Dear Mr Dyer (for the Secretary of State),

I write on behalf of myparents, Joy and Hewlett Thompson,who live atThey are bothand though continuing to live

independently, spend most of their time at home. Although there have been some amendments to the route, which we welcome, the proposals would place the dual carriageway, and an access road, only

from their house. The A66 new dual carriageway, in my view, contravenes the Human Rights Act of 1998, and in particular, Article 8, as detailed below.

## **ARTICLE 8**

Right to respect for private and family life 1. Everyone has the right to respect for <u>his private and family</u> <u>life, his home</u> and his correspondence.

2. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

On 1) the proposed dual carriageway and access road would be enormously disruptive of my parents' lives, **and quite likely to make living in their home impossible.** The house is likely to depreciate in value, which will mean it will raise much less money if it is necessary to sell it to pay for their care. This is a real threat to their wellbeing in their **access**.

The house is a former shepherd's cottage and barn, mostly bordering on to the field where construction would take place, so there would be nowhere to escape from the noise. My father spends his time in a room separate from the main house: again, the noise would be inescapable.

Article 8 covers "protection from noise and pollution nuisance". Not only the noise from the construction, but also the impact on air quality would be detrimental to my parents. Natural England have identified this as a risk to natural habitats, as an ongoing concern since the examination closed, especially in the North Pennines SAC, but it is also a risk to human health

The dual carriageway will also prevent

her right to walk on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as she will be not be allowed to cross the dual carriageway.

The dual carriageway and access road are, therefore, in my view, a breach of article 8.

(This also resembles article one of the first protocol of the European Convention of Human Rights, the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

2.The counter-argument would be that subjecting them to this deliberate harm and intrusion on their human rights is necessary for the economic well-being of the country, or public safety. Taking the last first, if public safety is a concern, why are there no speed cameras, and minimal speed monitoring, on most of the A66 from Scotch Corner to Penrith? The statistics produced by National Highways do not suggest the dual carriageway will be very much safer.

National Highways have frequently argued that if the dual carriageway does not go ahead, there will be loss of connectivity from east to west. I question whether the saving of a few minutes' journey time will contribute to economic wellbeing in a project predicted to cost £1.5bn. The BCR for the project is unacceptably low, and the costs of construction have been mounting. The increased carbon emissions contribute to putting the country in breach of international legal obligations and jeopardise the likelihood of reaching net zero. These roads therefore pose a risk to long-term economic wellbeing rather than a benefit.

Dr Mary Clare Martin

On behalf of Joy and Geoffrey Hewlett Thompson

