

Evans, Rebecca

From: Laura Blake <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 08 February 2024 14:14
To: A66Dualling
Subject: A66 post examination consultation

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Interested Party Reference number: 20031900

Good afternoon

Please accept this as my response to your letter dated 2nd February 2024 in regard to the A66.

I wish to express my complete support of the comments made by the Woodland Trust.

Government talk about the need to save, protect, and plant trees/woodlands in our country, but infuriatingly are also allowing destructive and harmful projects to be progressed that would destroy and adversely impact trees and woodlands. It is counterintuitive to on one hand be spending money on planting more trees, whilst the other hand is spending money destroying them with projects like the A66 and other projects.

For National Highways not produce an Arboricultural Impact Assessment as part of a DCO application is completely unacceptable. How can you consider the full consequences of the A66 without such an assessment being presented? National Highways should be held accountable for such inadequacies.

From participating in the Lower Thames Crossing DCO Examination, I am also aware that National Highways are not taking their responsibilities seriously on other projects. For example, they categorically stated that their ecology surveys for LTC showed no evidence of a particular woodland being an ancient woodland. Yet independent evidence that was provided to Natural England resulted in said woodland being awarded Ancient Woodland status. This is just one example of many instances of inadequacies when it comes to National Highways, and in particular environmental aspects.

I am also similarly concerned about National Highways dismissive attitude in regard to the new statutory requirements in regard to National Parks, as support Campaign for National Parks comments.

These inadequacies and National Highways apparent general attitude that they can get away with things needs to be scrutinised and action taken to hold them accountable. They also lead to questions as to how reliable their ecology (and other) surveys are. With decisions being made on these destructive and harmful projects, that are all too often not good value for money, decisions should not be made until there is a review of National Highways inadequacies, and the road programme.

I would like to close by reiterating that the A66 scheme remains Very Poor in the Government's value for money framework, with an adjusted BCR of only 0.9. Therefore, the considerable

environmental harms and compulsory acquisition of property cannot be justified. Ultimately, the A66 DCO should not be granted.

Kind regards

Laura



Virus-free

