

**A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
TR010062**

**8.3 Change Application –
Environmental Statement Addendum
Volume I (Rev 2)
(Clean)**

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 8

Deadline 7

09 May 2023

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

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

A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project
Development Consent Order 202x

**8.3 CHANGE APPLICATION – ENVIRONMENTAL
STATEMENT ADDENDUM - VOLUME I**

| | |
|---|---|
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference | TR010062 |
| Application Document Reference | 8.3 |
| Author: | A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project Team, National Highways |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|---------------|---|
| Rev 1 | 24 March 2023 | Change Application |
| Rev 2 | 09 May 2023 | Deadline 7 - Revised following Examining Authority's acceptance [PD-014] of National Highways' Change Application [CR-001 – CR-018] |

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Background..... | 1 |
| 1.2 | Reasons for this Environmental Statement Addendum | 1 |
| 1.3 | Changes descriptions | 1 |
| 1.4 | Assessment methodology..... | 2 |
| 1.5 | Cumulative and in-combination effects..... | 3 |
| 2 | Design change scoping exercise | 4 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 4 |
| 2.2 | DC-01 - Change in speed limit west of M6 junction 40..... | 5 |
| 2.3 | DC-03 – Reorientation of Kemplay Bank junction | 11 |
| 2.4 | DC-04 - Separation of, and greater flexibility for, shared public rights of way and private access track provision from Penrith to Temple Sowerby..... | 15 |
| 2.5 | DC-05 – Removal of junction for Sewage Treatment Works (and private residence) from A66, and provision of an alternative access from B6262 | 19 |
| 2.6 | DC-06 – Increase in vertical Limits of Deviation local to Shell Pipeline..... | 23 |
| 2.7 | DC-08 – Inversion of the mainline alignment at the junction at Center Parcs | 27 |
| 2.8 | DC-09 – Flexibility to reuse the existing A66 carriageway..... | 32 |
| 2.9 | DC-11 – Earlier tie-in of Cross Street to the existing road..... | 36 |
| 2.10 | DC-13 – Realignment of Main Street..... | 40 |
| 2.11 | DC-14 – Realignment of Sleastonhow Lane..... | 44 |
| 2.12 | DC-15 – Realignment of Crackenthorpe underpass..... | 48 |
| 2.13 | DC-17 – Café Sixty Six Revised Land Plan..... | 51 |
| 2.14 | DC-19 – Realignment of cycleway local to Cringle and Moor Beck..... | 54 |
| 2.15 | DC-20 – Update to Limits of Deviation on eastbound connection to local road (immediately west of Hayber Lane)..... | 58 |
| 2.16 | DC-21 – Amendments to Order Limits within Ministry of Defence Land..... | 61 |
| 2.17 | DC-24 – Reuse of existing A66 (north of Flitholme) | 66 |
| 2.18 | DC-25 – Removal of Langrigg westbound junction, revision to Langrigg Lane link, and shortening of Flitholme Road..... | 70 |
| 2.19 | DC-26 – Revision to West View Farm Accommodation Bridge and Removal of West View Farm Underpass..... | 75 |
| 2.20 | DC-27 – Construction of Noise Barrier South of Brough | 79 |
| 2.21 | DC-28 – Realignment of Local Access Road to be Closer to New Dual Carriageway East of Bowes..... | 84 |
| 2.22 | DC-30 – Realignment of Maintenance/Footway Adjacent to Waitlands Lane | 87 |
| 2.23 | DC-31 – Realignment of Warrener Lane | 90 |
| 2.24 | Glossary and Abbreviations..... | 93 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 National Highways (the Applicant) is upgrading the A66 road, improving the East West connection between Penrith and Scotch Corner. The A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Project (the Project) aims to reduce congestion by improving and dualling sections of single carriageway road and improving safety by reducing right-hand turns across busy lanes of traffic.
- 1.1.2 The likely environmental impacts and significant effects resulting from the Project during construction and operation are reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (doc ref. 3.1 to 3.4, APP-043 to APP-233) submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Project.
- 1.1.3 The Applicant submitted a notification of proposed Project changes to the Planning Inspectorate on the 16th of December 2022 and a formal change request was submitted to the Examining Authority by the Applicant on 24 March 2023 (CR1-002). A Procedural Decision (PD-014) was made on the 18th of April 2023 by the Examining Authority, accepting a total of 22 Project changes into the Examination.

1.2 Reasons for this Environmental Statement Addendum

- 1.2.1 The purpose of this ES Addendum is to report an environmental assessment of the 22 Project changes accepted into the Examination, specifically how, if at all, they change or alter the conclusions of the ES. This is to ensure the likely significant effects of the Project (as altered by the accepted changes) are fully reported and available to the Examining Authority and Secretary of State.

1.3 Changes descriptions

Post application changes

- 1.3.1 As set out above, the Applicant submitted a formal request to the Examining Authority to make 24 changes to the DCO Application. These are described in the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1; CR1-002). As previously stated, 22 of the changes applied for were accepted by the ExA as a result of the Procedural Decision (PD-014). The changes given references DC-22 and DC-23 in the Change Application were not accepted into the Examination. As such, these changes are not considered further in this ES Addendum – instead, it focusses only on the 22 changes (referred to as ‘the changes’) accepted into the Examination. An updated description of the Project following the acceptance of the 22 changes can be found in Environmental Statement Addendum Volume III: Updated Project Description.

1.4 Assessment methodology

- 1.4.1 Each of the changes have been assessed in line with the topic specific methodologies set out in Chapters 5 to 15 of the ES (APP-048 to APP-058). Chapter 4: Environmental Assessment Methodology (APP-047) of the ES outlines the overarching process for the assessment of environmental impacts.
- 1.4.2 Any deviations or specific changes are outlined in the change specific assessments detailed within the Environmental Statement Addendum Volume II: Detailed Assessments (Rev 2). Otherwise, the methodologies set out in the ES should be taken as applying to the assessments reported in this document.

Design change scoping

- 1.4.3 As a first step, a scoping exercise in relation to each Environmental Impact Assessment topic was undertaken in respect of each of the changes. This was to determine the potential for the changes to impact on the reasonable worst case scenario assessed in the ES and to consider whether any new or different likely significant effects could arise from the changes (when compared to those reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 5 to 15 (APP-048 to APP-058)). Where there were no receptors considered to be affected differently, or the change is not of a scale or nature to worsen the reasonable worst case then the change was scoped out of assessment.
- 1.4.4 It is not considered that any of the changes would affect the assessment undertaken in Appendix 5.1 of the Scoping Report (ES Appendix 4.1: EIA Scoping Report (APP-148) and summarised in ES Chapter 4: EIA Methodology (APP-047) Table 4-2: Major events – appraisal of additional risks identified through scoping. This is due to major events being assessed at a Project level and the changes are not deemed to be of a size, nature, and scale to alter the findings reported.
- 1.4.5 Consultation was undertaken on the changes prior to the formal change request being made. The consultation materials included an environmental assessment of the proposed changes (referred to as the Environmental Appendix -this is included as Appendix H of the Consultation Report that formed part of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.2; CR1-015). This allowed consultees to review and comment on the predicted likely significant environmental effects of the proposed changes when compared with those reported in the ES. A precautionary approach was taken at that stage, where the potential worst case for the environmental impacts and likely significant effects was reported, to allow consultees an opportunity to comment on this 'worst case'.
- 1.4.6 Subsequent to the consultation exercise, more detail became available for the changes, which, in the majority of cases, confirmed the findings that were previously reported in the Environmental Appendix. However, this detailed information in a few cases refined those findings further, such that for certain environmental topics the potential for a proposed change to give rise to a new or different likely significant environmental effect from those

previously reported has now been able to be scoped out, for the reasons given below. Nevertheless, consultees were given the opportunity to comment on the full extent of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed change.

Consultation

- 1.4.7 Consultation has been ongoing as part of the design change process. Detailed information regarding the proposed change consultation can be found within the Consultation Report (Document Reference 8.2; CR1-007). Consultation has informed the detailed assessments undertaken as part of this addendum where relevant to the assessment or topic in question.

1.5 Cumulative and in-combination effects

- 1.5.1 To assess the potential effects of combined impacts between changes on a precautionary worst-case basis, each topic considered all changes both in isolation and on the assumption that all other changes were implemented.
- 1.5.2 It is acknowledged that the aforementioned Environmental Appendix noted potential new or different cumulative or in-combination effects between changes in the topic of Biodiversity and the topic of Noise and Vibration.
- 1.5.3 In the topic of Biodiversity, only two changes remain scoped in for further assessment, one on the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme and one on the Appleby to Brough scheme. Neither of these changes are anticipated to result in new or different likely significant effects. New non-significant effects may arise, however the distance between these two changes is considered too great, and the scale of these changes is considered too minor to combine to the extent whereby it would result any new or different likely significant cumulative effects between changes.
- 1.5.4 Topic assessments that have been carried out are inherently cumulative and where there may have been a risk of new or different likely significant effects as a result of interaction between topics this has been considered in both scoping and in further assessment.
- 1.5.5 Of the developments identified in ES Chapter 15, there is no change to those developments identified as falling within the Zone of Influence of the Project as assessed in ES Chapter 15 (APP-057) as a result of any of the changes. No new or different likely significant effects have been identified in any change when considered cumulatively with other developments as assessed in ES Chapter 15 (APP-057).

2 Design change scoping exercise

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 Not all of the design changes accepted by the ExA are likely to result in an amendment to the findings of the ES assessments. In some instances, one or more topics will be unchanged and there will be no new likely significant effects or changes to those reported previously.
- 2.1.2 The following chapter provides an assessment table for each change to confirm whether or not each environmental topic is scoped in or out of assessment. Topics have only been scoped out of the addendum assessment where a robust, reasoned rationale can be provided without the need for a full assessment.
- 2.1.3 Instances where topics require any form of assessment to validate their findings, including instances where it is to confirm no changes to the effects reported in the ES, a full assessment has been provided in Volume II (Rev 2) of this ES Addendum.

2.2 DC-01 – Change in speed limit west of M6 junction 40

2.2.1 Table 2-1 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-1: ES Chapter affected by DC-01 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | X | <p>It is not anticipated that there will be any change in construction approach that will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>During operation, an NO₂ concentration of 12.3µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 5 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean NO₂ air quality objective (AQO) threshold of 40 µg/m³. A reduction in speed limit from 70 to 50 mph in this location has the potential to create a minor worsening of effects as a result of car engines running less efficiently at 50mph than at 70mph. However, current concentrations are considered too low at HSR 5 for this change to have a risk of affecting the significance of the results. Given the risk is so low at the closest receptor, it is not anticipated that any receptor is at risk of exceeding the air quality objective. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used to assess construction impacts in relation to habitat loss for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The reduction to the speed limit does not change any effects on biodiversity receptors as reported in the ES. There are no changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | operation to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Consequently, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. Therefore, biodiversity is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of carrying out any assessment in respect of construction and operational impacts. |
| Climate | x | <p>Greenhouse Gases (GHG)</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for the area of carriageway/hardstanding. The change may reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the conclusion of ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050). Climate GHG assessment is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of carrying out any assessment in response of construction and operation impacts.</p> <p>Climate Change Resilience (CCR)</p> <p>An assessment of the potential impacts on the Project from weather events was undertaken for the ES (ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050)). A detailed CCR assessment was not taken forward for the construction period of the Project, with justification provided in paragraph 7.5.27 of ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050). This same approach has been followed for the changes.</p> <p>It was concluded that all climate change risks during the operational phase of the Project are 'not significant' due to effective embedded mitigation measures in the existing Project design or to be delivered through monitoring and maintenance regimes assumed to be in place throughout operation (ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) section 7.10.11 to 7.10.20). The change is not considered to introduce any new climate change risks or require additional mitigation measures to be embedded into the design or monitoring and maintenance regimes. Therefore, climate change resilience is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of carrying out any assessment in response of construction and operation impacts.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered as part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. The change is a speed limit change only. There is no change to the Order Limits, or the land take required. No potentially contaminated sites have been introduced within the vicinity of the change and the impact to ALC grade soils remains the same. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils Section 12.9 (APP-052) and the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils Management Plan, (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in Section 9.10 of ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) and is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>The change would not alter the design, Order Limits, or the Limits of Deviation (LOD).</p> <p>The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (REP3-003) and Project Design Principles (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>Having regard to the minor nature of the change in terms of the overall engineering requirements, it would not affect the outcomes of the material assets and waste assessment as the ES Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste (APP-054) takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank scheme.</p> <p>There is no cause for new or different likely significant effects for the sterilisation of mineral safeguarding sites for DC-01 or the M6 J40 to Kemplay Bank scheme as the change is within the Limits of Deviation on which the ES assessment was based. The change will not require additional land take for the M6 J40 to Kemplay Bank scheme and the parameters that were assessed in the ES will not alter.</p> <p>As per the reported effects within the ES Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste (APP-054) Section 11.9.21, the change will not significantly change the quantities of materials required for construction or the effects on the future waste infrastructure capacity as, having regard to the minor nature of the change in terms of overall engineering requirements which would be within the parameters of the worst-care scenario assessed previously, any additional waste generated is likely to be small in context to the whole Project and adequate inert, non-hazardous and hazardous landfill capacity has been identified in within the ES.</p> <p>The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 10 Materials and Waste (APP-054) Section 11.8 and the EMP Reference D-MAW-01 to D-MAW-03 and MW-MAW-01 to MW-MAW-03 (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of the Site Waste Management Plan (APP-022, Annex B2 Outline Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) (Ref: D-MAW-01)) and the Materials Management Plan (APP-028 2, Annex B8 Materials Management Plan (MMP) (Ref: D-GS-01)). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction or operation and is therefore scoped out of assessment in respect of material assets and waste.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Noise and Vibration | Construction (x) Operation (✓) | <p>The change is not anticipated to result in any significant changes to the construction impacts arising from the Project in respect of noise and vibration. The change is not anticipated to result in significant changes in the method, programme and construction site boundary that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during construction phase of the Project that are reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055). The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) (APP-025) as set out in the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects to those reported in the ES for construction noise and vibration and is therefore scoped out of assessment in respect construction phase noise and vibration.</p> <p>See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-01 (Rev 2) for the detailed operational assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>Within the Population assessment detailed within the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056) a worst-case scenario assessment was undertaken considering the maximum extent of the Limits of Deviation. The change of altering the speed limit will not affect the Limits of Deviation and as such it will not result in any new or different likely significant effects as to those reported in the ES for construction and operation for DC-01. Therefore the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> <p>The ES and Human Health Statement of Significance (REP4-013) predict a moderate positive (significant) health effect as a result of safety improvements on the A66 at this location. The reduction in speed limit is likely to further improve safety but will not materially change the assessment and therefore has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change is not anticipated to result in any significant changes to the construction impacts arising from the Project in respect of road drainage and the water environment, including from the method, programme, and construction site boundary, that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction phase of the Project that are reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water (APP-057). This is due to the ES assessing a conservative scenario of potential construction effects (which the change would be consistent with), and the mitigation that has been secured within the first iteration</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the EMP ((Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>For the operation phase, the change is not anticipated to result in a change to the likely significant effects reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). This is because the change would not result in any new or greater impacts to nearby road drainage and water environment receptors to those reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). This is due to the nature of the change not varying from the water environment and drainage design features that were assessed within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). There are no anticipated changes to the DCO drainage design, watercourse crossings, cuttings, greater floodplain impacts, or any other design components that may cause an impact on road drainage and water environment receptors as a result of the change. The sensitivity of the receptors reported in the Environmental Statement has remained the same, and there is not expected to be any change in magnitude of impact to those reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the PDP (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)).</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |

2.3 DC-03 – Reorientation of Kemplay Bank junction

2.3.1 Table 2-2 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-2: ES Chapter affected by DC-03 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | x | <p>During construction NO₂ concentrations were predicted to increase by 1.5µg/m³ over the annual mean NO₂ air quality objective (AQO) threshold of 40 µg/m³ (to 41.5µg/m³) at the closest human receptor (HSR 22 as shown on ES Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)). With the change, the new alignment moves away from receptor HSR 22 which may therefore slightly improve the concentrations at this receptor. The change may result in differing construction methods and programme to be determined through detailed design, however it is considered that any change in construction phase effects can be controlled by the requirements of the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>During operation, an NO₂ concentration of 30.5µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 22 as shown on ES Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. A movement of the alignment by 90 degrees and 30m, as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002), closer to the closest sensitive human receptors in the north of the junction (including the hospital) is not likely to result in NO₂ concentrations exceeding the air quality objective as the modelled NO₂ concentrations are so low. Given the risk is so low at the closest receptor, it is not anticipated that any receptor is at risk of exceeding the air quality objective. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Biodiversity | x | <p>In ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049), there were no likely significant effects from M6 Junction 40 to Kemplay Bank for construction or operation, after mitigation. The change is located within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary (permanent land take area) would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change would result in a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary in two locations, this includes an area of amenity grassland (rugby pitch) and an area of poor semi-improved grassland. No changes in impacts on Thacka Beck (tributary of River Eden Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)) are anticipated which are new or different to those reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-49) or HRA (Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Stage 1 Likely Significant Effects Report (APP-234) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (APP-235)) due to the rationale outlined in the Road Drainage and the Water Environment scoping text for DC-03. In summary, this is because the change would not result in any new or greater impacts to nearby road drainage and water environment receptors, including Thacka Beck. This is due to the change not varying from the water environment and drainage design features that were assessed in the ES and there are no anticipated changes to the DCO drainage design, watercourse crossings, cuttings, greater floodplain impacts, or any other design components that may cause an impact on road drainage and water environment receptors as a result of the change. The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the Project Design Principles (PDP) (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)).</p> <p>Any updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will have to be in accordance with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided. Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). There are no other changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction or operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment. |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for retaining structures/bridges. The change may result in increased emissions as a result of additional land take. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>An assessment of the potential impacts on the Project from weather events was undertaken for the ES (ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050)). A detailed CCR assessment was not taken forward for the construction period of the Project, with justification provided in paragraph 7.5.27 of ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050). This same approach has been followed for the changes.</p> <p>It was concluded that all climate change risks during the operational phase of the Project are 'not significant' due to effective embedded mitigation measures in the existing Project design or to be delivered through monitoring and maintenance regimes assumed to be in place throughout operation (ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) section 7.10.11 to 7.10.20). The change is not considered to introduce any new climate change risks or require additional mitigation measures to be embedded into the design or monitoring and maintenance regimes. Therefore, climate change resilience is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of carrying out any assessment in response of construction and operation impacts.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | The change is a Limit of Deviation change intended to allow the reorientation of the Kemplay Bank Junction. This is not anticipated to change the significance of the effects on Toll Bar Cottage, a listed building located on the south-western side of the junction, during construction or operation as the proximity of the works would not be altered. The temporary change to the building's setting was assessed as a temporary moderate adverse effect during construction, with the constructed scheme resulting in a permanent slight adverse effect and an operational effect of slight adverse. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Impacts from construction are considered to have been adequately addressed by the mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) and Annex B3 Outline Heritage Mitigation Strategy as found in Application Document 2.7 EMP (Rev 4). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (APP-051) in construction.</p> <p>In operation, the potential change in levels allowed for within the new Limit of Deviation may result in minor change to effects to heritage assets within the Zone of Visual Influence, however it is not anticipated they would increase the size or dominance of the Project within the setting of heritage resources to an extent that the setting of heritage resources would be noticeably different from the DCO design. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-03 (Rev 2) |
| Landscape and Visual | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-03 (Rev 2) |
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-03 (Rev 2) |
| Noise and Vibration | Construction (x) Operation (✓) | The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. For potential effect during operation, see ES Addendum Volume II: DC-03 (Rev 2) |
| Population and Human Health | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-03 (Rev 2) |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-058) which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.4 DC-04 - Separation of, and greater flexibility for, shared public rights of way and private access track provision from Penrith to Temple Sowerby

2.4.1 Table 2-3 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-3: ES Chapter affected by DC-04 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality construction assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). It is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>During operation, an NO₂ concentration of 6.3µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 46 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean NO₂ air quality objective (AQO) threshold of 40 µg/m³. The NO₂ concentration at this location is so low that it is not considered likely that there is a risk of change in significance of the results, therefore it is not anticipated to have an effect on any receptor further from the change. Given the risk is so low at the closest receptor, it is not anticipated that any receptor is at risk of exceeding the air quality objective. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-04 (Rev 2) |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may give rise to increased construction emissions as a result of the additional material required for the new access tracks. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project’s GHG emissions including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>The main road alignment is the dominant feature affecting the setting of heritage resources between Penrith and Temple Sowerby. The appearance of the Public Right of Way within the setting of heritage resources will be in the context of views of the main alignment of the A66 and associated infrastructure meaning that there would be nothing to stand out and create a difference in the setting of heritage resources than that assessed in the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. The change will not alter the construction methodology, which has been assessed in the DCO application.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>No additional potentially contaminated sites have been identified within the vicinity of the change; and the impact to ALC grade soils remains the same. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 12.9 and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils Management Plan (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in 3.2 ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 9.10 for construction and operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>The change would result in a minor change to the Limits of Deviation. There would be some changes to the configuration and location of proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053) Landscape and visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-04 (Rev 2) |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction within ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change would not alter the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and it is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change will not alter the construction methodology or order limits when compared to that which was assessed within the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056). The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)), for example maintaining PRow connectivity during construction through appropriate temporary diversions. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction.</p> <p>The segregation of the PRow and private access track would not alter the impacts reported within the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056) as the operational connectivity of the route would still be maintained. The change is therefore not considered to be materially different during operation. As such the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | Construction (x) Operation (✓) | <p>The change is not anticipated to result in any significant changes to the construction impacts arising from the Project in respect of road drainage and the water environment, including from the method, programme, and construction site boundary, that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during construction phase of the Project that are reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). This is due to the Environmental Statement assessing a conservative scenario of potential construction effects (which the change would be consistent with), and the mitigation that has been secured within the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, the change has been scoped out of assessment for construction impacts.</p> <p>The change has the potential to alter the conclusions reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) for operational effects.</p> <p>The assessment of likely effects during operation have been further assessed and are reported in the relevant ES Addendum Volume II: DC-04 (Rev 2).</p> |

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

2.5.1 Table 2-4 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-4: ES Chapter affected by DC-05 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The DMRB LA105 guidance suggests identifying sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN); beyond this point impacts are considered to be imperceptible. There are no sensitive human receptors within 200m of the change which may be affected by changes in air quality during construction. The change may result in differing construction methods and programme to be determined through detailed design, however it is considered that any change in construction phase effects can be controlled by the requirements of the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>During operation, the change is anticipated to lead to a reduction in works which may result in a reduction of in pollutant concentrations at surrounding sensitive ecological receptors. However, there was no likely significant effect reported in this location and with the change it is not anticipated that the scale of the change is sufficient to result in any significant benefit. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048) in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>In ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049), there were no likely significant effects from the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme for construction or operation, after mitigation. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include barn owl obstacle planting, badger fencing and badger crossing at this location. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for the junction. The change may however give rise to an increase in emissions as a result of additional land take. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES Chapter 7 Climate (APP-050) considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | Construction (✓) Operation (x) | <p>The change has been scoped in for assessment of its construction effects within the ES Addendum. See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-05 (Rev 2).</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change would not alter the mainline A66 which is the dominant feature which may affect the setting of heritage features and would not alter the enhanced setting and access to the Countess Pillar included in the DCO design. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant operational effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (APP-051). As a result, the change is scoped out of assessment of operational effects in the ES Addendum.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. The change is to provide a private access track, shared with a cycle track. There is no change to the Order Limits, or the land take required. No potentially contaminated sites have been introduced within the vicinity of the change and the impact to ALC grade soils remains the same. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils Section 12.9 (APP-052) and the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils Management Plan, (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 9.10 for construction and operation and is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>The change would reduce the development footprint by simplifying junction arrangements, aligning the access track between the balancing pond and the main carriageway, reducing the bridge width, and reducing the lengths of access roads to the southwest. Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the original ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES Chapter 11 Material Assets and Waste (APP-054) takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01 as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. The change would not alter the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in ES Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration of the ES (APP-055) for operation and it is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change will not alter the construction methodology, Order Limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project either as no population and human health receptors would be impacted. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and therefore the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-058), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

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

2.6.1 Table 2-5 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-5: ES Chapter affected by DC-06 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The DMRB LA105 guidance suggests identifying sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN); beyond this point impacts are considered to be imperceptible. There are no sensitive human receptors within 200m of the change which may be affected by changes in air quality. The change may result in differing construction methods and programme, to be determined through detailed design, however it is considered that any change in construction phase effects can be controlled by the requirements of the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, there was no likely significant effect reported in the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065) in this location and, with the change, it is not anticipated that the scale of the change is sufficient to result in any change to that assessment. Therefore it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-48) in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The increase in the vertical LOD does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). It has been confirmed that there are no changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include badger fencing, badger crossing and barn owl obstacle planting at this location. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change could give rise to increased construction emissions as a result of the additional material/ earthworks required to raise the height of the bridge. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project’s GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES Chapter 7 Climate conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change would not alter the mainline A66 and associated earthworks which is the dominant feature assessed within the ES for effects arising from change to the setting of heritage resources. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. The change includes an increase in vertical Limits of Deviation. There is no change to the Order Limits, or the land take required. No potentially contaminated sites have been introduced within the vicinity of the change and the impact to ALC grade soils remains the same. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils Section 12.9 (APP-052) and the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)), which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils Management Plan, (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 9.10 for construction and operation and is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This change increases the LoD upwards by 0.5m in a limited area. In Appendix 10.9 Limits of Deviation Assessment (APP-205), the assessment considers the impacts of variations of this scale to be not significant as they are within the scope of the standard LOD.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of further construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change in vertical LOD has the potential to change noise emissions from the main alignment. However, the only nearby receptor to this change is the former Llama Karma Kafe. This receptor has been acquired by National Highways. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) during operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change will not alter the construction methodology, order limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-058), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

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

2.7.1 Table 2-6 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-6: ES Chapter affected by DC-08 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>In the construction phase, an NO₂ concentration of 10.6µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 29 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. The change may result in differing construction methods and programme, to be determined through detailed design, however it is considered that any change in construction phase effects can be controlled by the requirements of the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>In the operation phase, an NO₂ concentration of 8.1µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 29 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. While there is a vertical change in the design to the mainline A66 which is the dominant source of emissions, the Air Quality assessment does not use the comparative height of the road within its model. Based on air quality concentrations in the area, it is not anticipated that inversion of the junction will result in a change in significance reported in at HSR29. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>In ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049), there were no likely significant effects from Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme for construction or operation, after mitigation. The change is located within the DCO Order Limits.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary (permanent land take area) would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change would result in a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary in two locations, this includes an area of poor semi-improved grassland and part of an arable field.</p> <p>Any updates to the habitat mitigation proposed are required to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios. Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include the bat and red squirrel crossings at this location. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction or operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. The change may also reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took a reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>The appearance of the overbridge would be different to the DCO design assessed in the ES, however, it does not stand out in the context of the dualling works themselves and the associated earthworks will be less substantial than those proposed in the DCO. As a result there would be no increase the magnitude of impact to the setting of the Whinell Farm buildings (the nearest asset to the overbridge the setting of which might be affected) which was assessed as negligible adverse in the ES (ES Appendix 8.10, pA8.10-112, APP-187).Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. Assessment has been carried out on the identified potentially contaminated sites at this location. No additional potentially contaminated sites have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The impact to ALC grade soils remains the same. Grade 2 soils are present in this area and the impact is assessed as significant. This is worst case. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils Section 12.9 (APP-052) and the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils Management Plan, (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP. It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in Section 9.10 of the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) and is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By keeping the main line of the A66 close to the current grade, rather than lifting it over the access road and including the slackened slopes associated with the engineering works as defined in Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4) Table 4-4</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Reference 03.01, this proposal would result in less pronounced earthworks over a shorter length of road, with the main traffic flow being less visible in the landscape compared to the DCO design. We have therefore already assessed a worst case scenario.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | Construction (x) Operation (✓) | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>Operational noise is scoped into assessment. See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-08 (Rev 2).</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may present the opportunity to reduce the extent of land required to accommodate the temporary road to the south of the junction for Center Parcs, however it is not considered that this reduction in isolation is of a size that would alter the construction assessment findings reported within the ES. The change will not alter the Order Limits when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The ES and Human Health Statement of Significance (REP4-013) predicted a moderate negative (significant) health effect during construction, as a result of increased journey times on the A66 and congestion through Temple Sowerby impacting on access for rural communities. The removal of the temporary diversion will reduce the adverse effect but will not materially change the assessment, and therefore has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of further environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| | | The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.8 DC-09 – Flexibility to reuse the existing A66 carriageway

2.8.1 Table 2-7 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-7: ES Chapter affected by DC-09 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The DMRB LA105 guidance suggests identifying sensitive receptors within 200m of the Affected Road Network (ARN); beyond this point impacts are considered to be imperceptible. There are no sensitive human or ecological receptors within 200m of the change which may be affected by changes in air quality. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction or operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction and operation. This analysis is also relevant to DC-11, DC-13, DC-14, DC-15, DC-20, DC-24, DC-28, DC-30 and DC-31. |
| Biodiversity | x | The change will allow the flexibility for utilising more of the existing road surface, which could result in a reduction in earthworks. The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). There is the potential to retain trees and woodland to the south of the A66 in this location because of the change. Any updates to any of the habitat creation proposed as a result of this change will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios. Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Mitigation requirements for habitat losses are described within Table 6-20 and 6-21 (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)) which detail the requirements to ensure the provision of required replacement habitat mitigates for that which is anticipated to be lost. The tables secure the mitigation requirements for replacement habitats and inform the quantum of habitat mitigation that would be required. The mitigation measures outlined in the ES chapter (APP-049) as included within the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) secure the measures to ensure that replanting of lost habitats is achieved. The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include badger fencing, badger crossing, barn owl obstacle planting and bat crossing at this location.</p> <p>Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The change will allow the flexibility for utilising more of the existing road surface, resulting in a reduction in ground works. The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will result in a small change in the appearance of the completed mainline alignment from that assessed in the ES.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>However, this change would make the road appear closer to its baseline levels meaning that there would be no worsening of setting change to heritage resources. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The change will allow the flexibility for utilising more of the existing road surface, resulting in a reduction in ground works. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES Chapter 9 (APP-052) takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This change would adjust the Limits of Deviation to allow more of the new road to be constructed close to the current grade, resulting in less earthworks with the new road positioned closer to the baseline condition compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore the worst case scenario has already been assessed.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Penrith to Temple Sowerby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01 as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change provides the opportunity to alter the vertical alignment of the A66 mainline, however, it is anticipated the change would be minor within the context of the dual carriageway. Noise sensitive receptors located within the study area of the change, receptors in Whinfall Park and on Lane End, were all reported as adverse likely significant effects within the Noise and Vibration Chapter of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference APP-055). The change is unlikely to result in any new</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| | | or different likely significant effects. Therefore, this change would not result in any different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for operation and is scoped out of assessment. |
| Population and Human Health | x | The change will not alter the construction methodology, Order Limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES. Therefore it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

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

2.9.1 Table 2-8 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-8: ES Chapter affected by DC-11 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | The change is within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). This includes the assumption that all habitats within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary be lost as a result of construction. This change will result in less land take than originally assessed however does include a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which includes arable and marshy grassland habitats which were not originally within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary. Updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within for DC-09). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include barn owl planting and the greened bridge bat crossing at this location. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment. |
| Climate | x | GHG The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. The change may also reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional potentially contaminated sites have been identified within the vicinity of the change.</p> <p>The impact to ALC grade soils is reduced as the change moves from Grade 2 to Grade 3 soils. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and soils assessment as the ES (APP-052) takes into account the worst-case scenario. Therefore the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This change seeks to change the Limits of Deviation to allow Cross Street to retain more of its original alignment. It also seeks to alter the configuration of paths, tightening the development area. The DCO design requires a larger development area and therefore the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits. |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors within the study area. The re-aligned Priest Lane on an embankment in the ES design provided some partial screening of the traffic on the A66 mainline. Lowering the embankment would therefore result in less screening and potentially higher noise levels compared to the proposed DCO design. Given the distance between the receptor and the A66 (about 500m), the difference in noise impacts from the A66 with the change is likely to be negligible. Moreover, receptors to the north of the new A66 alignment (Halefield Farm and Halefield Bungalow), which would benefit from the re-aligned Priest Lane on embankment, were already reported to experience an adverse likely significant effect in the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the ES in operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | The change will not alter the construction methodology, Order Limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project either as no population and human health receptors would be impacted. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| | | Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and DC-11 has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.10 DC-13 – Realignment of Main Street

2.10.1 Table 2-9 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-9: ES Chapter affected by DC-13 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change is within the Order Limits, however during construction the change would result in a change to the permanent land take. This would therefore result in amendments to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used to determine habitat loss and mitigation requirements within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). This includes the assumption that all habitats within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be lost as a result of construction. The change will result in less land take than originally assessed but will result in a change in the habitats that are impacted for this element of the design, by extending into an area of coniferous plantation woodland and arable land that was not originally included in the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary</p> <p>Mitigation requirements for habitat losses such as those above are described within Table 6-20 and 6-21 (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). Any changes to any of the habitat mitigation proposed will require to be in line with ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios (as detailed within DC-09). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049).</p> <p>Other than habitat loss, there are no other changes to any of the effects reported in the ES as a result of the change, e.g. this location does not introduce any additional effects on protected species and is not the location of any species specific mitigation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include barn owl planting at this location.</p> <p>Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. The change may reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change allows for a slight change in the Limits of Deviation but would not alter the appearance or dominance of the mainline A66 and associated earthworks within the setting of heritage resources. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By changing the speed limit and retaining the existing barn this change would result in less change to the baseline condition compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). We have therefore already assessed the worst-case scenario.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change, including reduction in the speed limit to 30mph on the realigned Main Street, would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment. The dominant noise source affecting the noise sensitive receptors in this area would be traffic on the A66 mainline.</p> <p>The Green Barn was assumed to be demolished in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference APP-055) which is to be retained as result of this change. This building is not identified as a noise sensitive receptor since it is understood that this is used for agricultural storage space. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects from operation compared to those reported in the ES and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may allow for a reduction in land required for the realignment of Main Street, however it is not considered likely to affect the significance of the effect reported in the ES for construction (APP-056). Otherwise, the change is not anticipated to result in any material changes in terms of factors such as construction method, programme and construction site boundary that could impact on population and human health receptors. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project either as no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted.</p> <p>Therefore it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.11 DC-14 – Realignment of Sleastonhow Lane

2.11.1 Table 2-10 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-10: ES Chapter affected by DC-14 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change is located within the Order Limits assessed within the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). There is no change in any effects on designated sites through the change.</p> <p>During construction the change would result in a change to the permanent land take. This would therefore result in amendments to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used to determine habitat loss and mitigation requirements within ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). This included the assumption that all habitats within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary will be lost as a result of construction. This change will result in less land take than originally assessed however does include a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which includes arable and improved grassland habitats which were not originally within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary.</p> <p>Mitigation requirements for any such habitat losses are described within Table 6-20 and 6-21 (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)) which detail the mitigation requirements to ensure the provision of required replacement habitat mitigates for that which is anticipated to be lost. The tables secure the mitigation requirements for replacement habitats and inform the quantum of habitat mitigation that would be required.</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined in the ES chapter (APP-049) as secured in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) ensure that replanting of lost habitats is achieved. The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The Sleastonhow oak (ancient tree) and two other semi-mature ash trees will be retained and protected as part of the change as will the bat and barn owl mitigation at the Sleastonhow Lane overbridge (greened bridge) as described within the ES Chapter 6 (APP-049). Following the implementation of mitigation, no likely significant operational effects reported within the ES chapter 6(APP-049). As there will be no change in the bat and barn owl mitigation provision, the significance of operational effects also therefore remains unchanged. This change is therefore scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks and demolition waste. The change may reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES.</p> <p>There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By realigning the bridge this change would require a smaller structure and less earthworks resulting in less change to the receiving environment compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change to re-align and reduce the speed limit from 60mph to 30mph on Sleastonhow Lane would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant source in this area. Taking account of the change, the traffic on the A66 mainline is still the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the Noise and Vibration Chapter of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may present the opportunity to reduce the extent of land required to accommodate the realignment of Sleastonhow Lane, however it is not considered that this reduction in isolation is of a size that would alter the construction assessment findings reported within the ES. The change will not alter the construction methodology or order limits compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.12 DC-15 – Realignment of Crackenthorpe underpass

2.12.1 Table 2-11 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-11: ES Chapter affected by DC-15 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the Scoping Out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used to assess habitat loss for the biodiversity assessment of the ES (APP-049). The change avoids the removal of sections of species poor hedgerow in this location which was included as part of the original DCO design and assessed in Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The underpass has not been included specifically as a biodiversity mitigation crossing. Any changes to any of the habitat mitigation proposed will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within DC-14). There are no other changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By realigning the underpass this change would result in less change to the receiving environment compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the original ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Temple Sowerby to Appleby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant source in this area. Moreover, there are no residential receptors in close proximity to the change. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (Document Reference APP-055) and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may present the opportunity to reduce the extent of land required to accommodate the realignment of Crackenthorpe Underpass Lane, however it is not considered that this reduction in isolation is of a size that would alter the construction assessment findings reported within the ES. The change will not alter the construction methodology or Order Limits compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.13 DC-17 – Café Sixty Six Revised Land Plan

2.13.1 Table 2-12 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-12: ES Chapter affected by DC-17 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | There is no change to the construction or operation of the scheme as the change is limited to the removal of an area from the Order Limits. A change in Order Limits does not impact air quality emissions. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction or operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction or operation. |
| Biodiversity | x | The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used to assess habitat loss for the biodiversity assessment of the ES (APP-049). It is not anticipated that this change would require any updates to the biodiversity mitigation proposed as this is a retraction of the DCO alignment within an area of hard standing and improved grassland. The habitat mitigation will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP ((Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios (as detailed within DC-14). There are no changes to any of the other proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment. |
| Climate | x | GHG The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in land required/ land use change. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>There is no change to the construction or operation of the scheme as a result of this change, as the change is limited to the removal of area from the Order Limits. This part of the design assessed in the ES had no specific impacts on cultural heritage receptors. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction or operation.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. The change is limited to the removal of an area from the Order Limits and no additional land take is required and the worst case was therefore reported in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 9.10. As such the change will not introduce new or different likely significant effects and it has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This is a minor correction to the Order Limits and does not result in any new land take or the introduction of any new receptors which could be affected. The change is therefore scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01 as there is no increase to the Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>There is no change to the construction or operation of the Project as the change is limited to the removal of an area from the Order Limits that is not anticipated to change the DCO design. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for construction or operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>There is no change to the construction or operation of the Project as the change is limited to the removal of area from the Order Limits and the design will remain unchanged. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation as reported within the Population and Human Health chapter of the ES (APP-056). The change has therefore been scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | There is no change to the construction or operation of the Project as the change is limited to the removal of area from the Order Limits and the design will remain unchanged. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation as reported within the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES (APP-056). |

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

2.14.1 Table 2-13 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-13: ES Chapter affected by DC-19 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change will result in a reduction of construction work. During construction phase an NO₂ concentration of 10.4µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 46 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the construction Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective (40µg/m³). It is not currently anticipated that any change in construction will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions at this receptor and therefore no further receptor is considered at risk of exceeding the air quality objective. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>During operation, an NO₂ concentration of 6.3µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 46 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. The change is not anticipated to have an effect on the mainline A66 which is the dominant source of emissions, and therefore it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change requires a change in the Order Limits used for the assessment in the ES. However, the new area of Order Limits is within the alignment of the existing A66, i.e. an area of existing hardstanding. Therefore, there will be no change to any effects on biodiversity receptors.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The relocation of the cycleway removes the requirement for two watercourse crossings for the cycleway on Hayber Beck and Moor Beck. The change is in line with the worst case that was assessed in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). There are no changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The addition of the cycleway to the de-trunked A66 will not increase disturbance above existing levels to adjacent biological receptors. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity)(APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for the underpass, bridges, and walking/cycling route. The change may reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The change requires a change to the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. However, the new area of Order Limits is within the alignment of the existing A66 which has already been developed, therefore it is not anticipated that there would be any new impacts to buried archaeological remains. (3.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage APP-051 sets out the position about survival of archaeological remains beneath the existing carriageway). There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. It is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By re-routing the walking and cycling route onto the existing road and removing the underpass this change would result in less change to the receiving environment compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the original ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change to re-route a section of the WCH and cycling route from the new A66 mainline to the existing de-trunked A66, would not alter the A66 mainline alignment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| | | Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment. |
| Population and Human Health | ü | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-19 (Rev 2). |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change is not anticipated to result in any likely significant changes to the construction impacts arising from the Project in respect of road drainage and the water environment, including from the method, programme and construction site boundary, that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during construction phase of the Project that are reported in the Road Drainage and the Water Environment Chapter of the Environmental Statement (APP-057). This is due to the Environmental Statement assessing a conservative scenario of potential construction effects (which the change would be consistent with), and the mitigation that has been secured within the first iteration of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>For the operational phase, the change is not anticipated to result in a change to the likely significant effects reported in the Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). This is because the change would not result in any new or greater impacts to nearby road drainage and water environment receptors to those reported in the Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057).</p> <p>The sensitivity of the receptors reported in the ES has remained the same, and there is not expected to be any change in magnitude of impact to those reported in the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the PDP (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)).</p> |

2.15 DC-20 – Update to Limits of Deviation on eastbound connection to local road (immediately west of Hayber Lane)

2.15.1 Table 2-14 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-14: ES Chapter affected by DC-20 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). There are no changes to any of the proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project’s GHG emissions, including the Project, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By changing the Limits of Deviation to allow lowering of the carriageway and side roads this proposal would result in less change to the receiving environment compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| Material Assets and Waste | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits. |
| Noise and Vibration | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. The change in LOD for the connecting road which joins the de-trunked A66 would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment. |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may allow for a reduction in land required should the side road be lowered within the LOD however it is not considered likely to be a scale to affect the significance of the effect. The change will not alter the construction methodology or order limits compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impact's and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and therefore the change has been scoped out of assessment</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.16 DC-21 – Amendments to Order Limits within Ministry of Defence Land

2.16.1 Table 2-15 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-15: ES Chapter affected by DC-21 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change is anticipated to result in a reduction of construction work. During construction an NO₂ concentration of 10.4µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 46 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the construction Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective (40µg/m³). It is not currently anticipated that any change in construction will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions at this receptor and therefore no further receptor is considered at risk of exceeding the air quality objective. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>An NO₂ concentration of 6.3µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 46 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. The change is not anticipated to have an effect on the mainline A66 which is the dominant source of emissions, and therefore it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change requires removal of some areas from the Order Limits and addition of some areas that were not previously in the Order Limits, to be used as habitat mitigation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The additional areas are adjacent to the Application stage Order Limits so were picked up in the Phase 1 Habitat surveys undertaken for the DCO design as they are within the 250m survey buffer that was used (3.4 Environmental Statement Appendix 6.3 Phase 1 Habitat Survey (APP-156)). The areas which are outside of the Application stage Order Limits were recorded to include improved grassland, marshy grassland, semi-improved neutral grassland, running water and scattered broadleaved trees.</p> <p>The additional areas also fall within the survey buffers used for most of the protected species surveys undertaken to inform the ES. The exceptions to this are: bat roosts (trees) which were assessed within the Application stage Order Limits; 50m radius from the Order Limits for hedgerows; and 100m radius from the Order Limits for bat roosts (structures), bat crossing points, water vole (<i>Arvicola amphibius</i>), reptiles and terrestrial invertebrates.</p> <p>There is habitat (scattered broadleaved trees) with potential to support bat roosts within the areas proposed as part of this change which are outside of the Application stage Order Limits. These trees were therefore not assessed for bat roosts as part of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). However, the biodiversity mitigation proposals within these additional areas are for woodland planting and retain the existing habitat which may have suitability for bat roosts. Therefore, there will be no change in impacts in relation to bat roosts (trees).</p> <p>There are no hedgerows included in the additional areas which are greater than 50m from the Order Limits. Therefore, there is no change in impacts on hedgerows to that reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049).</p> <p>Habitats which are part of this change and are greater than 100m from the Order Limits include improved grassland, marshy grassland and scattered broadleaved trees. This does not include any suitable habitat for bat roosts (structures), bat crossing points or water vole. The scattered trees and marshy grassland are retained and incorporated into the biodiversity mitigation proposals. The areas of improved grassland are proposed for woodland planting. The areas of improved grassland which are outside of the 100m buffer used for the reptiles and terrestrial invertebrate assessments are additional sections of fields part of which do fall within 100m of the Application stage Order Limits. These fields were not scoped in for further survey for reptiles within ES Appendix 6.7 Reptiles (APP-160) or terrestrial invertebrates within ES Appendix 6.8 Terrestrial Invertebrate (APP-161). Therefore, no change in impacts on any protected species are anticipated.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Consequently, it is not anticipated that the change will result in any likely significant changes that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction or operational phase of the Project that are reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Whilst there will be a change in the locations of the mitigation areas, it is not anticipated that this will introduce a significant change and will have to be in accordance with the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios (as detailed within DC-09). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). This includes pre-construction biodiversity surveys, to update the baseline, inform the requirements for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) or development licences if required, and inform suitable construction method statements. Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change is not likely to have an impact on construction emissions as land take is considered to be of equal size to that originally suggested. As set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | Construction (✓) Operation (x) | <p>The change has been scoped in for assessment of its construction effects within the ES Addendum. See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-21 (Rev 2).</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. As a result, the change is scoped out of assessment of operational effects in the ES Addendum.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Geology and Soils | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-21 (Rev 2). |
| Landscape and Visual | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-21 (Rev 2). |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01 specifically the mitigation measures which are secured via the EMP and ES Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste and the ES Chapter which would prevent any new or different likely significant effects when compared to those reported in the ES for construction or operation . In addition the change is related to mitigation for ecology planting on the MOD land. It is unlikely MOD land would be used for mineral development. In addition this planting is unlikely to permanently sterilise a mineral resource. Therefore the change is scoped out of further assessment for Material Assets and Waste for both construction and operation.</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. There is no aspect of this change that would introduce new or different operational noise effects to those identified in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055). Therefore, this change is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change will require an amendment to the Order Limits in order to reduce the potential operational impact on the MoD Facility. However, the amendments will not alter the assessment findings detailed within the ES for construction or operation due to the absence of population and human health receptors within these areas of change to the Order Limits.</p> <p>The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| | | Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.17 DC-24 – Reuse of existing A66 (north of Flitholme)

2.17.1 Table 2-16 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-16: ES Chapter affected by DC-24 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09 |
| Biodiversity | x | In Environment Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049), there were no significant effects for construction or operation, after mitigation. The change is within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). This includes the assumption that any habitats within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary will be lost. This change will result in less land take but includes a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which includes an intact species-poor hedgerow, a defunct species-poor hedgerow and improved grassland. Updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will have to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within for DC-09). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include the bat crossing at this underpass. Consequently, there would be no new or different significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change requires a new section of cutting that has the potential to be a maximum of 6m deep. The interpretation of the assessment for Appleby to Brough scheme presented in ES Appendix 14.6 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (APP-225), is not anticipated to change due to the change DC-24 as described in ES Addendum Volume II (Rev 2) Appendix 2: HIA addendum. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The revised zone of influence extends the zone of influence presented in ES Appendix 14.6 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (APP-225) by a small area to the south of the proposed underpass and an area north-west of the assessed cutting. However, the new areas are not anticipated to impact any new receptors, and the assessed cutting is not anticipated to cause greater impact to those receptors already identified as being impacted in ES Appendix 14.6 Hydrogeological Impact Assessment (APP-225).</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the change will result in any significant changes that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction or operational phase of the Project that are reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the Project from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Based on the above the change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks and land use change i.e. tree loss. The change may reduce operational emissions through the reduction in traffic speeds. The change may give rise to an increase in emissions as a result of materials required for the new underpass. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including in consideration of the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This change would allow the use of more of the existing A66 and retain more of the mature woodland to the north. Consequently, this change would result in less change to the existing baseline conditions compared to the DCO design assessed in Document 3.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst case scenario has already been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | <p>See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-24 (Rev 2).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. This change would not result in any changes to the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source in the area. Changes to the de-trunked A66, including changing speed from 60mph to 30mph, would not result in higher noise levels than those predicted in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055). Therefore, this change is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change may allow for a reduction in land required by enabling more of the existing A66 to be utilised operationally. However, it is not considered that any change in land take would affect the significance of the construction effect reported in the ES. The change is not anticipated to result in any material changes in terms of factors such as construction method, programme and construction site boundary that could impact on population and human health receptors and which are not already adequately controlled by the requirements of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change will not alter the level of provision.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | ✓ | <p>See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-24 (Rev 2).</p> |

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

2.18.1 Table 2-17 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-17: ES Chapter affected by DC-25 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change is anticipated to reduce construction work in the vicinity of human receptor HSR 48 (as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)), however construction phase NO₂ has not been modelled at this receptor because it is not part of the ARN construction phase. The closest modelled receptor was HSR46 which predicted a concentration of 10.4µg/m³ in the construction phase. This is representative of the receptors adjacent to this change and is well below the air quality objective. The modelled construction phase NO₂ is not anticipated to change in the DCO design for any human sensitive receptor on the Appleby to Brough scheme. It is not currently anticipated that any change in construction will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>In the operational phase an NO₂ concentration of 4.9µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 48 as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. The change is not anticipated to have an effect on the mainline A66 which is the dominant source of emissions, and therefore it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for operation.</p> <p>Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The removal of the Langrigg junction results in less land take and includes the relocation of a large balancing pond away from an area of marshy grassland/fen habitat. The change also includes two areas outside of the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used in the ES assessment (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). One area is at the western end of the change location where the change joins onto the existing Flitholme Road (within the DCO Order Limits). This area includes improved grassland and two species-poor hedgerows with trees (surveyed as part of the baseline data collection for the ES). The second area is at the eastern end of the change location where an additional area of land is outside of the Order Limits to enable the outfall of the relocated balancing pond into the unnamed tributary of Lowgill Beck. Lowgill Beck is functionally linked to River Eden SSSI/SAC. This area is immediately to the south of the location where the new A66 crosses the watercourse and in terms of habitats includes the watercourse, arable, improved grassland, and a species-poor intact hedge.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the change will result in any significant changes to the impacts that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction or operational phase of the Project that are reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). This is due to the impact assessment taking account of the worst-case scenarios and mitigation measures being included within the Project design accordingly and within the Limits of Deviation (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)). No impacts on the watercourse are anticipated which are new or different to those reported in the ES or HRA (3.5 Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Stage 1 Likely Significant Effects Report (APP-234) and 3.6 Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Stage 2 Statement to Inform Appropriate Assessment (APP-235)) due to the rationale outlined in the Road Drainage and the Water Environment scoping text for this change. In summary, this is because the change would not result in any new or greater impacts to nearby road drainage and water environment receptors, including the tributary of Lowgill Beck.</p> <p>This is due to the change not varying from the water environment and drainage design features that were assessed in the ES and there are no anticipated changes to the DCO drainage design, watercourse crossings, cuttings, greater floodplain impacts, or any other design components that may cause an impact on road drainage and water environment receptors as a result of the change.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) and the PDP (Deadline 7 Submission Application Document 5.11 Project Design Principles (Rev 4)).</p> <p>The change would also not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). This includes pre-construction biodiversity surveys, to update the baseline, inform the requirements for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) or development licences if required, and inform suitable construction method statements. This change will result in less land take but will include a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary. Any updates to any of the habitat mitigation proposed would have to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within DC-14). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include the barn owl planting to the east. Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for the road. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By removing the Langrigg westbound junction this change would result in less change to the existing baseline conditions compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The changes, including removal of Langrigg westbound junction and realignment of the new link road to Flitholme Road, would not result in altering the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change would result in two small areas of additional land take outside of the original Order Limits assessed within the ES. The areas in question are small and are not located within the vicinity of any population and human health receptors. Whilst they would increase land take from the West View agricultural land holding, the additional land take is negligible, approximately 0.17 hectares, when considering the overall impact to the holding which was assessed within the ES. As such the land take required for the change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>The change will not alter the level of provision. There is a change in Order Limits required, however the additional land is the existing A66 carriageway and its acquisition is unlikely to have an effect on surrounding business.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.19 DC-26 – Revision to West View Farm Accommodation Bridge and Removal of West View Farm Underpass

2.19.1 Table 2-18 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-18: ES Chapter affected by DC-26 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change is anticipated to reduce construction work in the vicinity of HSR 50 (as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)), however construction phase NO₂ has not been modelled at this receptor.</p> <p>This is because only those receptors located at the worst-case locations need to be assessed (i.e. the closest receptors to the road alignment) of which HSR 50 is not, as other receptors are closer to the Project. However, the modelled construction phase NO₂ is not anticipated to change as a result of the changes for any human sensitive receptor on the Appleby to Brough scheme. It is not currently anticipated that any change in construction will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change does not alter the Order Limits or the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which was used for the biodiversity assessment of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). There are no changes to any of the proposed biodiversity mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | | Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. |
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks and materials required for the bridge and underpass. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>The change in the design may allow for the Grade II listed Boundary stone to north of Bullistone Cottage to be retained in situ rather than be relocated. However, as the stone is still within the Order Limits a worst-case assumption has been made that temporary relocation may still be required. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Geology and Soils | x | The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils. |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By reconfiguring the bridge and reducing the extent of access roads this change results in less change to the existing baseline conditions compared to the DCO design assessed in the ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-53). Therefore, the worst-case scenario has already been assessed within the original ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Appleby to Brough scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits. |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>This change would not result in any changes to the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source and would not change the predicted noise from the A66 mainline at the closest receptors.</p> <p>Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | The change may allow for a reduction in land required however it is not considered to be of a scale that is likely to affect the significance of the effect. The change is not anticipated to result in any material changes in terms of factors such as construction method, programme and construction site boundary |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>that could impact on population and human health receptors and which are not already adequately controlled by the requirements of the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>The change will not alter the level of access to land or businesses and does not reduce the level of PRow provision that currently exists.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.20 DC-27 – Construction of Noise Barrier South of Brough

2.20.1 Table 2-19 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-19: ES Chapter affected by DC-27 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | <p>The change is anticipated to reduce construction work in the vicinity of HSR 52 and HSR 53 (as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)), however construction phase NO₂ has not been modelled at this receptor. This is because only those receptors located at the worst-case locations need to be assessed (i.e. the closest receptors to the road alignment) of which HSR52 and HSR 53 is not, as other receptors are closer to the proposed Scheme. Therefore, if no likely significant effect is demonstrated at a worst-case location the same can be said of properties further from the road, due to the decrease in NO₂ concentrations as distance increases from the roadside.</p> <p>However the modelled construction phase NO₂ is not anticipated to change in the DCO design for any human sensitive receptor on the Appleby to Brough scheme. It is not currently anticipated that any change in construction will be of the scale to result in any new or different likely significant effects in construction emissions. Any change to the construction phase is not anticipated to introduce additional construction impacts which could not be mitigated via the construction dust mitigation measures outlined in the first iteration EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for construction. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of construction.</p> <p>An NO₂ concentration of 7.5µg/m³ and 7.0µg/m³ was predicted at the closest human receptor (HSR 52 and HSR 53 respectively as shown on Figure 5.1 Air Quality Study Area and Constraints (APP-065)) in the operational Do Something scenario, which is well below the annual mean air quality objective. The change is not anticipated to have an effect on the mainline A66 which is the dominant source of emissions, and therefore it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES for operation. Therefore, further assessment of air quality is scoped out of this DCO change in terms of operation.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change requires an additional area of Order Limits. This area has not been subject to the full suite of surveys undertaken for the Order Limits of the DCO design, however the area was picked up almost in its entirety in the Phase 1 Habitat surveys undertaken for the DCO design as the area is within the 250m survey buffer that was used (ES Appendix 6.3 Phase 1 Habitat Survey (APP-156)). As reported in ES Appendix 6.3 Phase 1 Habitat Survey (APP-156), small, isolated areas within 250m of the Order Limits that could not be field surveyed due to land access restrictions have been subject to desk-based aerial assessment. In line with this approach and using a combination of desk-based and field survey, this area includes dense scrub and improved grassland and is located between the A66 and a housing development. Whilst there is potential for protected/notable species to occur in this location, due to the location and habitats present, it is not anticipated that this would include any species which were not assessed as part of ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049).</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the change will result in any significant changes to the impacts that would result in a change in the outcomes of the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction or operational phase of the Project that are reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Whilst there will be an additional area of habitat loss due to the installation of the noise barrier, this is not considered to introduce a significant change and will require to be in accordance with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios (as detailed within DC-09). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change would not impact the effectiveness of, or prevent the DCO from meeting, the mitigation requirements outlined within both ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). This includes pre-construction biodiversity surveys, to update the baseline, inform the requirements for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) or development licences if required, and inform suitable construction method statements. Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may give rise to an increase in construction emissions as a result of the additional land take/land use. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The change would introduce a new area to the Order Limits in order to facilitate the construction of the noise barrier. The area of land required is minor in size when compared to the entire land take required for the Project. Whilst it is provisionally located within ALC Grade 3 land (according to desk-based data) it is situated between the existing A66 highway verge and residential properties, with limited agricultural potential. The change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements outlined within both the ES Section 12.9 (Document Reference 3.2, APP-052) and the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which is inclusive of Annex B9 Soils</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Management Plan, (REP3-013) and the requirement for further ground investigation (Phase 2 GI). The change would not alter the effectiveness of the measures contained in these documents, particularly given they must be worked up in more detail and approved by the Secretary of State as part of a second iteration EMP.</p> <p>It is therefore not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) Section 9.10 for construction and operation. Subsequently assessment of Geology and Soils has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This is a minor amendment to the Order Limits to incorporate an area between the existing carriageway and the boundary fencing to housing on Lady Ann Drive near Brough to allow the incorporation of an acoustic fence. As the location for the fence is between an existing boundary fence and the existing carriageway it would create no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation to those reported in Paragraphs 10.10.104-10.10.148 in document 3.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | <p>See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-27 (Rev 2).</p> |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The operational effects of the change in this area (Pembroke Close and Lady Anne Drive) are already reported within the Noise and Vibration Chapter of the ES (APP-055). The barrier (reference ID 14) is noted in Table 12-20 of the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (under section 12.9 Essential mitigation and enhancement measures) and it remains unchanged as part of this change.</p> <p>As such, there is no change in the location and efficacy of the barrier. The change is not anticipated to result in a new adverse likely significant effect in operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change would result in additional land take outside of the original Order Limits assessed within the ES. The area in question is approximately 0.7 hectares in size and would not be taken from the land ownership of any nearby population receptors. As such the land take required for the change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects. The change will not alter the construction</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>methodology, order limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)).</p> <p>During operation, the introduction of the change would reduce a minor adverse health effect identified in the ES upon the residents at Lady Anne Drive to negligible. The improvement in noise human health conditions for this receptor would not however result in a new or change to the likely significant operational effects reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057) takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01.</p> |

2.21 DC-28 – Realignment of Local Access Road to be Closer to New Dual Carriageway East of Bowes

2.21.1 Table 2-20 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-20: ES Chapter affected by DC-28 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES (APP-065). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>In Environment Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049), there were no likely significant effects for construction or operation, after mitigation. The change is located within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary (permanent land take area) would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change would result in a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary for the realigned local access road by removing an area of improved grassland and hardstanding which was previously included and adding in an area of improved grassland which was not originally included.</p> <p>Any updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios (as detailed within DC-09). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). It has been confirmed that there are no changes to any of the other proposed mitigation measures identified in document ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)), therefore this would include the proposals for this bridge to be greened and for it to be the location for barn owl obstacle planting. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction or operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in materials required for the bridge. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>Although there will be changes to the East Bowes Accommodation Overpass, there will be no change to the area immediately north of the group of three listed buildings at Stone Bridge Farmhouse to the south-west of the change. The impact on the setting of the listed buildings is anticipated therefore to remain the same.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| | | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Geology and Soils assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils. |
| Landscape and Visual | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-28 (Rev 2). |
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-28 (Rev 2). |
| Noise and Vibration | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. This change would not result in any changes to the A66 mainline alignment which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment. |
| Population and Human Health | x | The change may allow for a reduction in land required however it is not considered likely to be of a scale to affect the significance of the effect. The change is not anticipated to result in any material changes in terms of factors such as construction method, programme and construction site boundary that could impact on population and human health receptors. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project either as no population and human health receptors would be impacted. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and the change has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment (APP-057), which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.22 DC-30 – Realignment of Maintenance/Footway Adjacent to Waitlands Lane

2.22.1 Table 2-21 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-21: ES Chapter affected by DC-30 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | The change is located within an arable field within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). This change will result in a slight extension of the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary which includes the entrance to the arable field and approximately 25m of intact species-rich hedgerow. Updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will require to be in line with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within DC-09). There are no changes to any of the other proposed mitigation measures included in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result. |
| Climate | x | GHG The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in earthworks and materials required for the access track. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project’s GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion. |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | x | <p>The construction phase assessment for cultural heritage took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any Cultural Heritage resources within the Order Limits will be affected by the construction of the Project (ES Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage, paragraph 8.5.2, APP-051). The change is within the Order Limits used for the assessment within the ES. There may be an opportunity to reduce the effect assessed within the ES through reduction in the extent of the work required. However, this is not considered to be part of the change. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this change would result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in construction.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation.</p> <p>Therefore, this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the assessment as the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>By changing the access arrangement to the balancing pond this change would result in less change to the existing baseline compared to the DCO design assessed in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053). Therefore, the worst- case scenario has already been assessed within the original ES.</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|--|
| Material Assets and Waste | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Material Assets and Waste assessment as the ES Chapter 10 Material Assets and Waste (APP-053) takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project and for the Cross Lanes to Rokeby scheme. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for Material Assets and Waste is summarised in DC-01, as there is no change in Order Limits. |
| Noise and Vibration | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01. The change to move the access road to the balancing pond from the west to the east would not result in altering the A66 mainline which is the dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment. |
| Population and Human Health | x | The change will not alter the construction methodology, order limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES. Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and this change has been scoped out of assessment. |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 14 Road Drainage and the Water Environment which takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.23 DC-31 – Realignment of Warrener Lane

2.23.1 Table 2-22 provides a scoping table describing whether or not any environmental topics have been scoped out of assessment and a justification as to why.

Table 2-22: ES Chapter affected by DC-31 and scoping out rationale

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Air Quality | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Air Quality assessment detailed within the ES Chapter 5 Air Quality (APP-048). The rationale for the scoping out of further assessment for Air Quality is summarised in DC-09. |
| Biodiversity | x | <p>The change is located within an arable field within the DCO Order Limits. The assessment of construction related impacts took the reasonable worst-case approach in assuming that any biodiversity receptors within the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary would be affected by the Project (ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049)). The change to increase the horizontal Limits of Deviation to the north includes a change to the Indicative Site Clearance Boundary, however this will remain within the same arable field. No changes in impacts on watercourses are anticipated which are new or different to those reported in the ES due to the rationale outlined in the Road Drainage and the Water Environment scoping text for this change.</p> <p>Any updates to the habitat mitigation proposed will have to be in accordance with the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) and the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) requirements in relation to the habitat loss to mitigation ratios to be provided (as detailed within DC-09). Therefore, there will be no change in the habitat loss to mitigation ratios reported in the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). The change as described in Section 3 of the Change Application (Document Reference 8.1, CR1-002) does not prevent the implementation of mitigation measures as described in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049) or in the EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)) which would include provision for bats and otters at this location. Consequently, there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity (APP-049). Therefore, this change is scoped out from assessment as there will be no change in the significance of any effects as a result.</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Climate | x | <p>GHG</p> <p>The change may reduce construction emissions as a result of the reduction in land take/ land use change. However, as set out by DMRB LA 114 and in line with the NPSNN (paragraph 5.17), the Project's GHG emissions, including the change, will not have a likely significant effect on climate. The change would, therefore, not result in a change to the ES conclusion.</p> <p>CCR</p> <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the CCR assessment as the ES considers the worst-case scenario across the Project, and this worst-case scenario approach accommodates the change. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment for CCR is summarised in DC-03.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage | Construction (✓) Operation (x) | <p>The change has been scoped in for assessment of its construction effects within the ES Addendum. See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-31 (Rev 2). In terms of operation, the change will not alter the mainline A66 and its associated earthworks. As these are the dominant feature potentially affecting the setting of heritage resources it is not anticipated that there would be any new or different likely significant effects as compared to those reported in the ES in operation. As a result, the change is scoped out of assessment of operational effects in the ES Addendum.</p> |
| Geology and Soils | x | <p>The geology and soils assessment within the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessed the impacts to land within the Order Limits. No additional impacts have been identified within the vicinity of the change. The change would not affect the outcomes of the ES Chapter 9 Geology and Soils (APP-052) assessment as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project Therefore, the change is scoped out of assessment for Geology and Soils.</p> |
| Landscape and Visual | x | <p>This change would allow the opportunity to reduce the development footprint, bringing Warrener Lane closer to the A66. Therefore the worst case scenario has already been assessed within Document 3.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> <p>The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01 as the change would not prevent the DCO from meeting the mitigation requirements and consequently there would be no new or different likely significant effects for construction and operation for this change to those reported in ES Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual (APP-053).</p> |

| Environmental topic | Scoped in (✓) or out (x) of environmental addendum assessment | Rationale for scoping out |
|---|---|---|
| Material Assets and Waste | ✓ | See ES Addendum Volume II: DC-31 (Rev 2). |
| Noise and Vibration | x | <p>The change would not affect the outcomes of the noise and vibration construction assessment. The rationale for the scoping out of construction noise and vibration assessment is summarised in DC-01.</p> <p>The change in the horizontal alignment of the existing A66 (Warrener Lane) to the north by approximately 12m would not alter the A66 mainline alignment. The dominant noise source affecting sensitive receptors in this area would be the traffic on the A66 mainline. Therefore, this change would not result in any new or different likely significant effects compared to those reported in the ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration (APP-055) for operation and is scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Population and Human Health | x | <p>The change will not alter the construction methodology, order limits or permanent land take requirements when compared to that which was assessed within the ES. The mitigation measures outlined within the Section 13.9 of the ES Chapter 13 Population and Human Health chapter (APP-056) will adequately control any potential impacts and these are secured through EMP (Application Document 2.7 (Rev 4)). The change would not alter the operational impacts of the Project and no additional population and human health receptors would be impacted beyond that of what was reported within the ES.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not anticipated that this would result in a new or change to a likely significant effect during construction and operation and this change has been scoped out of assessment.</p> |
| Road Drainage and the Water Environment | x | The change would not affect the outcomes of the Road Drainage and the Water Environment chapter as the ES takes into account the worst-case scenario across the Project. The rationale for the scoping out of assessment has been outlined in DC-01. |

2.24 Glossary and Abbreviations

- 2.24.1 See Application Glossary (APP-005) of the DCO Application for all definitions and abbreviations used within this document.