

From: [REDACTED]
To: A66Dualling
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: A66 request for information from IPs
Date: 03 October 2023 00:11:08

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mary Clare Martin** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Fri, 8 Sept 2023 at 23:55
Subject: A66 request for information from IPs
To: <A66Dualling@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Dear Secretary of State,

Thank you for the opportunity to make further comments about the proposed A66 dual carriageway and the 13 submissions of 25th August.

I write on behalf of [REDACTED] parents who live near the A66 at [REDACTED], on the Appleby-Brough section 06 of the proposed dual carriageway. They will be very badly affected by having road works adjacent to where they live, and two new roads between their house and the existing A66. The road will have only negative effects on their wellbeing, and make access to the AONB on foot impossible. They are by no means the only people affected. Since the examination ended, more people are finding that their land will be compulsorily purchased.

I support the concerns of Natural England about the impact of the dual carriageway on air quality and on blanket bog in the North Pennines SAC. This reflects wider concerns about the impact of the new roads on climate change, the local environment, air quality, and the cost to the taxpayer.

I also support Tim and Emma Nicholson's letter, and Mrs Nicholson's to Tim Farron. I do not believe there is a compelling case in the public interest to support this road. Nor do the drawbacks outweigh the benefits, in accordance with the Planning Act 2008.

I am also convinced from my very recent observation of the road that much more could be done to increase safety by installing speed cameras and lowering the permissible speed limits. In the 1970s, during the oil crisis, the speed limit was lowered to 50 mph and this also reduced carbon emissions. Since the examination ended there continue to be hold ups and accidents on the A66 but nothing appears to have been done to improve safety. This would be a far better use of taxpayers' money and reduce accidents in the short term, as has happened elsewhere.

The incompetence of National Highways in filling in a bridge at nearby Great Musgrave with concrete, which is now being removed at taxpayers' expense, has led to a local back road near the A66 being closed for 3 months while it is removed. This closure has exacerbated congestion, as on August 25th after an incident between Brough and Warcop. Many of the accidents appear to be caused by driver behaviour in moving from single to dual carriageways and this should be addressed by strategies targeted at motorists.

The other recent evidence on cost and climate change, highlighted by Emma Nicholson, further reinforces the problematic status of the dual carriageway.

The withdrawal of Costain and recent re-estimates of the cost as 1.5 bn coupled with the already low BCR of 0.92 demonstrate even further that the road is not value for money.

Recent high profile committees and experts have criticized the slow progress towards net zero and warned that we are unlikely to meet our international commitments under the Paris Agreement . Failure to reduce carbon emissions from road transport form a major aspect these concerns.

Key examples are:

The work of Professor Greg Marsden, *Reverse Gear*

The Transport Select Committee 6th report of session

The Climate Change Committee's 2023 report to Parliament

It seems unlikely that the government will meet its legal obligations if it continues with these proposals. The government should have the information requested in the Nicholson's letter before making a decision about this potentially very damaging project.

Dr Mary Clare Martin

on behalf of the residents of [REDACTED]

University of Greenwich, a charity and company limited by guarantee, registered in England (reg no. 986729). Registered Office: Old Royal Naval College, Park Row, Greenwich SE10 9LS.