural England (EM041)	
Winderwath Settled Estate (EM058)		Gordon Cooper & Mary Ann Nobbs (HC009)	
The Applicant's way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern regarding potential impacts on the scheduled monument to the south-east of the B6262 junction, impacts on the River Eden SAC and the need to update the HRA to reflect the changes, and comments regarding proximity to Lightwater watercourse. Some comments suggested that additional land will be required to accommodate the change. • Concerns were raised regarding the increase in traffic relating to the change, particularly HGV's, through Brougham via the B6262. It was noted that the B6262 is already a rat-run and acts as an alternative route during flood events where it was used for diverted traffic. There was concern regarding lack of provisions for horse riders, concerns regarding the length of diversion having to access properties to the north from the B6262 and concern that vehicles will use access tracks and PMAs on the northern side of the dual carriageway from the junction at Center Parcs instead of looping back to the B6262. Comments were made in relation to the design of the road to accommodate sewage treatment works traffic, parking provision for Countess Pillar and queries regarding maintenance liability in respect to the ownership and upkeep of tracks. • One comment expressed support for the pedestrian access to Countess Pillar and connection to Brougham. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it is considered that the safety risk associated with works in proximity and over two nationally significant pipes would, once mitigation measures were put in place, outweigh matters that have been raised in consultation feedback (further detail on the justification for proceeding with this change is included in the Change Application Report (Document Reference 8.2)).</p> <p>Considering the environmental points, the Applicant acknowledges the need to ensure that construction method statements are developed in discussion with Historic England but</p>			

does not anticipate changes to core documents such as the Project Design Principles or the EMP as a result of the change. Assessment work undertaken and reported in the ES Addendum Volume II: has confirmed that there is no risk of potential new or different effects on the Lightwater watercourse and therefore there is no change to the outcome of the HRA.

The Applicant can confirm that the proposed change will not amend the DCO Order limits meaning that no additional land will be required.

The Applicant acknowledges the level of concern in respect of the proposed change and the suitability of the road network for the traffic that will need to utilise it. The design will be subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project, and this will include the specification of the road network. This includes, but is not limited to, pavement construction, design standards, road widths, passing facilities and how shared road space will be delineated. The Applicant will continue to engage with user groups via the established Community Liaison Groups and Technical Working Groups as well as individual landowners and stakeholders.

The proposed change does not seek to encourage extra traffic to use the B6262 via Brougham. The B6262 is not suitable for HGV's and as such signage will be installed to direct drivers onto the A66 for all onward journeys. The Applicant is working closely with Cumbria County Council and parish councils during the detailed design stage to review existing prohibitions as well as consider further restrictions that limit movements southwards on the B6262.

The DCO design included provision for eastbound movements only, meaning that there was a need for westbound movement to utilise the junction at Kemplay Bank in order to return east to access lands to the north. The proposed change seeks to reverse that movement such that eastbound traffic will need to utilise the junction at Center Parcs to return westwards. Whilst the overall journey length will increase marginally as a result of having to navigate the B6262, it is considered to be a nominal change in the overall journey time when compared to the DCO design. Any potential informal routes via PMA will be deterred through physical barriers such as gates, however this will need to be discussed with relevant landowners (please note DC-04 in respect of the approach to shared tracks).

The Applicant acknowledges the support for the pedestrian access to the Countess Pillar and will continue to assess parking provision for the monument through the detailed design process (noting that the car park at the former Llama Karma Kafe will provide parking provision as per the DCO design).

Across the Project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the route. In the case of DC-05, provision for horses is not proposed nor does the change impact upon any existing horse-riding provision at this location. This is in accordance with Table 1 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) Proposals APP-010.

DC-06 Increase in vertical Limits of Deviation local to Shell Pipeline

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
2	0	0	2
Responsees			
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Natural England (EM041)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern regarding the degree of information presented in the Environmental Statement on the proposed change noting that the information does not provide clarity on the nature of impacts. There was also concern regarding potential impacts on the River Eden SAC and the need for updates to the HRA to reflect the changes. • There was support expressed in regard to safety and buildability matters. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it is considered that additional flexibility is required in order to minimise the risk associated with works in proximity and over a nationally significant pipeline.</p> <p>Comments on the adequacy of the information contained within the Environmental Statement (APP-044 to APP-059) have been addressed at Issue Specific Hearing 3 and in the Issue Specific Hearing 3 Post-Hearing note. The Applicant ensured the consultation materials, including the Consultation Brochure and environmental appendix, contained sufficient and clear information to enable people to respond in an informed manner as part of the consultation. In addition support was available during the consultation to help people understand the proposals, including at public consultation events.</p> <p>Assessment work undertaken and reported in the Environment Statement Addendum Volume II: has confirmed that there is no risk of potential new or different effects on the Lightwater watercourse and therefore there is no changes to the outcome of the HRA.</p>			

DC-08 Inversion of the mainline alignment at the junction at Center Parcs

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
6	0	0	6
Responsees			
Sally Shear (CE002)		The Ramblers - Penrith Group (CS015)	
Allan W Jenkinson (CS043)		Winderwath Settled Estate (CS068)	
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Winderwath Settled Estate (EM058)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were made in relation to the need for land to the south of the junction at Center Parcs as a result of the proposed change. • Questions were raised relating to accessibility to Center Parcs on foot from the north of the A66 and the potential for shorter routes being accommodated in the design via steps for example. • There is concern regarding the proposed diversions to footpath 311/004 to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs and the adverse impacts of this on farming operations. • Questions are raised as to why the length of shared track to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs has not been considered in a similar manner to that on the north where it is proposed to separate pedestrians/cyclists from PMA. The need for segregated public and private access was emphasised noting safety issues with mixing public and private access. • Comments are made in relation to surface material, standards and widths. • Concerns were raised in respect of drainage design and attenuation ponds due to alignments changes. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it does not change the principal objectives of the Scheme at this location but will minimise disruption to road users and to Affected Parties. If the proposed change is brought forward, there may be potential to reduce the amount of land required for the Project at this location, should it transpire that land to the south of the A66 is, in consequence of further detailed design work, no longer required to accommodate a temporary diversion route during the construction of the junction.</p> <p>In relation to pedestrian routes a shared footway/cycleway has been provided to link the existing A66 at Lane End through the junction to the Center Parcs access. Further consideration will take place, as part of the detailed design process, as to how best to accommodate the various needs and demands of the users, with the relevant affected persons.</p> <p>Following a review of the feedback received and consideration of the design implications, the Applicant intends to seek further flexibility (via DC-04) to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs to enable the separation of the footpath and PMA as well as move it northwards to be closer to the A66 dual carriageway. The proposed change will align with the principles adopted on the north side of the dual carriageway on this scheme.</p>			

The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project that will include the specification of the tracks (e.g. surface material, standards and widths).

The principles of the drainage design are unaffected by the proposed change. Detailed design will develop the solution further in respect to the size, shape and location of attenuation ponds.

DC-09 Flexibility to reuse the existing A66 carriageway

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
3	1	0	2
Responsees			
Winderwath Settled Estate (CS068)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
Winderwath Settled Estate (EM058)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was support for the change with a view to it reducing land required. • Comments were made in regard to the design standard being applied leading to no adverse impact on safety. There was support for measures to reduce the extent and duration of construction works. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change in order to provide the greatest level of flexibility to follow the level of the existing A66, allowing for variance in survey data and any other detailed design development. This may lead to a reduction in the overall land-take for the Project but this subject to detailed design.</p> <p>Further technical work at the detailed design stage will follow appropriate design standards and will be include a formal independent Road Safety Audit.</p>			

DC-11 Earlier tie-in of Cross Street to the existing road

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
5	1	1	3
Responsees			
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (CS089)	
Metcalf Family (EM036)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (EM055)	
Dr A. J. Sewell (HC016)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were raised as to the degree of information provided as part of the consultation, particularly in relation to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW). It is noted that the amendments to the PRoW shown on the maps are not discussed in the consultation text. Some responses referenced reduced land-take as a positive. The proposed change was welcomed in the main but there were objections to the amendments to footpath 336/011 and concerns regarding the benefits of reducing the speed limit from 60 mph to 30mph. Further consideration as to possible physical interventions to differentiate speed limit changes was suggested as well as solutions that do not require reductions in speed limit. The enforcement of any change in speed limit was raised as a concern. There were also comments relating to alternative routes in principle. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will provide the same overall solution and, subject to detailed design and the necessary agreements in regard to design standards, it will provide the opportunity to reduce the amount of construction work and the footprint of the scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the general support of this proposed design change whilst recognising other concerns that have been raised.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work including a formal independent Road Safety Audit. In addition, the Applicant intends to engage with the emergency service providers, police enforcement teams and Local Authorities as part of the development of detail design.</p> <p>The PRoW change associated with footpath 336/011 to the east of Cross Street is associated with DC-12. It should not have been shown on the DC-11 images and is not dependent upon DC-11 taking place. However, following a review of consultation feedback the Applicant will not be pursuing change DC-12.</p> <p>Comments on the adequacy of the information contained within the Environmental Statement (APP-044 to APP-059) have been addressed at Issue Specific Hearing 3 and in the Issue Specific Hearing 3 Post-Hearing note.</p> <p>The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant’s assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.</p>			

DC-13 Realignment of Main Street

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
5	3	0	2
Responsees			
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (CS090)	
Metcalf Family (EM036)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (EM055)	
Dr A. J. Sewell (HC016)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised as to the degree of information presented in the Environmental Statement on the proposed change. • Land related responses referenced reduced land-take as a positive. • The proposal to reduce the speed limit is generally welcomed however concerns were expressed regarding the safety benefits highlighting the need for other physical interventions in order to achieve a reduction in speed limits. Questions were raised as to how the proposed reduction in speed limits would be enforced. It is suggested that a form of design mitigation is provided to slow vehicles. • Comments were made relating to alternative routes in principle. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will provide the same overall solution and, subject to detailed design and the necessary agreements in regard to design standards, it will provide the opportunity to reduce the amount of construction work and the footprint of the scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the general support in favour of this proposed design change whilst recognising that other concerns have been raised.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work including a formal independent Road Safety Audit. In addition, the Applicant intends to engage with the emergency service providers, police enforcement teams and Local Authorities as part of the development of detail design.</p> <p>Comments disagreeing with proposed DC-12 are included in responses to this proposed change. Following a review of consultation feedback the Applicant will not be pursuing change DC-12.</p> <p>The Applicant ensured the consultation materials, including the Consultation Brochure and environmental appendix, contained sufficient and clear information to enable people to respond in an informed manner as part of the consultation. In addition support was available during the consultation to help people understand the proposals, including at public consultation events.</p> <p>The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant’s assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.</p>			

DC-14 Realignment of Sleastonhow Lane

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
8	0	2	6
Responsees			
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (CS090)	
Dr Mary Clare Martin (CS098)		Mrs FMR, RK & GF Nicholson (CS100)	
Charlotte Ditchburn (EM034)		Kirkby Thore Parish Council (EM055)	
Emma Nicholson (EM057)		Dr A. J. Sewell (HC016)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised as to the degree of information presented in the Environmental Statement on the proposed change. • There was response referencing the reduced land-take as a positive. • The proposed change was welcomed in the main with comments requesting further consideration as to possible physical interventions to differentiate speed limit changes and consideration of solutions that do not require reductions in speed limits. The enforcement of any change in speed limit was raised as a concern. • It was suggested that Sleastonhow Lane should be designated as a quiet lane. There was concern that the brochure imagery indicates that the Sleastonhow Oak will be lost as a result of the proposed change. • There was objection to the proposed design for the new bridge on Sleastonhow Lane. Comments were made in respect of the design of the lane including signage, width, passing provision, visibility, surfacing, suitability for larger vehicles, road space for WCH. • Concerns were raised in relation to drainage design, lack of provision for horse-riders and objections to the amendments to footpath 336/011 referenced (DC-12) given a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) has been submitted. • Comments were made relating to alternative routes in principle, as well as queries on the timing and appropriateness of the consultation. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will provide the same overall solution and, subject to detailed design and the necessary agreements in regard to design standards, it will provide the opportunity to reduce the amount of construction work and the footprint of the scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the general support in favour of this proposed design change whilst recognising that other concerns have been raised.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the level of concern in respect to the design of Sleastonhow Lane. The design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project that will include the specification of the road network. This includes, but is not limited to pavement construction, design standards, road widths, passing facilities, forward visibility, how shared road space will be delineated. The Applicant will continue to engage with user groups via the established Community Liaison Groups and Technical Working Groups as well as individual landowners and stakeholders. In addition, the Applicant intends to engage with the emergency service providers, police enforcement teams and Local Authorities as part of the development of detail design.</p>			

The principles of the drainage design are unaffected by the proposed change. Detailed design will develop the solution further in respect to the size, shape and location of attenuation ponds.

Comments disagreeing with proposed change DC-12 are included in responses to this proposed change. Following a review of consultation feedback the Applicant will not be pursuing change DC-12.

The Applicant ensured the consultation materials, including the Consultation Brochure and environmental appendix, contained sufficient and clear information to enable people to respond in an informed manner as part of the consultation. In addition support was available during the consultation to help people understand the proposals, including at public consultation events.

Sleastonhow Lane realignment has been designed to avoid the Sleastonhow Oak, a veteran tree in the vicinity. The retention of this tree has been secured in the Project Design Principles (APP-302) 0405.15 which states: The mature oak tree along Sleastonhow Lane must be retained. Additionally, the Environmental Management Plan (REP3-004) D-LV-01 sets out the requirement for an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to be undertaken prior to any part of the Project construction starting, including establishing root protection areas and Tree Protection Plans. DC-14 will comply with these requirements hence why the Environmental Appendix as part of the consultation material takes this into account as part of its conclusions. Additional information can be found in the Environmental Statement Addendum Volume II.

Across the Project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the Project. The Applicant is not proposing to make any changes to the designation of Sleastonhow Lane as part of the DCO, meaning that the rights of existing users are maintained. The Applicant is aware of the DMMO application and are of the view that the scheme does not prohibit that proceeding.

With regards to consultation and engagement, the Applicant is now proposing this change as a result of landowner feedback and discussions at the DCO Examination Hearings and having considered this along with its delivery partners.

The proposed change consultation period sought the views of impacted landowners and local communities. Landowners were written to directly and invited to speak to the Applicant as part of the consultation period. The Applicant also liaised directly with land agents and has engaged with impacted landowners as part of the change consultation process in one-to-one meetings or at the drop in events. Landowners' feedback has been given due consideration and has shaped the decision as to which changes the Applicant is taking forward in its Change Application.

The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant's assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.

DC-15 Realignment of Crackenthorpe Underpass

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
3	2	0	1
Responsees			
Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
Charlotte Ditchburn (EM034)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. Other than support for the change, the key matter raised related to more detailed information on the change to the PRow.</p> <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it provides a more direct route and shorter underpass.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the project and will continue to engage with user groups via the established Community Liaison Groups and Technical Working Groups as well as individual landowners.</p>			

DC-17 Café Sixty Six – Revised land plan

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
2	1	1	0
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS085)		Mr M Carruthers (CS085)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matter raised related to the need for further consideration of how the Café will operate during construction and the implications of temporary possession of land.</p> <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change in order to ensure that the land required to construct the scheme, including temporary possession and permanent acquisition in and around Café Sixty Six, is secured via the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant will work with the owners of Café Sixty Six to ensure that the business remains open and operational during the construction period. Appropriate diversions and signage will be utilised to direct customers to the Cafe and parking areas during construction. The Project may involve multiple phases of construction but the Applicant will engage and work with the owners to advise and confirm the proposals in advance of them being implemented, throughout the Project.</p>			

DC-19 Realignment of cycleway local to Cringle and Moor Beck

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
12	7	2	3
Responsees			
David Pearson (CS010)		Warcop Parish Council (CS019)	
Steve Atkinson (CS024)		Mr George Atkinson (CS027)	
Mrs Elizabeth Atkinson (CS028)		Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)	
Pennine National Trails Partnership (CS047)		Mrs Sheila Strong (CS050)	
British Horse Society (EM024)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
Mary Helvin (HC006)		Frank Mallet (HC004)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were made in respect of the excessive land required for the proposed change that impinge on a farmyard. • Whilst some comments offered support, questions and comments were raised on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provision for gypsy traveller horse drawn vehicles; • the provision for horses; • footpath provision local to Wheatsheaf Farm; and • requirements for the provision of crossing points and the standards of the design. • Objection to the proposed change were raised due to the lack of provision for horse-riders. • Other comments sought an update in respect to a proposed footpath to link the village and school. <p>The Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it enables the old, de-trunked A66 road to be repurposed rather than introducing a new route, thus reducing the footprint of the road. The proposed change removes the footpath from the floodplain and reduces the number of new structures required over watercourses. In its initial form, as presented in the consultation on the proposed changes, this change (DC-19) included some additional land (beyond the Order limits for the DCO Application) owned by Affected Persons.</p> <p>Following a review of the feedback received (including feedback from Affected Persons with an interest in some of the additional land which was proposed to be acquired) the Applicant has amended this proposed change to reduce the area of land required. As a consequence, the revised proposed change, which is now presented in the Change Application, only requires additional land (being land outside the current Order limits) which is already owned by National Highways. The Affected Parties whose land was, in response to their consultation feedback, excluded from the area of additional land required for this change, have agreed to the revised changed proposal.</p> <p>Across the Project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the route. This proposed change includes the retention of the old A66 over the length which will be wide enough for horse drawn vehicles.</p>			

In the case of DC-19, additional provision for horses is not proposed nor does the change impact upon any existing horse-riding provision at this location. This is in accordance with Table 1 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) Proposals APP-010.

The Applicant acknowledges that the design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the Project that will include the specification of the tracks, including crossing points. The design will be carried out in accordance with the relevant design standards and a Road Safety Audit will be carried out by an independent team to ensure that any safety issues are considered, and recommendations made accordingly to mitigate those issues.

There has been an application to National Highways Designated Funds to conduct a feasibility study for a footpath to connect Warcop village to the school, church and village hall. This is separate from the Project. The funding for the feasibility study was recently approved and the study will commence imminently. Once the feasibility study has been undertaken, further applications will be made for detailed design and implementation funding and are subject to future approval being granted. The construction of the footpath will also be subject to landowner agreements being in place.

DC-20 Update to Limits of Deviation on eastbound connection to local road

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
2	0	0	2
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS010)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matter raised was in regard to the level and environmental assessment of the elevated stretch of dual carriageway at Cringle Beck.</p> <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change in order to ensure that the design of the local road can tie into the level of A66 dual carriageway should it be amended within the scope of the Limits of Deviation that the draft DCO permits.</p> <p>The elevation of the A66 dual carriageway is approximately 14m above existing ground levels local to Cringle Beck. This change allows flexibility for the minor local road to deviate downwards to the same extent as the dual carriageway.</p> <p>The DCO Application's Environmental Statement includes the design and assesses the A66 dual carriageway at the stated elevation, so matters such as visual and noise impacts have been reported and assessed within the DCO Application documents (specifically Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053) and Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055)). This elevation will only reduce as part of this design change, therefore the ES assessment within the aforementioned documents is already considered to be the worst case scenario for this location.</p>			

DC-21 Amendments to Order limits within Ministry of Defence land

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
9	5	3	1
Responsees			
Deidre Cullen (CS008)		Warcop Parish Council (CS019)	
Mark Blackett-Ord (CS025)		The Heron Family (CS083)	
Raymond Bromby (EM044)		Frank Mallet (HC004)	
Mary Helvin (HC006)		Judith Heelis (HC008)	
Raymond Bromby (EM015)			
The Applicant’s way forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was an individual objection to the increase in land required from their farm for environmental mitigation. • Comments were made in respect to footpath changes and relating to concerns about flooding in Warcop and the drainage design development. In addition, comments were provided about the route of the scheme with alternatives sought further north. • Other comments sought an update in respect of a proposed footpath to link the village and school. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it reduces the operational impact on Ministry of Defence land. Whilst the change would require some additional land (outside of the DCO Order limits) consent has been provided by the landowners to proceeding with the change (further details on matters to do with this additional land is included in the Change Application Report Document Reference 8.2). An objection was raised in respect to a specific parcel of land being acquired, however further investigations have determined that the individual does not have an interest (as acknowledged by the land agent) in the land they objected to.</p> <p>The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant’s assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.</p> <p>The design would be subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the project that will include development of the drainage proposals.</p> <p>There has been an application to National Highways Designated Funds to conduct a feasibility study for a footpath to connect Warcop village to the school, church and village hall. This is separate from the A66NTP project. The funding for the feasibility study was recently approved and the study will commence imminently. Once the feasibility study has been undertaken, further applications will be made for detailed design and implementation funding and are subject to future approval being granted. The construction of the footpath will also be subject to land owner agreements being in place.</p>			

DC-22 Realignment of Warcop Westbound Junction

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
7	0	2	5
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
The Heron Family (CS083)		British Horse Society (EM024)	
Environment Agency (EM034)		Frank Mallet (EM041)	
Dr A. J. Sewell (HC016)			
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in relation to the potentially detrimental impact on environment and the potential flood risk leading to significant impacts on the River Eden SAC requiring an update to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). • Comments on design included support for the removal of structures over watercourses and questions on the footprint of the junction appearing smaller. Concerns also referenced flooding in Warcop and the drainage design development, including its impact on the productivity of the remaining land. • Objection to the proposed change due to the lack of provision for horse-riders. • Other comments related to alternative route suggestions. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it considered that it will minimise the impact of the new A66 dual carriageway on watercourses and the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the proposed change is located in an area of known flooding and sensitive environment as the watercourses are functionally linked to the River Eden SAC.</p> <p>It is proposed this change is taken forward as a potential alternative to the existing DCO design, whereby the change could not be implemented unless certain tests were met to the Secretary of State’s satisfaction (following consultation with Natural England and the Environment Agency, amongst others). The tests would require the Applicant to robustly demonstrate that implementing this change would not (a) give rise to any materially new or materially worse adverse environmental effects when compared to those reported in the Environmental Statement; and (b) adversely affect the integrity of a site subject to protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (“the 2017 Regulations”). Where either limb of the test cannot be met to the Secretary of State’s satisfaction, the limit of deviation as originally applied for would continue to apply. This mechanism is proposed to be captured in article 7 (limits of deviation) of the DCO and would ensure that the Examining Authority and Secretary of State can be certain that any environmental effects arising from the implementation of the change would (a) be within the envelope of effects already reported; and (b) not give rise to a breach of the 2017 Regulations.</p> <p>The Applicant would continue to actively engage with stakeholders including MoD, Environment Agency and Natural England in the development of this proposed change.</p> <p>Design development of the ponds and associated access for maintenance would continue in the detailed design stage in consultation with the drainage authorities which may involve</p>			

amendments to pond locations and/or shape to better fit the existing landscape/field patterns. At this location, the intent of the change is to retain the drainage pond within the loop of the reduced junction footprint.

Across the project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the route.

In the case of DC-22, additional provision for horses is not proposed nor does the change impact upon any existing horse-riding provision at this location. This is in accordance with Table 1 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) Proposals APP-010.

The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant's assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.

DC-23 Realignment of de-trunked A66 to be closer to new dual carriageway at Warcop

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
4	1	1	2
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)		British Horse Society (EM024)	
Environment Agency (EM034)		Natural England (EM041)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments raised in relation to the detrimental impact on the environment and the potential flood risk leading to significant impact on the River Eden SAC requiring an update to the HRA. • Objection to the proposed change due to the lack of provision for horse-riders. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it considers that it would minimise the impact of the new A66 dual carriageway on watercourses and the surrounding environment.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that the proposed change is located in an area of known for flooding and as a sensitive environment as the watercourses are functional linked to the River Eden SAC.</p> <p>It is proposed this change is taken forward as a potential alternative to the existing DCO design, whereby the change could not be implemented unless certain tests were met to the Secretary of State’s satisfaction (following consultation with Natural England and the Environment Agency, amongst others). The tests would require the Applicant to robustly demonstrate that implementing this change would not (a) give rise to any materially new or materially worse adverse environmental effects when compared to those reported in the Environmental Statement; and (b) adversely affect the integrity of a site subject to protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (“the 2017 Regulations”). Where either limb of the test cannot be met to the Secretary of State’s satisfaction, the limit of deviation as originally applied for would continue to apply. This mechanism is proposed to be captured in article 7 (limits of deviation) of the DCO and would ensure that the Examining Authority and Secretary of State can be certain that any environmental effects arising from the implementation of the change would (a) be within the envelope of effects already reported; and (b) not give rise to a breach of the 2017 Regulations.</p> <p>Across the project, the pedestrian, cyclist, and horse-rider facilities that would be severed by the dualling works are proposed to be reconnected via grade-separated crossings to provide the same level of provision as that being affected by the Project.</p> <p>In the case of DC-23, additional provision for horses is not proposed nor does the change impact upon any existing horse-riding provision at this location. This is in accordance with Table 1 of the Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) Proposals APP-010.</p>			

DC-24 Re-use of existing A66 (north of Flithome)

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
7	1	1	5
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)		Byways and Bridleways Trust (CS036)	
Owen and Alex Wynne (CS055)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
British Horse Society (EM024)		Environment Agency (EM034)	
Dr. A. J. Sewell (HC016)			
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental concerns over potential significant effects reported in the Environmental Appendix to the Consultation Brochure in respect to road water and drainage environment. • Other comments supported the inclusion of an equestrian track (although a question was raised on its legal status) and its relationship to the A66 to ensure its design is an attractive route, as well as comments on the route of the scheme with alternatives sought further north. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will provide the same overall solution but, subject to detailed design and the necessary agreements in regard to design standards, provide the opportunity to reduce the amount of construction work and the footprint of the scheme.</p> <p>The definition of the equestrian track is included in article 2 (interpretation) of the DCO.</p> <p>The design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the project that will include the specification of the road network, including but not limited to design standards, road widths and how shared road space will be delineated. A formal independent Road Safety Audit will be undertaken, whilst National Highways also intend to engage with the emergency service providers, police enforcement teams and Local Authorities as part of the development of detail design.</p> <p>The comment in respect to road water and drainage environment is duly noted by the Applicant. An environmental assessment of the proposed design changes has been completed and can be found within Environmental Addendum Volume I and Environmental Addendum Volume II: Detailed Assessments. The ES Addendum details the assessment undertaken in order to quantify whether or not any of the design changes result in any new or different likely significant effects when compared to those submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Project (doc ref. 3.1 to 3.4, APP-043 to APP-233). For further information on the outcomes of this assessment, please refer to Environmental Addendum Volume I and Environmental Addendum Volume II: Detailed Assessments.</p> <p>The comments that were made in relation to alternative routes for this scheme are not directly related to the change being promoted and have not therefore influenced the outcome of the Applicant assessment to submit the change. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.</p>			

DC-25 Removal of Langrigg westbound junction, revision to Langrigg Lane link, and shortening of Flitholme Road

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
15	11	2	2
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)		Byways and Bridleways Trust (CS036)	
Owen and Alex Wynne (CS055)		Mel Morris (CS056)	
Louise Taylor-Kenyon (CS062)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
Susanna Martin (CS081)		Mrs Elisabeth Joy Faucitt Thompson	
Andrew Thompson (CS096)		Dr Mary Clare Martin (CS098)	
British Horse Society (EM024)		Environment Agency (EM034)	
Emma Nicholson (EM057)		Geoffrey Hewlett Thompson (EM060)	
Mary Helvin (HC006)			
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were made in respect to noise and air quality impacts of the scheme (as well as overall opposition to the scheme on environmental grounds), with specific points raised in respect to the location of the ponds and their final design, including concerns as to potential alternatives to the DCO design. • Support was expressed for the proposed change’s reduction in engineering works local to the properties. • A number of questions and comments were raised on the legal status of the equestrian track. • Comments also raised questions on means to access the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) to the north, and comments on the route of the scheme with alternatives sought further north. • Other comments raised issues with the timing and appropriateness of previous consultation for the DCO Application and why this change is only being brought forward now, and an update sought in respect to a proposed footpath to link the village and school. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will reduce the quantum of engineering works required for the project. Strong support has been shown for the proposed change with no objection received to the removal of the westbound exit and entry to Langrigg Lane.</p> <p>Assessment of the potential air quality and noise effects of the proposed Project are included in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-049) and Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) respectively. It is considered that the increased distance may result in a minor betterment, with more information provided in the Environmental Statement Addendum Volume II.</p> <p>The definition of the equestrian track is included in article 2 (interpretation) of the DCO.</p> <p>Following a review of the feedback received and consideration of the drainage and land implications, National Highways intend to amend our proposal to rationalise the pond designs.</p>			

Design development of the ponds and associated access for maintenance will continue in the detailed design stage, in consultation with the drainage authorities, which may involve amendments to pond locations and/or shape to better fit the existing landscape/field patterns. Access and maintenance provisions will also be considered to determine how these can be minimised.

It is understood that residents currently cross the A66 to access the PRoW on the northern side of the road and the AoNB. Whilst this route will no longer be possible, a safer route via the proposed Flitholme underpass will retain this connectivity north-south.

The comments on alternative routes suggestions are noted, however they are not directly related to the change being promoted. The route was selected following extensive investigation of possible alternative route options and assessed against the Project vision and objectives, and a range of engineering, economic and financial criteria.

With regards to consultation and engagement, the Applicant is now proposing this change as a result of landowner feedback and discussions held at the DCO Examination hearings, and having considered this along with our delivery partners.

The proposed change consultation was about getting the views of impacted landowners and local communities. Landowners were written to directly and invited to speak to us in the consultation period. National Highways also liaised directly with land agents and engaged with impacted landowners as part of the change consultation process in one-to-one meetings or at the drop in events. Their feedback has been given due consideration in the decision of which changes National Highways is taking forward in our Change Application.

There has been an application to National Highways Designated Funds to conduct a feasibility study for a footpath to connect Warcop village to the school, church and village hall. This is separate from the A66NTP project. The funding for the feasibility study was recently approved and the study will commence imminently. Once the feasibility study has been undertaken, further applications will be made for detailed design and implementation funding and are subject to future approval being granted. The construction of the footpath will also be subject to land owner agreements being in place.

DC-26 Revision to West View Farm accommodation bridge and removal of West View Farm underpass

Total Comments	Response to "Are you in favour of the change?"		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
15	8	6	1
Responsees			
Mrs Lynn Clapham (CE003)	Duncan Clapham (CE004)		
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)	Hannah Mary Middleton (CS026)		
Mrs D Robinson (CS031)	Mr Joe Robinson (CS030)		
Byways and Bridleways Trust (CS036)	Mr Paul Robinson (CS029)		
Cumbria County Council (CS076)	Mr Charles Blackett-Ord (CS052)		
Mr & Mrs Stead (CS086)	Jonathon Garbutt (CS075)		
Mary Helvin (HC006)	Mr and Mrs Hayllar (CS080)		
	British Horse Society (EM024)		
The Applicant's Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were raised in relation to the overall design, with support expressed for the movement of West View Farm Accommodation bridge eastwards and noting that less traffic will pass properties. • Questions and concerns were also raised on the proposed change, including the maintenance of the structure, the provision of the footpath and bridleway to routes northwards, the limiting of movements to and from Helbeck Quarry, drainage design and location of attenuation ponds, and concerns about an increase in traffic through Brough. • Objections were also made to the removal of the left-in left-out junction for westbound movements, the removal of the underpass to the west of West View Farm resulting in the overbridge having to be shared by users, and that the route should be a bridleway for walkers, horse riders and cyclists. • An update was sought in respect to a proposed footpath to link the village and school. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as the movement of the overbridge eastwards will mean that it is further away from residential properties. Whilst the westbound left-in and left-out will be lost as a result of the change, it is considered that the number of vehicles that would have utilised the turning is not significant. Access to and from the quarry is maintained to the old A66 with the junction at Warcop enabling movements east and westbound without the need to enter Brough.</p> <p>The Applicant does acknowledge the level of concern in respect to the suitability of the road network for the traffic that will need to utilise it as a consequence of the proposed change, and the potential impacts on businesses. The design is subject to further technical work during the detailed design stage of the project and that will include the specification of the road network, including but not limited to design standards, road widths, how shared road space will be delineated. National Highways acknowledges comments made in response to the impact that the removal of the underpass will create to the operation of the farm. National Highways will continue</p>			

to engage with user groups via the established Community Liaison Groups and Technical Working Groups as well as individual landowners and stakeholders.

The responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of infrastructure provided as part of the project, such as accommodation bridges, will be discussed with each landowner on a case-by-case basis and, where applicable, will be subject to management agreements and third-party access rights where required.

There is no change to the provision of footpaths or bridleways as a result of the planned change. The overbridge will provide a footpath, whilst a bridleway has been provided that runs parallel to the southern side of the A66 to tie into Musgrave Lane and provides a means for horses to cross the A66 in to Brough. National Highways acknowledge that the drawings presented in the consultation brochure were not clear in this regard.

In respect to the Helbeck Quarry movements, in order to avoid Brough in the DCO design, HGVs would have to turn right to the Warcop junctions to then travel onwards east or west, so there was already an expectation of increased haulage for 50% of journeys. As a result of the westbound left-in left-out being removed, HGVs will now need to utilise the Warcop junctions for all journeys to avoid Brough. Neither the DCO design nor the proposed change will prevent laden vehicles leaving the quarry site. The change effectively means that more journeys will need to be completed by using the Warcop junctions to avoid Brough than were proposed in the DCO.

Removal of the direct left-in left-out junction has a safety benefit for the A66 but West View Farm is serviced by two all-movement junctions, one in Brough and the Warcop Junctions. Traffic coming from the west will be able to use the Warcop Junction and this should be an improvement compared to the current situation where traffic has to turn around at the Brough junction to gain access.

The provision of the accommodation overbridge provides access 24/7 to land to the north and south of the farm. This is an improvement on the current situation where farm works have to cross the busy A66 just as the road widens into a dual carriageway. This change makes the bridge more secure and safer for West View Farm traffic. As a result of this improvement, it was felt the underpass was no longer required.

With the removal of the left-in left-out junction, the bridge becomes a PMA and footway only. Without this change, the bridge was open to all traffic and could easily become a rat run for traffic to enter the west side of Brough. Whilst this will lead to a small increase in traffic through Brough, the numbers of the properties served by the bridge means that this is not considered to be a significant factor.

The principles of the drainage design are unaffected by the proposed change. Detailed design will develop the solution further in respect to the size, shape and location of attenuation ponds.

There has been an application to National Highways Designated Funds to conduct a feasibility study for a footpath to connect Warcop village to the school, church and village hall. This is separate from the A66NTP project. The funding for the feasibility study was recently approved and the study will commence imminently. Once the feasibility study has been undertaken, further applications will be made for detailed design and implementation funding and are subject to future approval being granted. The construction of the footpath will also be subject to land owner agreements being in place.

DC-27 Construction of noise barrier south of Brough

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
2	1	0	1
Responsees			
Warcop Parish Council (CS019)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, National Highways has considered the feedback received. The only matter raised was in respect to the effectiveness of the noise barrier.</p> <p>Overall, National Highways has decided to submit this proposed change as the noise barrier will lead to a reduction in noise at properties to the south of Brough and the change ensures that it can be built within land secured by the DCO.</p> <p>The noise fence will be located on the alignment included within the original DCO Application. The front face of the barrier is therefore not proposed to move meaning that noise levels and the mitigation afforded by the barrier remains the same as reported in the project Environmental Statement (APP-044 to APP-059).</p>			

DC-28 Realignment of local access road to be closer to new dual carriageway east of Bowes

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
5	4	1	0
Responsees			
Byways and Bridleways Trust (CS036)		Mr Simon & Mrs Carolyn Gill (CS041)	
Andrew Clarke (CS053)		Mr J Manners (CS087)	
Carolyn Gill (HC007)			
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in respect to noise local to Bowes, noting that these are not specific to the proposed change. • A number of matters related to the design approach, including the need for the overbridge, its location and design (including HGV access), that the bridge should also be for all non-motorised users, and questions raised in respect of the maintenance of the bridge. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it is considered that the reduced length and simplification of the new overbridge structure are beneficial to the scheme.</p> <p>In response to the concern that the bridge is not required, not all landowners who have plots north and south of the A66 have access from the A67 and the proposed accommodation bridge will provide this as well as providing a safe crossing of the A66 for users of the diverted PRow from Bowes Cross Farm (Bowes footpath 12).</p> <p>The proposed bridge has already been moved east and the extension of The Street has been moved closer to the A66 after representations made by the affected persons during the 2021 Statutory Consultation. Locating the proposed bridge further east onto High Broats Farm track would require more land and make the structure wider due to the tighter turning areas required as well as consideration relocating ponds.</p> <p>Maintenance of the extension of The Street and the accommodation overbridge will be the responsibility of the proposed highway authority (National Highways and/or Local Highway Authority).</p> <p>As well as providing landowner access north and south of the A66, the proposed accommodation bridge provides a safe crossing of the A66 for users of the existing PRow at Bowes Cross Farm (Bowes footpath 12) that currently cross the A66 at grade without any formal crossing facilities. This PRow will be diverted to the accommodation bridge. There are no proposals under the DCO change for a northern bridleway link to Bowes Quarry (Hulands Quarry).</p> <p>The proposed bridge design will be subject to the same design standards as the DCO design which has been designed for HGV access. The detailed design stage will include further vehicle swept path analysis in consultation with landowners on vehicle types to be accommodated.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments made in relation to noise at Bowes but notes that it does not relate directly to change DC-28.</p>			

DC-30 Realignment of maintenance/footpath adjacent to Waitlands Lane

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
4	1	1	2
Responsees			
Robin Russell (CS005)		Namulas Pension Trust (EM031)	
North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council (EM033)		Lindsay Russell (HC001)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant’s has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were raised emphasising the need for avoidance of any impact on archaeological remains associated with the Roman Fort. • Comments were also made on the suitability of the proposed path for all users and compliance with standards. • A number of other comments were made linked to DC-29 which is longer being taken forward. <p>Overall, the Applicant’s has decided to submit this proposed change as it avoids the need to realign the footpath and reduces the quantum of construction work. The proposed change will not affect the Roman Fort Scheduled Monument at Carkin Moor.</p> <p>An equestrian crossing at this location would only be required if DC-29 was also being taken forward. DC-29 is no longer being progressed.</p> <p>The existing footpath (20.55/1/1) will stay on its original alignment with a small ramp and / or short realignment along the de-trunked A66 embankment to bring it up to the new level of the de-trunked A66 to comply with relevant accessibility and LTN/120 standards. An uncontrolled crossing point will be installed to facilitate a connection to the equestrian track on the north side of the de-trunked A66 which can also be used by pedestrians.</p>			

DC-31 Realignment of Warrener Lane

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
6	3	1	2
Responsees			
Robin Russell (CS005)		Byways and Bridleways Trust (CS036)	
Historic England (CS051)		Andrew & Maria Henshaw (CS082)	
North Yorkshire County Council & Richmondshire District Council (EM033)		Lindsay Russell (HC001)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were raised emphasising the need for avoidance of any encroachment on to the Scheduled Ancient Monument. • A number of comments were also raised on the proposal in relation to drainage design and impact at Mainsgill Farm, bridleway connectivity and temporary works, including the timing of the works and potential disruption during construction. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit this proposed change as it will reduce the overall footprint of the construction works without impinging on the Scheduled Ancient Monument to the north.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the proposed change will not lead to any additional encroachment on the Scheduled Ancient Monument area, and this proposed change will not impact the drainage arrangements for Mainsgill Farm. The proposed change at Warrener Lane does not affect the proposed connectivity to surrounding bridleways which has been consulted on previously.</p> <p>The proposed change will also not impact any planned temporary works at this location as included in the DCO application. With regards to temporary works required, in this case a temporary roundabout on the existing A66, there are no plans to incorporate the temporary roundabout into the permanent road design. As a result, a roundabout has not been designed and assessed as part of the permanent works for this location in the DCO Application.</p> <p>The timing and phasing of the proposed works is currently being developed by the delivery partner for this scheme. It is acknowledged that without mitigation and suitable design, the timing and duration of the works could have an impact on Mainsgill Farm Shop. The delivery partner will continue to engage with Mainsgill Farm Shop as the detail of the programme is developed.</p>			

3.4. Project-wide Comments Relevant to the Proposed Changes Consultation

3.4.1. In addition to comments on design changes, a number of broader matters were raised through the consultation. The Applicant has considered this feedback when deciding which of the proposed changes to progress to submission.

Project wide Comments

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
67	10	18	39
Respondee			
Mr. A.S. Walker (CE006)		Homes England (EM040)	
Michael Roff (CS002 / CS003)		Richard Hawker (EM042)	
Robert Stott (CS006)		Durham County Council (EM043)	
Rod Hepplewhite (CS011)		Andrew Boswell (EM045)	
Mrs Judy Dobson (CS014)		Charlotte Morison (EM047)	
The Ramblers, Penrith Group (CS015)		Catherine Harrison (EM048)	
Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)		David Morton (EM049)	
The Rt Hon the Lord Blencathra PC (CS040)		Nicola Estill (EM050)	
Guy Harvey (CS057)		Paul Caygill (EM051)	
Chris White (CS066)		Lucy Rowley (EM052)	
Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Simon Scott-Harden (EM053)	
Holly Martin (CS077)		Transport Action Network (EM054)	
Robert Towell (CS095)		Adam Walmsley (EM056)	
Darlington Borough Council (EM002)		Emma Nicholson (EM057)	
Laura Blake (EM006)		Patricia Cumiskey (HC002)	
The Coal Authority (EM007)		John Woodman (HC005)	
Matt Davy (EM009)		Dr. A. J. Sewell (HC016)	
Archie Agnew (EM010)		Keith F Lewis (CS001)	
Rachael Agnew (EM011)		Warcop Parish Council (CS019)	
Steve Agnew (EM012)		Robert Birtwell (CS023)	
Anne Robinson (EM017)		Anne Sayer (EM004)	
Northumberland County Council (EM018)		D & S Coward (EM019)	
NSIP Team - HSE Safety (EM021)		Daniel Harding (EM023)	
Royal Mail (EM022)		Val Harvey (EM028)	
The British Horse Society (EM024)		Ginny Kirkham (EM046)	
Cumbria & Lakes Joint Local Access Forum (EM025)		Sunderland City Council (HC061)	
Adam Barker (EM026)		Plant Protection Team - on behalf of ESP Utilities Group Ltd (HC062)	
Stewart McWilliam (EM027)		Jamie Russell (EM038)	
UK Health Security Agency (EM035)		Friends of the Lake District (EM039)	

The applicant's Way Forward

In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed changes for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:

Design

Several comments raised concerns that the provisions for equestrian users were inadequate and suggested that horse riders were not treated equally as other non-motorised users (including reference to discrimination of equestrians under the Equality Act).

There was concern regarding inadequate information provided in relation to impacts to PRoW networks and request for plans showing full extent of PRoW diversions. There is concern that inadequate PRoW provisions will result in safety risks to pedestrians.

An Equalities Impact Assessment (APP-243) was submitted with the DCO application that considered the impact of the Project on walkers, cyclists and horse riders, concluding as follows: *"The proposed Project is likely to result in temporary impacts on a number of routes used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders (WCHs) potentially resulting in changes to journey times and travel patterns, loss of routes, temporary closures and diversions, changes to noise and visual environment, and changes to crossing points and safety aspect. The full detail of impacts on routes for WCH's is provided in Chapter 13 Population and Human Health. The majority of the routes are rural routes generally used for recreational walking, and therefore differential or disproportionate effects on equalities groups are likely to be more limited. (page 3.10-33 of 63)".* The changes proposed by this application would not change the conclusion of the equalities impact assessment.

The Consultation Brochure provided as part of the proposed changes consultation includes information regarding PRoW networks in relation to each change where relevant. In addition, several of the changes are to provide improvements for non-motorised users. For example, DC-01 would make the shared cycleway safer and reduce the speed limit.

The Change Application main document notes in relation to each proposed change where there is a proposed amendment to any PRoW and any impacts on the existing provision or that proposed by the DCO Application.

Questions were raised relating to construction impacts such as rat-running, traffic congestions and delays. Assurance was also sought that adequate consultation would be undertaken prior to setting up of diversions during construction. Concerns were also raised relating to the closer proximity of Kirkby Thore to a 70mph road.

The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) was submitted with the DCO Application as Annex B13 of the Environmental Management Plan (APP-033). The proposed changes, if accepted into the examination and should the DCO be made, will be subject to the provisions set out in the CTMP. Future versions of that plan will be produced and informed by detailed design and consultation with local highway authorities. In addition, general road users will be notified of proposed diversions.

Environment

Several comments raised concerns that National Highways had not assessed the proposed changes adequately to address the impact of these changes on the environment, especially the traffic and carbon impacts. The comments also stated that there was a lack of detail on cumulative assessments of carbon and biodiversity impacts.

Some of the responses also referred to potential adverse impacts on specific environmental issues and assets such as: Special Area of Conservation, Sites of Specific Scientific Interest, impacts to the North Pennines Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting, protected species and habitats, severance of PRoW, air pollution, climate change implications, impacts on heritage assets and impacts on health and wellbeing. Some responses also disagreed with the lack of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirement for the project. Detailed information on construction traffic mitigation measures was also requested.

Further information on the potential new or different significant effects resulting from the proposed changes can be found in the Environmental Statement Addendum, submitted with the Change Application. No single design change in isolation nor cumulatively is anticipated to be of a scale or nature to result in new or different significant effects in greenhouse gas emissions for

the Project. Environmental information was also provided as part of the proposed changes consultation and was provided as an Appendix to the Consultation Brochure.

The potential effects of the proposed changes were assessed as a reasonable worst case scenario. Since the end of the consultation, the proposed design changes were progressed further in terms of design detail, which allowed for a more refined assessment to be undertaken to verify where there is a risk of new or different significant environmental effects when compared to those reported within the Environmental Statement (APP-044 to APP-059). This is presented within the Environmental Statement Addendum Volume I and Volume II.

This includes, where applicable, reference to potential effects on the HRA, the Water Framework Directive (WFD), protected species and cumulative effects.

Regarding comments proposing that BNG should be applied to the Project, the Applicant has responded to this point in various submissions to the Examination and these set out the Applicant's position. In summary, a BNG is not a requirement for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and is therefore not included as part of the Application documents. However, the Applicant reiterates that it is committed to maximising biodiversity delivery achieved by the Project within the current policy and legislative terms.

Consultation

There were several objections made regarding the adequacy of the proposed changes consultation period, with consultees expressing that the 31-day period was not long enough and reflects the poor consultation carried out on the project, including the previous supplementary consultations.

Some consultees expressed that the proposed changes should have been resolved before the DCO Application was submitted and they commented that this reflects an inadequately prepared application. Related points were raised on the adequacy of information provided as part of the consultation. Overall, people felt that Project Speed was a cause of these issues, and that another consultation during a congested examination process was unacceptable. Some comments also expressed concern that the proposed changes materially alter the scheme and the DCO should therefore be withdrawn and reconsidered.

There were some comments that suggested National Highways had consulted enough already and they wanted to see the scheme built sooner without any further delays.

As set out in this Consultation Report (at Section 2), the 31-day consultation period is deemed proportionate given the information presented for comment and is in accordance with the time required by statutory consultation periods (i.e. Planning Act 2008 and EIA Regulations 2017). The consultation also adheres to the guidance provided in Advice Notice 16 and further guidance provided by the ExA (PD-009).

As part of the Government's Project Speed initiative the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project has undertaken measures to accelerate the programme for planning and delivery and this also reflects the need for the Project to be operational. A key measure in accelerating delivery has involved National Highway's appointing Delivery Partners who are responsible for the detail design stage of the Project earlier than would traditionally be the case. Through this early detailed design work and our ongoing engagement with landowners and stakeholders, the Applicant has been able to identify several opportunities to improve the Project which have evolved to the changes proposed. These changes often positively respond to stakeholder and landowner feedback, reduce the impact on the environment or reduce the amount of land required for the construction and operation of the Project.

The Change Application is seeking acceptance of the proposed changes into the current examination of the DCO Application and therefore to be included in the DCO if made. This reduces objections to the project and the need for changes to the Development Consent Order once made and therefore should speed up the delivery of the project.

Other

There was some general support expressed for the Project stating it was long overdue and delays should be avoided. It was noted that given as the scheme is funded by public money it should be beneficial to all not just a few.

Comments were raised that these proposed changes further questioned the case for the Project

It was suggested that the driver for the proposed changes was to reduce costs, but the changes do not represent value for money. It was noted that cost was not covered in the consultation.

A number of comments were raised which were not specifically relevant to the scope of the consultation or noted that certain organisations had no comments to make. This included a number of alternative route suggestions or issues not in relation to the proposed changes, including increased traffic around Barnard Castle, which has been subject to previous project responses (please see A66 Consultation Report Annex N Row ID 464). One comment expressed concern that the project is not in compliance with the NPPF.

Other matters raised include consultees raising or re-emphasising previously made comments, including installations subject to HSE consultation and operations of Royal Mail.

The Applicant considers that the 'other' comments are not specifically relevant to the Change Application and that the points are addressed through previous various submissions to the examination and the DCO Application itself.

Overall, the Applicant has decided to submit the 24 proposed changes following consultation. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including consideration of these project wide responses.

3.5. Comments on proposed changes not being progressed

3.5.1. Following the consideration of the feedback from consultation and engagement, a decision was made following a re-evaluation of the benefits and drawbacks that some changes could not be justified at this stage. Following the consultation, it was proposed that the following design changes identified should not be taken forward:

- DC-02 – Realignment of walking and cycling route at Skirsgill
- DC-07 – Retention of Lightwater Cottages
- DC-10 – Removal of Priest Lane underpass
- DC-12 – Green Lane Bridge Realignment
- DC-16 – Removal of Roger Head Farm overbridge
- DC-18 – Revision to access for New Hall Farm and Far Bank End
- DC-29 – Realignment of A66 mainline and Collier Lane
- DC-32 – Lower the A66 mainline east of Carkin Moor and change an underpass to an overbridge

3.5.2. This section provides an overview of the comments received on these proposed changes, and the Applicant's overall response to why each change is not being taken forward.

DC-02 – Realignment of walking and cycling route at Skirsgill

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
6	3	1	2
Responsees			
Penrith Town Council (CS013)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
The Ramblers – Penrith Group (CS015)		British Horse Society (EM024)	
Mr J Dent (CS022)		Plant Enquiries Team (Vodafone) (EM022)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three comments that indicated support for this change were generally on grounds of increased pedestrian safety, shortened construction and traffic improvement. It was also suggested that this was a better route. However, comments were also received expressing concerns regarding pedestrian safety, the location of the proposed route through the depot site, and potential conflict with the historical status of Skirsgill as a bridleway. • There was concern about lack of engagement prior to introduction of this proposed change by Cumbria County Council. One of the comments set out the procedure that would apply when Other Parties intend or are undertaking works in the vicinity of Vodafone apparatus. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided not to submit this proposed change following consultation. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including an objection to the change from Cumbria County Council and discussions with the Council during the consultation period to understand the significance of their concerns.</p>			

DC-07 – Retention of Lightwater Cottages

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
6	1	4	1
Responsees			
Tony Greenwood (CS017)		Anne Scott (CS044)	
Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036)		Mrs Patricia and Mr Iain Scott (CS049)	
Allan W Jenkinson (CS043)		Cumbria County Council (CS076)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One responsee expressed support for the retention of Lightwater Cottages based on its current and historic significance. However, a number of responsees raised concerns that the retention of the cottages would make them badly affected by harmful noise and environmental pollution with ongoing safety issues. Assurance was sought that the increased noise would be within acceptable limits or could be appropriately mitigated. There was concern that noise levels of 99dB at these dwellings are presented in the Environmental Statement which may be harmful to health and will make the properties uninhabitable. • Concerns were raised around access to land and imposition of third-party rights over land that is in the ownership of others. This includes some objections that expressed a preference for the original DCO design, noting that it would give better long-term outcomes for the area. There was concern that this design change would result in unsatisfactory and unsafe access to affected properties. • It was noted that the original DCO design was the result of detailed discussions and agreement had been reached regarding the loss of Lightwater Cottages. <p>This Design Change was based on Eden District Council (EDC) Principal Areas of Disagreements Summary Statement (PADSS) around the demolition of Lightwater Cottages. EDC has since confirmed its position and removed this from the PADSS and advised that if Lightwater Cottages were kept as per the change they would raise concerns over noise levels for the occupants. Therefore, the Applicant has decided to not submit this proposed change.</p>			

DC-10 – Removal of Priest Lane underpass

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
25	4	14	7
Responsees			
The Ramblers, Penrith Group (CS015 / EM008) Tony Greenwood (CS017) George Pattimore (CS035) Byways & Bridleways Trust (CS036) Helen Bendelow (CS042) Ridley (CS046) Daniel Pattimore (CS048) Rev Kristy Pattimore (CS058) Mrs Palmer (CS059) Martin Farrell (CS069) John Gordon Slee (CS070) Cumbria County Council (CS076)		Tim Nicholson also on behalf of Mrs FMR Nicholson, RK&GF Nicholson and Cactus Tree Guards LTD (CS100) The British Horse Society (EM024) Cumbria & Lakes Joint Local Access Forum (EM025) Matt Bell - on behalf of Metcalf Family (EM036) Natural England (EM041) Kirkby Thore Parish Council (EM055 / CS088) Emma Nicholson (EM057) Nicola Renison (EM059) Michael Hill (HC010) Mandy Mills (HC011) Dr. A. J. Sewell (HC016)	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern regarding the loss of wildlife crossing points including for bats. It was noted that alternative and appropriate crossing points would need to be provided to ensure there were no impacts on protected species. The cumulative adverse impacts to Kirkby Thore was also highlighted. • There was reference to the land retained not being useful for farming but also a positive response concerning reduced land-take. • There was strong opposition raised to this design change on grounds of safety, worsening of impacts to walkers and public users, lack of safety for horses, difficulty with movement of livestock, impact on livestock wellbeing, the need for more holdings, creation of a considerable detour for farming machinery, increased costs for the farmer and excessive length of the diversion. It was suggested that this change was a cost-reduction exercise to improve the benefit-cost ratio (BCR). • There was concern regarding lack of clarity and sufficient information in the consultation materials. Concern was raised about the lack of consultation on this design change. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided not to submit this proposed change following consultation on the proposed changes. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including objections and concerns raised by stakeholders. These concerns included impacts on a local bridleway and from landowners.</p>			

DC-12 – Green Lane bridge realignment

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
18	4	10	4
Responsees			
CS012 - Flora Oxley		CS091 - Kirkby Thore Parish Council	
CS015 - The Ramblers, Penrith Group		CS100 - Tim Nicholson also on behalf of Mrs FMR Nicholson, RK&GF Nicholson and Cactus Tree Guards LTD	
CS017 - Tony Greenwood		EM024 - The British Horse Society	
CS036 - Byways & Bridleways Trust		EM025 - Cumbria & Lakes Joint Local Access Forum	
CS046 - Ridley		EM036 - Matt Bell on behalf of Metcalf Family	
CS059 - Mrs Palmer		EM055 - Kirkby Thore Parish Council	
CS060 - Daniel Pattimore		HC003 - Lindsay Hill	
CS076 - Cumbria County Council		HC016 - Dr. A. J. Sewell	
CS078 - Councillor Henry Sawrey-Cookson			
CS079 - Councillor Henry Sawrey-Cookson			
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several comments raised concerns regarding adverse impacts to the amenity of residents, and that the impact of the proposed change to residents is underestimated in the Environmental Appendix to the Consultation Brochure for DC-12. • There was support shown for reduced land-take of landowner property. • Several objections were made due to adverse impacts to local residents including cutting off walking routes, the length of the diversion, several safety concerns, insufficient design detail, poor value for public money with little community benefits, no provisions for horse riders and non-motorised users. It was noted that additional detail is required on the provisions for non-motorised users considering safety concerns. One respondent expressed preference for the previous DCO design as it provided some mitigation against loss of community amenity. Objections were made to the proposal to make Green Lane Bridge a private access track and the associated changes to the PRoW. • Concerns were raised about the insufficient level of information and mapping provided as part of the consultation. <p>The Applicant has decided to not submit this proposed change following consultation on the proposed changes. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including objections and concerns raised by stakeholders. These concerns included impacts on a local footpath and its users.</p>			

DC-16 - Removal of Roger Head Farm overbridge

Total Responses	Response to "Are you in favour of the change?"		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
14	2	9	3
Responsees			
CS015 - The Ramblers, Penrith Group		CS097 - The Taylor Family	
CS033 - Mr and Mrs Iain Waite		Charlotte Ditchburn - The British Horse Society	
CS036 - Byways & Bridleways Trust		EM025 - Geoff Wilson - Cumbria & Lakes Joint Local Access Forum	
CS042 - Helen Bendelow		EM041 - Niamh Keddy - Natural England	
CS072 - Thomas Chappelhow		HC012 - Mandy Mills	
CS073 - Chris, Geoff and Janet Bell		HC013 - Michael Hill	
CS076 - Cumbria County Council		HC014 - Margaret Yvonne Rigg	
The Applicant's Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, The Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern was raised regarding the loss of bat crossing points. • There were concerns around access to retained land and the adverse impacts of land-take on productive agricultural land and farming practicalities. • There were several objections to the proposal on grounds of adverse effects on users of the path, safety concerns, additional walking distance caused by the change, lack of provisions for horse riders including connectivity, removal of access for moving livestock and machinery, additional journey times to access both sides of land, difficulty in transporting large machinery, difficulty in livestock handling, and permission from the landowner for walkers to cross their land. Some clarity was also requested about maintenance responsibilities for the path. • Concern that the Environmental Statement was overly technical and needed to be simpler so it is easily understood. Reference was also made to a lack of adequate engagement with the affected landowner. <p>The Applicant is not progressing this change following consultation on the proposed changes. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including objections and concerns raised by stakeholders. These concerns included safety concerns from Cumbria County Council and objections from local landowners.</p>			

DC-18 – Revision to access for New Hall Farm and Far Bank End

Total Comments	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
12	2	8	2
Responsees			
The Ramblers, Penrith Group – CS015 Warcop Parish Council – CS019 Byways & Bridleways Trust – CS036 Helen Bendelow – CS042 Pennine National Trails Partnership – CS047 Mr Richardson – CS067		Cumbria County Council – CS076 Mr M Carruthers – CS085 The British Horse Society – EM024 Cumbria & Lakes Joint Local Access Forum – EM025 Mr and Mrs Bailey – EM029 Matt Bell - on behalf of Richardson – EM037	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised regarding impacts on drainage system crossing the surrounding farmland. • There is concern regarding the need for third-party access through another landowner’s land. • Comments were made regarding availability of a public crossing, insufficient provisions and arrangements for non-motorised users including horse riders, impacts to connectivity of the PRow network in the area, retention of existing crossings, preference for the original DCO design, consideration of access and land-take impacts to local business and the adverse impacts to farming activities in terms of increased journey times, financial implications and safety issues. • There was concern regarding the lack of engagement with affected landowners prior to this proposed change consultation. <p>The Applicant has decided not to submit this proposed change following consultation on the proposed changes. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including objections and concerns raised by stakeholders. These concerns included objections from the farm owners directly impacted by the proposed change and other stakeholder concerns.</p>			

DC-29 – Realignment of A66 mainline and Collier Lane

Total Responses	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
15	1*	14	0
Responsees			
CS005 - Robin Russell		EM001 / EM003 - Rachel Connolly - North Yorkshire Local Access Forum	
CS009 - Ian Walton		EM015 - Charlotte Newton	
CS016 - Michael J Blacklidge Elizabeth C Blacklidge		EM016 - Caroline Bradley	
CS020 - Sarah McDonald, Public Rights of Way Officer, North Yorkshire County Council		EM024 - Charlotte Ditchburn - The British Horse Society	
CS036 - Byways and Bridleways Trust		EM031 - Yasmin Peach - on behalf of Namulas Pension Trust	
CS074 - Jill Wales		EM033 - Michael Reynolds -on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council and Richmondshire District Council	
CS092 - W Austen Richardson Ltd, Mr J Richardson		HC001 - Lindsay Russell	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern regarding increased long-term environmental effects such as adverse noise, landscape and visual impacts of lifting the road level as well as negative health impacts to residents resulting from the proximity of a 70mph road. Concern was also raised that the proposed access track would result in anti-social behaviour. • The removal of the underpass was identified as a negative for landowner operations. Questions were raised about the restrictions to the private access to avoid trespassing on private land. • There was opposition to the removal of the underpass and raising the road level. Several objections were made due to the increased length of diversion, preference for previous DCO design, the proposed farm access arrangement which was described as unacceptable, safety and security concerns, negative effects of the design to farming operations, negative impacts for non-motorised users particularly horse-riders and impacts to the PRoW network due to the proximity of the new dual carriageway. It was suggested that any de-trunked part of the A66 should have a 30mph speed limit and the accommodation underpass should be a bridleway. The responses also asked for clarification about the maintenance arrangement for the private access / bridleway. • Disappointment was expressed that years of engagement and agreement with landowner and the community has been discounted without any prior engagement and that the proposed design did not include input from those affected by the change. It was highlighted that the information provided as part of consultation was insufficient. • Concern raised that the change only seeks to reduce cost with no long-term benefits. <p>Overall, the Applicant has decided not to progress with this proposed change following the consultation. The Applicant has given due regard to the feedback, including objections and concerns raised by stakeholders. These concerns included objections from adjacent landowners including those where further land would be required for the change.</p>			

* Note that a second comment clarified that there had been a misunderstanding in their initial response which changed support to an objection.

DC-32 – Lower the A66 mainline levels east of Carkin Moor and change an underpass to an overbridge

Total Responses	Response to “Are you in favour of the change?”		
	Yes	No	Not Stated
12	4	2	6
Responsees			
CS005 - Robin Russell		EM016 – Caroline Bradley	
CS020 - Public Rights of Way Officer, North Yorkshire County Council		EM024 –The British Horse Society	
CS036 - Byways & Bridleways Trust		EM030 - Namulas Pension Trust	
CS051 – Historic England		EM033 - North Yorkshire County Council and Richmondshire District Council	
CS084 - Mr & Mrs Harrison		HC001 - Lindsay Russell	
EM001 - North Yorkshire Local Access Forum		HC016 - Dr. A.J. Sewell	
The Applicant’s Way Forward			
<p>In coming to a decision on whether to submit the proposed change for examination, the Applicant has considered the feedback received. The key matters are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were concerns raised in relation to potential harm to the Scheduled Monument, including visual impacts and impacts to the setting of the monument, and concerns about adverse visual impacts to affected properties. The comments asked for clarification about the additional surveys and assessment that would need to be carried out if the change went ahead. There was also concern about further land-take requirements from the monument on either side of the existing carriageway. • Concern was raised over excess land-take and related impacts on a local business with a request for less land-take from the affected landowners. • Queries were raised in relation to the need for a bridge or underpass at this location, such as details around its length and width. Some comments indicated a preference for retention of the bridge as a bridleway, with suggestion that its use should be restricted to a bridleway only for non-motorised users. Concerns over safety and security were also flagged. Other comments raised a preference for an underpass and compliance with current design standards and British Horse Society best practice was also advised. <p>The Applicant has decided to not submit this proposed change following engagement with Historic England. The applicant thanks Historic England for their comments and notes their concerns. Due to these concerns raised around potential impacts on the scheduled monument the applicant believes this cannot be progressed through the proposed DCO changes application.</p>			

4. Conclusion

4.1. Summary

- 4.1.1. The Applicant consulted on the 32 proposed changes to the DCO application ahead of the submission of the Change Application to the ExA on 24 March 2023.
- 4.1.2. The consultation ran from Saturday 28 January 2023 to Monday 27 February 2023 (providing a 31-day consultation period). The Applicant is confident that the consultation has been proportionate, that all relevant parties and statutory bodies have been consulted with and their views captured, and that there are no persons who would be affected by the proposed changes who were deprived of the opportunity to participate in the consultation.
- 4.1.3. In total, 184 responses to the consultation were received by the Applicant within the consultation period. The Applicant has carefully reviewed all consultation responses received and provided an overall response as set out in Section 3 of this Report.
- 4.1.4. The consultation responses received from stakeholders and interested parties provided the Applicant with a robust understanding of what matters ought to have been addressed in the Change Application for each proposed change. This understanding has shaped and informed the changes that were submitted within the Change Application. This includes the following:
- For DC-08 and DC-25 it is acknowledged that the detailed design should accommodate specific request of land interests on the size, shape and precise location of attenuation ponds. For DC-31 there is a better understanding of the matters to be addressed in the detailed design and construction of the Project to minimise impacts on Mainsgill Farm Shop.
 - Four revised or modified proposed changes, compared to the designs included in the consultation. This includes:
 - DC-01 where the speed limit reduction has been revised to 50mph;
 - DC-04 where the extent of the proposed separation and flexibility for shared tracks has been extended to include an additional length of proposed shared track to the south-east of the junction at Center Parcs;
 - DC-14 where, for clarity, the proposed Limits of Deviation have been amended to ensure that the design of the realignment of Sleastonhow Lane entirely avoids the Sleastonhow Oak; and
 - DC-19 was modified to avoid the land parcel that was queried by the affected landowner, which in turn helped to facilitate the landowner's decision to grant consent to the inclusion in the DCO application of the remaining area of additional land required for this design change.

- Eight changes are not being progressed and therefore 24 proposed changes are included the Change Application. Those not being progressed are as follows.
 - DC-02 – Realignment of walking and cycling route at Skirsgill
 - DC-07 – Retention of Lightwater Cottages
 - DC-10 – Removal of Priest Lane underpass
 - DC-12 – Green Lane Bridge Realignment
 - DC-16 – Removal of Roger Head Farm overbridge
 - DC-18 – Revision to access for New Hall Farm and Far Bank End
 - DC-29 – Realignment of A66 mainline and Collier Lane
 - DC-32 – Lower the A66 mainline east of Carkin Moor and change an underpass to an overbridge
- 4.1.5. The Applicant considers that it has publicised the proposed changes in a way that responds to the ExA's guidance (as set out in PD-008 and PD-009) and the Planning Inspectorate's AN16, as well as the EIA Regulations. The Applicant has provided justification for the consultation methods and publicity used and has demonstrated that the consultation responses have been taken into account in the Change Application.
- 4.1.6. The Applicant has set a programme for engagement with stakeholders post submission of the Change Application to provide support in understanding the proposed changes and the additional environmental information and responding to any questions that may be asked. The Applicant will explain the process for the submission of the Change Application, which is seeking for the changes to be included within the examination of the DCO application.
- 4.1.7. This will include meetings with the local authorities and statutory environmental bodies providing a summary of the consultation, the changes proposed in the Change Application and additional environmental information. In addition, an email will be sent to landowners and land agents advising them that the Change Application has been submitted and contact information should they have any queries. The Applicant will also provide an update to the Community Liaison Groups.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: List of Persons Consulted

APPENDIX B: Press Notices

APPENDIX C: Notices and covering letter sent to consultees

APPENDIX D: Site notices, location plan and photographic evidence

APPENDIX E: National Highways website promotion of the Proposed Changes

APPENDIX F: Social Media Promotion of the Proposed Changes

APPENDIX G: Consultation responses received by the Applicant

APPENDIX H: Proposed Changes Consultation Brochure