



**Report to the Secretary of State for
Communities and Local Government
and to the Secretary of State for
Transport**

By C J Tipping MA(Cantab)

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government and the
Secretary of State for Transport**

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372

Date: 9 February 2007

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE A1 MOTORWAY DISHFORTH TO BARTON IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

Inquiry opened: 17 October 2006

Ref: HA65/11/102

CONTENTS

The Report

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Case Details | 1 |
| Preamble | 1 |
| Description of the Site and its Surroundings | 2 |
| The Case of the Highways Agency: | 3 |
| Background and need for the scheme | |
| Scheme objectives | |
| The scheme | |
| Scheme assessment | |
| Policy context | |
| Public consultation | |
| Funding and construction | |
| Traffic assessment | |
| Economic appraisal | |
| Environmental Assessment | |
| Compulsory acquisition of land | |
| Modifications | |
| The Case of the Objectors: | 21 |
| North Yorkshire County Council | |
| Hambleton District Council | |
| Richmondshire District Council | |
| Local access roads | |
| Non-motorised users | |
| Councillor T Pelton | |
| Eastern Harvesters Limited | |
| Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Limited | |
| W G Baker Baker and others | |
| Scurragh Lane Residents | |
| T M Jopling & Partners and others | |
| Tunstall Road Action Committee | |
| Mr P and Mrs J Chapman | |
| Mr & Mrs J McIntyre | |
| Mr J D Middleton | |
| Mr F and Mr J Pinkney | |
| Mr H Proom | |
| Written objections | |
| Objectors' alternative proposals | |
| Counter-objections | |
| Objections to HA proposed modifications | |
| The Response of the Highways Agency: | 43 |
| Introduction | |
| North Yorkshire County Council | |
| Hambleton District Council | |
| Richmondshire District Council | |
| Local access roads | |
| Non-motorised users | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Councillor Pelton | |
| Eastern Harvesters Limited | |
| W G Baker Baker and others | |
| Scurragh Lane Residents | |
| T M Jopling & Partners and others | |
| Tunstall Road Action Committee | |
| Mr P and Mrs J Chapman | |
| Mr and Mrs McIntyre | |
| Mr J D Middleton | |
| Messrs Pinkney | |
| Mr H Proom | |
| Written objections | |
| Objectors' Alternatives | |
| Modifications | |
| Objections to modifications | |
| Conclusions: | 62 |
| Introduction | |
| Economic appraisal | |
| Objections | |
| Introduction | |
| Local access roads | |
| Provision for non-motorised users | |
| Scurragh Lane Residents | |
| Tunstall Road Action Committee | |
| Private means of access | |
| <i>Eastern Harvesters Limited</i> | |
| <i>Mr J D Middleton</i> | |
| Other issues raised by objectors | |
| Modifications | |
| Objectors' Alternatives | |
| Environmental Assessment | |
| Summary of conclusions | |
| Recommendations: | 79 |
| | |
| The Annexes | |
| | |
| Annex A: Appearances: | 80 |
| Annex B: Documents: | 84 |

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

AADT: Annual Average Daily Traffic
Appropriation Order: The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Appropriation) Order 20..
AST: Appraisal Summary Table
BALB: Bedale, Aiskew and Leeming Bypass
BHS: British Horse Society
Compulsory Purchase Order: The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section) Compulsory Purchase Order (MP No.) 20..
CTC: Cyclists Touring Club
DD: Deposit Document
Detrunking Order: The draft A1 Trunk Road (Dishforth to Barton)(Detrunking) Order 20..
DfT: Department for Transport
DMRB: Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
EA: Environment Agency
EH: English Heritage
ES: Environmental Statement
HA: Highways Agency/prefix for documents submitted by the Highways Agency
HDC: Hambleton District Council
HGV: Heavy Goods Vehicle
LAR: Local access road
MSA: Motorway Service Area
NE: Natural England
NMU: Non-motorised user
NYCC: North Yorkshire County Council
The 1980 Act: The Highways Act 1980
Ob: Objector/prefix for Objector Document
OA: Objector's Alternative
PRoW: Public Right of Way
RA: Ramblers' Association
RDC: Richmondshire District Council
SACTRA: Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment
SAM: Scheduled ancient monument
Section and Connecting Roads Scheme: The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section and Connecting Roads) Scheme
Side Roads Order: The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Side Roads) Order 20..
SINC: Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SSSI: Site of Special Scientific Interest
vpd: vehicles per day
ZVI: Zone of visual influence

CASE DETAILS

- The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Appropriation) Order 20.. would be made under sections 18 and 326 of the Highways Act 1980 ("the 1980 Act").
- The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Side Roads) Order 20.. would be made under sections 12, 18, 125 and 326 of the 1980 Act.
- The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section) Compulsory Purchase Order (MP No.) 20.. would be made under sections 239, 240, 246, 250, and 260 of the 1980 Act, and section 2 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.
- The draft A1 Trunk Road (Dishforth to Barton)(Detrunking) Order 20.. would be made under sections 10 and 12 of the 1980 Act.
- The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section and Connecting Roads) Scheme 20.. would be made under sections 16, 17 and 19 of the 1980 Act.
- The draft Orders and Scheme were published on 31 March 2006.
- The draft Orders and Scheme, if made, would authorise the Highways Agency to upgrade to a dual three-lane motorway the section of the A1 trunk road between Dishforth and Barton and to carry out ancillary works.

Summary of Recommendations

I recommend: That the draft Orders and Scheme be made, subject to the modifications set out in paragraphs 6.6.4 and 6.6.7 of this report.

1. PREAMBLE

- 1.1 I have been appointed pursuant to the 1980 Act and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 to hold concurrent public inquiries into the above draft Orders and Scheme ("the Orders"), and to report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and to the Secretary of State for Transport. The applications for the Orders were made by the Highways Agency ("HA"). I refer hereinafter to the concurrent public inquiries as "the inquiry".
- 1.2 The inquiry was held at the Scotch Corner Hotel, North Yorkshire on 17 to 19, 24 to 27 and 30 October, and on 1 to 3 November 2006, a total of 11 sitting days. I held a pre-inquiry meeting on 5 September 2006 at the same venue. I made unaccompanied inspections of the sites affected by the proposals on 4 September and 16 October 2006. I made a formal site inspection, accompanied by the parties, on 2 and 3 November 2006.
- 1.3 During the period between publication of the Orders and the closing of the inquiry, a total of 153 representations were received. Of these, 5 were in support of the scheme. There were 125 objections to the scheme, and 18 parties made comments on aspects of the scheme, without objecting. There were 5 counter-objections to Objectors' Alternatives.
- 1.4 Of the objections, 21 were withdrawn before the inquiry closed. A substantial number of objections appear to have been met by responses from the HA and were not further pursued but also not formally withdrawn. A further substantial number of objections are from individual objectors duplicating

objections also made on their behalf by groups. 24 objectors and 1 counter-objector appeared or were represented at the inquiry.

- 1.5 There are no objections to the principle of the upgrading. All objections are to individual elements of the scheme. The objectors include North Yorkshire County Council ("NYCC"), Hambleton ("HDC") and Richmondshire ("RDC") District Councils, and the Councils for five of the Parishes affected by the scheme. With the exception of that of the Countryside Agency (Ob73)(now part of Natural England), there are no objections from statutory bodies.
- 1.6 There are no subsisting objections from statutory undertakers, the objection of Northern Electric Distribution Limited (Ob137) having been withdrawn prior to the inquiry. The withdrawn objections also include that of Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Limited (Ob64). Document PI/8 sets out the position in relation to all objections as at 3 November 2006 when the inquiry closed.
- 1.7 The main grounds of general objection relate to the adequacy of the proposed provision of local access roads ("LARs"), and of the proposed provision for non-motorised users ("NMUs"), that is pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. There are objections based on the adverse impact of the scheme on individual dwellings and businesses, including objections to the stopping-up of side roads and private means of access. Objectors put forward a total of 25 Alternatives ("OAs") to elements of the scheme.
- 1.8 At the inquiry, it was confirmed on behalf of the HA that all statutory formalities had been complied with. Written confirmation is contained in document HA/23. The inquiry was conducted under the Highways (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994 and the Compulsory Purchase by Ministers (Inquires Procedure) Rules 1994. There were no procedural or legal issues.
- 1.9 The remaining chapters of this report contain a brief description of the area, the gist of the cases presented, and my conclusions and recommendations. Proofs of evidence are included in the list. In the case of the HA's proofs of evidence, a small number of corrections and amendments were made in the course of the inquiry. These are set out in HA/P/Errata.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The A1 is the principal route between London and Edinburgh. Its overall length is some 650 kilometres, and it is the longest numbered road in the United Kingdom. The section affected by the proposed upgrade to motorway status lies between the existing A1 Motorway ("A1(M)") junctions at Dishforth at its southern end and Barton at its northern end, an overall distance of about 40 kilometres. The Dishforth junction with the A168 lies at the northern end of the section of the A1(M) section, the southern end of which is at Walshford, north of Wetherby. The Barton A1(M) junction with the B6275 Piercebridge Road and local roads lies at the southern end of the A1(M) section leading north to Durham and Tyneside.
- 2.2 Running north from the Dishforth junction, the principal existing road junctions, all grade-separated, along the stretch of the A1 in issue are with: the A61 Ripon to Thirsk road in the vicinity of Baldersby; the A684 Bedale to Northallerton road

to the west of Leeming Bar; the A6136 south of Catterick (providing links to the village of Tunstall to the west and to Catterick Garrison to the north-west); with the A6136 north of Catterick; and, at Scotch Corner, with the A66 Trans-Pennine route, the A6108 to Richmond and the local road to the village of Middleton Tyas.

2.3 The existing A1 between Dishforth and Barton is a two-lane all-purpose dual carriageway. There are a large number of at-grade junctions with minor roads and public rights of way ("PRoW"), and private accesses to properties and land. On the western side of this section of the A1, the principal settlements, from south to north, are Ripon, Bedale, Tunstall, Catterick Garrison, Brompton-on-Swale, Richmond and Melsonby. On the eastern side, again from south to north, the principal settlements are Thirsk, Leeming, Leeming Bar, Northallerton, Catterick Village, Scorton, Moulton and Middleton Tyas.

2.4 Other relevant site descriptions are included where appropriate in the sections of this report which set out the cases of the parties.

3. THE CASE OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY

The material points are:

3.1 Background and need for the scheme

3.1.1 The A1 is a strategic north/south inter-regional trunk road, linking London and the south of England with the north-east and Scotland, and passing through 5 regions of government. The A1 is also a regionally significant link road, connecting other strategic routes, including the M62 to Liverpool and Hull, the A64 to Leeds and Scarborough, the A19 to Teesside, and the A66 to the M6 and the Lake District.

3.1.2 There are now only two sections of sub-motorway-standard road in the link between London and Tyneside via the M1 and the A1. Of these, subject to the outcome of a public inquiry held earlier in 2006, the upgrading to a motorway of the A1 between Bramham and Wetherby is programmed to be completed by 2009. The other section is the Dishforth to Barton section, the subject of this report.

3.1.3 The A1 between Dishforth and Barton is currently a 2-lane dual carriageway open to all classes of traffic. Both the horizontal and vertical alignments are poor, and there are junction layouts which do not meet current design standards. There are many sub-standard junctions with local roads and private accesses, and there are junctions which require crossings of the central reservation. The national 70 mph speed limit applies.

3.1.4 Annual average daily traffic ("AADT") flows in 2004 ranged between 42,900 and 56,200 vehicles per day ("vpd"). These flows exceed the design capacity of the road. The average proportion of heavy goods vehicles ("HGVs") amounts to 23%, significantly above the national trunk road average. The road is also used by slow-moving agricultural vehicles to access farms and fields along the route. The result is frequent congestion and unreliable journey times.

3.1.5 The sub-standard layout combined with the volume, mix and speed of traffic results in a poor accident record. In the 5-year period 2001 to 2005 inclusive there were 11 fatal, 89 serious and 294 slight injury accidents on the road section in issue. In terms of the number of accidents, this record is not significantly above the national average, but there is an above-average proportion of "killed or seriously injured" accidents.

3.1.6 Proposals for the upgrading of the A1 between Dishforth and Scotch Corner were promoted during the 1990s, and, following a public inquiry, orders were made in respect of the Leeming to Scotch Corner section. These proposals were, however, withdrawn pending the outcome of the major review of the road programme undertaken following the publication of the July 1998 White Paper (see paragraph 3.5.1).

3.2 Scheme objectives

3.2.1 The objectives of the scheme are set out in the Scheme Brief (Appendix B of HA/P1). They are:

- To address the problems arising from the existing poor alignment of the road, and the high proportion of HGVs, and to address the poor accident record and congestion, safety and journey time reliability; and
- To ensure that there is no significant worsening in the assessment of sub-criteria results in the Appraisal Summary Table and to improve on them where possible within the constraints of the Brief.

3.2.2 The Brief also contains the following special requirements:

- To ensure that the needs of non-motorised users and public transport are catered for;
- To provide, as appropriate, single carriageway all purpose LARs to meet the needs of local and non-motorway traffic; and
- To liaise closely with statutory bodies, especially English Heritage, in relation to archaeological issues.

3.3 The scheme

3.3.1 The A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement Scheme complies with the objectives set out above. Its full detail can most readily be seen in the Scheme Layout Drawings which form Appendix A to the engineering proof of evidence (HA/P2).

3.3.2 The scheme consists of a generally on-line upgrade of the existing dual carriageway road to a 3-lane motorway with hard shoulders. A limited number of offline diversions are provided to preserve cultural heritage and to protect local residents. The sections of motorway between the Dishforth and Barton junctions and the four intermediate motorway junctions proposed are as follows:

Dishforth to Baldersby

3.3.3 The distance between junctions is some 4 kilometres. Apart from a section near Rainton, the road would be widened symmetrically along its existing line. At Rainton, the widening would be to the east of the existing line so that the existing Rainton overbridge could be retained without modification. This would require the demolition of the Little Chef Restaurant located to the east of the A1 at this point. The existing Dishforth and Baldersby junctions would be retained, with some realignment of the slip roads at Baldersby. Width limitations arising from the retention of the Baldersby junction overbridge would result in a loss of hard shoulders through the junction.

Baldersby to Leeming

3.3.4 The distance between the existing Baldersby and the proposed Leeming junctions is about 18 kilometres. The motorway would generally be accommodated on the eastern side of the existing line, with exceptions in the vicinity of Sinderby, Healam Bridge, Gatenby and Londonderry, where the alignment has been designed to be located further from residential properties, to avoid the Grade II listed Healam Bridge, a Scheduled Ancient Monument ("SAM"), and to permit re-use of the existing Gatenby Bridge without modification. The Londonderry overbridge is too short to accommodate the motorway and would be replaced with a new structure about 50 metres to its south. At Leeming, a new all-movements grade-separated junction is proposed, located about 1 kilometre north of the existing Leeming Bar junction. This would connect to the A684 Bedale to Northallerton road via an LAR to the west of the motorway, and via Leases Road which runs south from the proposed motorway junction on its eastern side.

Leeming to Catterick Central

3.3.5 This section would be some 9 kilometres in length. It would involve on-line widening of the existing road, with one significant exception. To reduce the impact of the proposals on the Roman archaeological site at Baines Farm SAM, the scheme would move significantly off-line to the west in the vicinity of the existing A1/Low Street junction, rejoining the existing line of the A1 north of the proposed Catterick Central junction. The new all-movements grade-separated Catterick Central junction is proposed to be located between the existing Catterick South and North junctions, rationalising junction provision in the area. Catterick Central junction has been carefully designed to minimise its impact on the Cataractonium Roman Town SAM and the Pallet Hill Site of Importance for Nature Conservation ("SINC").

Catterick Central to Scotch Corner

3.3.6 This section of the scheme would be about 8 kilometres long. Following the existing A1 alignment and only marginally widening the existing cutting to the north of the proposed Catterick Central junction would minimise any further impact on the Cataractonium SAM. The proposed alignment then moves slightly off-line to the east to reduce the impact of the motorway on residents of the village of Brompton-on-Swale. At Scotch Corner, the existing grade-separated junction and slip roads would be retained.

3.3.7 To permit re-use of the junction infrastructure, effecting a significant cost saving, the motorway would be reduced through the Scotch Corner junction to two lanes by means of a lane drop, a provision which is consistent with forecast AADT flows through the junction, having regard to traffic leaving the motorway at Scotch Corner. Traffic signals would be introduced at the junction roundabout to increase capacity, reduce speeds and promote the safe use of the junction by cyclists and pedestrians. Segregated cycle and pedestrian routes would be provided at the roundabout. The layout would also accommodate the A66 upgrade to dual carriageway which was in course of construction during the inquiry.

Scotch Corner to Barton

3.3.8 This section would be about 3 kilometres in length. It would involve symmetrical widening along the line of the existing A1. North of Scotch Corner the motorway would re-widen to three lanes by way of a lane gain to accommodate the substantial influx of traffic at the Scotch Corner junction. The three-lane motorway would extend north beyond the Barton junction northbound exit slip road and then reduce to tie in with the existing two-lane motorway running north from the Barton junction. The Kneeton Hall overbridge is of inadequate length to accommodate the three-lane motorway; it is also of inadequate height to accommodate high loads, which must currently use a designated route along local roads. A new bridge would be constructed.

Junctions and crossings

3.3.9 The existing range of substandard junctions, crossings and accesses between the existing Dishforth and Barton motorway junctions would be reduced to the four grade-separated, flyover junctions described above. The other proposed crossings for all users are (from south to north) the existing overbridges/underpasses at Rainton, Sinderby, Street Lane, Oak Tree, Gatenby Lane, Londonderry, the A684 Bedale-Northallerton Road, Tickergate Lane, Tunstall Road west of Catterick, the A6136 Catterick Road, Brompton North and South, and Catterick North. Additional crossings proposed at Bedale Beck and Kneeton Hall would make further provision for non-motorised users.

Local access roads

3.3.10 A continuous local road network parallel to the proposed motorway would be provided by supplementing, where appropriate, existing local routes with new roads. Wherever possible, in the interests of cost-minimisation, the new LARs would re-use one of the existing carriageways of the A1.

3.3.11 In assessing where provision of a new parallel LAR is appropriate, the HA has looked for clear justification in traffic, economic and environmental terms. Demands for additional LARs have been rejected where the existing road network is safe and within capacity, and additional traffic flows are predicted to be modest. The HA's proposals initially included new parallel LARs along only three sections of the proposed motorway, namely, between Baldersby and Leeming, between the northern end of Low Street and Catterick Central, and between the Catterick North overbridge and Scotch Corner. A 3.5-metre-wide service road with passing places for local access was also to be provided between Leeming junction and Bowbridge Lane.

3.3.12 Following further consideration, the HA now proposes an LAR along the full length of the section between the Leeming and Catterick Central junctions, upgrading the proposed service road to a full single carriageway status and extending this to join the proposed LAR at the northern end of Low Street (see paragraph 5.5.8).

Non-motorised users

3.3.13 The impact of the scheme on pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians has been assessed using the guidance set out in the DMRB. Including the Dishforth and Barton junctions, there are currently 20 grade-separated bridge or underpass crossings of the existing A1. In addition to these, there are 8 at-grade crossings, where a gap in the central reservation allows users to cross between minor roads or PRowS. NMUs are permitted to use the A1, but vehicle noise, emissions and dust combine to make the A1 an unpleasant and, especially at busy times, intimidating route, and it is little-used by NMUs. There are similar disincentives to NMUs using the at-grade crossings. A significant number of the existing PRowS are thus effectively cul-de-sacs terminating at the carriageway of the A1. The existing A1 creates a high degree of severance.

3.3.14 The coast-to-coast, St Bees to Robin Hood's Bay long distance footpath crosses the A1 at Brompton-on-Swale. This crossing would not be affected by the scheme. A national byway, Britain's Heritage Cycling Route, lies close to the western side of the A1. It is known as the Bedale Loop, starting and finishing in the village of Bedale. It does not cross the A1 and is unaffected by the scheme. The locations of all existing PRowS are shown in Figures 1.1 to 1.7 in HA/P4A, and proposed provision for NMUs is shown in Figures 2.1 to 2.7.

3.3.15 Surveys of use of PRowS have been conducted and the results are set out in Appendix A in HA/P4A. The surveys sought to ascertain the volume and mix of user of the 72 PRowS identified as affected by the scheme, including information about trip origins and destinations. The locations of the survey points are shown in Figure 3 and the results are summarised in Appendix A in HA/P4A.

3.3.16 The surveys show that of the 72 PRowS considered, 42 are used on average by fewer than 10 persons per day. The greater number of journeys are circular leisure routes around the larger residential areas of Leeming, Leeming Bar, Catterick, Brompton-on-Swale and Middleton Tyas. The existing at-grade crossings are little used and some have been closed on safety grounds.

3.3.17 Implementation of the scheme would lead to the closure of four overbridge crossings of the A1. These are Cowfold Bridge, Leases Bridge and Tunstall Bridge, together with Manor House Bridge which, though proposed to be retained post-upgrade, would no longer cross the mainline A1(M). Three new overbridges, at Street Lane, Tickergate Lane and Catterick Central, would be provided, together with three new underpasses (at Oak Tree Farm, Bedale Beck and Leeming Bar).

3.3.18 The loss of the Cowfold and Manor House Bridges is likely to create most severance in terms of crossing points. Diversions via alternative crossings would be provided but the diverted routes would be longer. The loss of the Manor

House Bridge would affect equestrians in particular; the suggested diversion via the Catterick Central motorway junction would expose riders to heavy vehicular traffic and create significant severance. In the course of consultations, a modification was put forward, now promoted by the HA as M11, providing an additional route via the proposed new Tunstall Road Bridge, with a connection to existing Bridleway 20.10/4. The HA's case regarding Cowfold Bridge is set out more fully in paragraphs 5.3.3 to 5.3.5.

- 3.3.19 The access to the retained and new crossing points would be improved by providing new PRow links and widened grass verges along the proposed LARs. In addition to connecting existing routes, the LARs would also significantly improve south/north NMU trips, exposing users to substantially lower volumes of traffic. The AADT flows on the LARs are predicted to be between 7,300 and 11,500 vpd in 2010, very significantly lower than on the A1.
- 3.3.20 There would be managed grass verges on each side of the LARs. The verge further from the motorway would be a minimum of 3 metres wide, and the nearer verge would be a minimum of 2.5 metres wide. Both verges would thus be generally significantly in excess of minimum design standards. Only at two "pinch points" some 40 to 45 metres in length would the width be less than as set out above, though nevertheless remaining at or above the minimum design standard. This minimum verge width would also be provided at the top of the embankments at the Baldersby and Leeming junctions and at the Gatenby and Londonderry bridges, but additional verge would also be available at the foot of the embankments. On each side of the LARs, a hard strip 1 metre wide would also be provided between the carriageway and the verge for the use of cyclists.
- 3.3.21 NMU crossing points on LARs would be provided with non-slip surfacing and horse corrals of the design urged on the HA by user groups in the course of consultation. Equestrian-style parapets would be provided on all overbridges except that at Street Lane, where predicted AADT levels of only 600 vpd would permit riders to use the main carriageway without unacceptable risk, and at Scotch Corner, where use by equestrians is not envisaged, though reduced speeds and traffic-signalisation would permit safe use by pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.3.22 Accepting that equestrians would not be able to use the Scotch Corner junction, a proposed modification to the Orders (M13) would provide a bridleway on the eastern side of the motorway south from Scurragh House Lane to join Bridleway 20.9/11 at the latter's junction with Gatherley Road. Equestrians would then be able to cross the motorway using the to-be-retained Catterick North overbridge and then return north along the LAR on the western side to Scurragh Lane.
- 3.3.23 Cumulative NMU severance is assessed by combining the impact of increases in journey length due to diversion with the benefit to NMUs resulting where a diversion no longer exposes them to large volumes of traffic. A full assessment of the impacts of the scheme on NMUs is set out at section 5 of HA/P4.
- 3.3.24 In summary, the HA's proposals for NMUs would constitute a significant improvement over the existing provision. They would replace the existing 20 usable crossing points with 22, and improve connectivity of other PRowS by

means of the provision of the LARs and new sections of PRoW. The HA's case with regard to provision for NMUs is further set out in its response to objections in section 5.6 of this report.

Other provision

3.3.25 To avoid visual intrusion, it is not proposed to light either the motorway or the LARs. Lighting would be provided at the four proposed junctions, using modern cut-off design, limiting light pollution. A number of balancing ponds are proposed to accommodate rain water run-off, and regard has been had to the requirements of the EA and of local drainage boards, as well as to the sensitivities of the River Swale and other watercourses.

3.3.26 Where appropriate, the scheme would include landscaping and other visual screening works, and noise and anti-glare barriers.

3.4 Scheme assessment

3.4.1 In accordance with the New Approach to Appraisal ("NATA"), the scheme has been assessed against the five overarching objectives therein set out, namely: economy, safety, accessibility, integration and environment. The assessment of the scheme against these objectives and the relevant sub-criteria is summarised in the Appraisal Summary Table ("AST"), which forms Appendix A to HA/P1.

3.5 Policy context

3.5.1 The scheme has been developed in line with government transport policy. The government's long-term strategy for the transport network is set out in the White Paper: "The Future of Transport; a Network for 2030" (DD8). The Targeted Programme of Improvements extending to 2020/1 has been developed within the framework of the July 1998 White Paper: "A New Deal for Transport" (DD9) and the "daughter" document: "A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England" (DD10). The White Paper established a core trunk road network; responsibility for the non-core trunk roads was subsequently transferred to local highway authorities. The government's 2004 Spending Review drew a distinction within the core network between roads of national importance and roads of regional importance. Since June 2002, the Dishforth to Barton Improvement scheme has been included in the TPI in the national category.

3.5.2 The Secretary of State for Transport is the highway authority for trunk roads and motorways. He is responsible for government transport policy and is required to keep under review the national road and motorway network and, in order to improve the network, may require a new motorway to be constructed. The HA is responsible for managing, maintaining and improving the trunk road and motorway network in the interests of safety, efficiency, reliability, and environmental acceptability.

3.5.3 The scheme is also supported by structure and local plan policy, by local transport plan policy, and is actively supported in principle by the County, and all District and Parish Councils.

3.6 Public consultation

3.6.1 Full public consultation took place in the summer of 2005. Some 1,450 people visited an exhibition held over a 4-day period in June of that year. There were 1,150 responses to a questionnaire sent to residents and businesses along the line of the scheme. Of these, 955 gave in-principle support to the upgrade, while 87% gave support to the scheme proposals presented.

3.6.2 In the course of developing the scheme, the HA has continued to consult with the County, District and Parish Councils, with user groups, and with local residents and businesses anticipated to be affected by the scheme. Where feasible and economically acceptable, adjustments to the scheme proposed by those affected have been adopted by the HA, and the necessary modifications to the scheme arising from these adjustments are promoted by the HA.

3.7 Funding and construction

3.7.1 The scheme budget is £325m at 3rd Quarter 2001 prices. The budget includes design and construction costs, land and compensation costs, supervision costs, and allowances for inflation and risk. The scheme forms part of the HA's £12.7 billion Targeted Programme of Improvements, and has been granted provisional funding. Confirmation of funding, subject to the decision of the Secretaries of State, is set out in HA/32.

3.7.2 In accordance with government advice, there has been early contractor involvement in the scheme. An early contractor involvement contract was awarded in March 2004 to a joint venture vehicle consisting of Amec and Alfred McAlpine.

3.7.3 Subject to the Orders being made and compliance with other requirements, construction would commence in early 2008. The anticipated construction period is 3 years, and it is therefore expected that the new motorway would be opened in 2011. For the purposes of the assessment of the scheme, however, 2010 was assumed to be the Opening Year. The scheme assessment has been carried out for 2010 and, in accordance with government guidance, for the "Design Year", 15 years after assumed opening, that is, 2025.

3.8 Traffic Assessment

3.8.1 In accordance with the guidance set out in the DMRB, a comprehensive traffic study has been undertaken covering the road network within the existing A1 Dishforth to Barton corridor. Locally collected traffic information from surveys in October 2002, October 2005 and June 2006 has been used to produce a computer model of the main routes in the area, and to permit assessments of local road and access issues to be carried out on a case-by-case basis.

3.8.2 The model has been validated, again in accordance with DMRB guidance. The Local Model Validation Report forms DD 166. The forecast of growth in cars and light goods traffic has been based on the DfT's TEMPRO database; HGV traffic growth has been based on the growth factors in the National Road Traffic Forecasts. All proposed local land-use developments have been included in the model inputs.

3.8.3 The model has been used to predict the growth in traffic flows in three scenarios, "pessimistic" or low growth, "realistic" or mid growth, and "optimistic" or high growth. The predictions are set out in Traffic Forecasting Report (DD167). In the high growth scenario, traffic flows are predicted to increase by 33% between 2004 and 2010 and by 75% between 2004 and 2025. In this scenario AADT flows would be about 69,000 vehicles in 2010 and about 87,000 vehicles in 2025. The proposed three-lane motorway would have a capacity capable of accommodating predicted traffic flows in the Design Year, 2025, even in the high growth scenario.

3.8.4 The traffic model has also been used to assess the impact on the local road network, and to establish in particular where within the network the increases in traffic levels are such as to render a new LAR appropriate. The studies included a roadside interview survey on the A168 south of Dishforth. The A168 here runs parallel to the existing A1(M), providing an appropriate context for the collection of non-motorway traffic information. This survey addressed the impact of the imposition of motorway regulations on the A1 Dishforth to Barton corridor, and indicated that the AADT flow of motorway-prohibited traffic in 2010 would be some 30 vpd. Other reasons for not using the motorway were also identified and analysed. The results are contained in HA/17. Modelled traffic flow predictions for 2010 in both the Do Nothing and Do Something scenarios are set out in Figures in Appendix A to HA/P3, and have been employed to inform the HA's proposals for new LARs.

3.8.5 The proposed new LARs are set out in paragraph 3.3.10 to 3.3.12 of this report. The HA judges that a new LAR is not required between Dishforth and Baldersby: the main impact on this route section would result from the closure of the A1 slip roads at Rainton, causing, compared with the Do Minimum scenario, an extra 200 vehicles or so per day to use the minor road south from Rainton to join the A1 at the Dishforth junction via the A168. The existing road can accommodate this extra traffic.

3.8.6 As to the Scotch Corner to Barton section, motorway-prohibited traffic has the choice of two routes, via Melsonby to the west or via Middleton Tyas to the east. Even if all the traffic displaced, predicted at 30 vehicles per day, chose to divert through only one of these villages, this would have no significant impact on traffic levels. The HA accordingly does not propose new LARs along either the Dishforth to Baldersby or Scotch Corner to Barton motorway sections.

3.8.7 Among the other impacts on the local road system considered by the HA are the following:

- **Tunstall Road:** The HA acknowledges that the route through Tunstall village is used by Marne Barracks to Catterick Garrison traffic in preference to other routes such as the A6136 via Catterick Bridge. However, traffic flows are not expected to increase as a result of implementation of the scheme. Traffic using Tunstall Road as a route between Marne Barracks and Catterick Garrison would have a new and more direct route option via the new LAR which would link with the A6136 to the west of the proposed motorway;
- **Catterick Bridge:** Given the proximity of the new A6136 junction to Catterick

Race Course, the HA recognises that this junction would be busy on race and other event days, including the weekly Sunday Market. Background traffic flows at Catterick Bridge would, however, be significantly reduced, permitting easier access to Race Course events. Some short term queueing may occur at the new junction on Market days, but this can be safely accommodated on the new section of link road; and

- **The A684/Leases Road junction:** This junction, known locally as the Crossways Junction, is located at the southern end of Leases Road and lies to the east of the existing A684/A1 junction at Leeming Bar. It currently experiences capacity problems, and these are anticipated to worsen with general traffic growth in the area. The impact on this junction of the scheme, however, is likely to be slightly beneficial, since traffic flows there are predicted to reduce as traffic to and from the industrial estate on Leases Road would have the option of travelling north along Leases Road to access the motorway directly at the proposed Leeming junction.

3.9 Economic Appraisal

3.9.1 In accordance with government guidance, the economic appraisal compares the total cost of constructing the scheme with the benefits accruing over a 60-year evaluation period. It has been carried out using the DfT's COBA and TUBA methodologies. Account has been taken, using the QUADRO Programme, of the economic impact on users during delays caused by construction and future maintenance works. All costs and benefits have been valued and discounted to 2002 prices. The traffic assessment reported above employs the high growth, worst-case scenario. To render the economic appraisal of benefits more robust, however, the realistic, mid growth scenario has been assessed.

3.9.2 The benefits are largely attributable to journey time and accident savings. The total costs of constructing the scheme at 2002 prices are £217m, and total benefits are £649m. The difference, known as the Net Present Value ("NPV") is £432m. A positive NPV shows that the scheme's benefits outweigh its costs. The Ratio of Benefits to Costs ("BCR"), 649 divided by 217, is 2.99. A BCR greater than unity again shows that the benefits outweigh the costs. A BCR greater than two represents high value for money in accordance with the Guidance to Ministers which forms HA/2. The scale of the NPV and a BCR of some three times unity demonstrates that the scheme's economic out-turn is robustly positive.

3.10 Environmental Assessment

3.10.1 The 3-Volume Environmental Statement ("ES")(DD169) was published in March 2006 and is accompanied by a Non-Technical Summary (DD7). Its preparation was preceded in 2004 by a Scoping Report (DD21). A draft ES was prepared and sent out to consultation. The full ES was then prepared.

3.10.2 In addition to the LAR and NMU issues addressed above and further addressed in section 5 of this report, other potential impacts of the scheme have been assessed and are set out in the following paragraphs.

Landscape and visual amenity

- 3.10.3 The potential impacts of the scheme on landscape and visual amenity have been assessed in accordance with guidance in the DMRB. A zone of visual influence ("ZVI") has been established extending generally to between 1 and 3 kilometres on either side of the route corridor, but also including distant views from the Yorkshire Dales to the west and the Yorkshire Moors to the east. The landform in the area is generally flat or gently undulating. Potential visual receptors of the scheme include dwellings in Leeming, Catterick and Brompton-on-Swale, rural villages set back from the A1 and isolated properties. They also include users of public rights of way and of leisure facilities, as well as persons at work at commercial premises in the vicinity of the proposed motorway.
- 3.10.4 The landscape assessment has had regard to national policy as set out in Planning Policy Statement 1 – "Delivering Sustainable Development", and PPS7 – "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas". Regard has also been had to Regional Policy Guidance 12 (October 2001), the Regional Spatial Strategy Consultation Draft for Yorkshire and the Humber (2005), and the North Yorkshire Structure Plan adopted in 1995. Local policy is contained in the Hambleton District, Richmondshire, and Harrogate District Local Plans.
- 3.10.5 The A1 route corridor lies in the wide Vale of Mowbray between the Dales and the Moors. The existing A1 is a prominent landscape feature, consisting as it does of a dual two-lane road with wide verges. The road is generally at-grade with the surrounding landform, and hedgerows and occasional groups of trees are to be found on either side.
- 3.10.6 The ZVI study area was divided into nine sections in each of which the visual impact of the scheme would be different. These are identified at paragraph 1.20 of HA/P5. The landscape impact of the scheme on each section was then assessed in the Opening and the Design Years. The detailed assessment is contained in section 5 of HA/P5 and summarised in Table 5-1. The overall impact of the scheme on landscape in the opening year is assessed as moderate adverse. This impact largely derives from the widening of the road corridor, the loss of roadside vegetation, the introduction of new structures and junctions, and of vertical elements such as gantries, electronic message boards, and anti-glare and crash barriers.
- 3.10.7 The landscape mitigation strategy is based on the Environmental Masterplan in Volume 2 of the ES (DD169) and includes retention of existing walls, hedgerows and trees wherever practicable, and new planting of trees, hedgerows and other vegetation. There would also be planting between the proposed motorway and LARs where possible, and off-site planting by agreement with landowners. Where appropriate, earth mounds and false cuttings would be constructed to provide mitigation. Fences would be used only where there is a need for immediate screening which could not otherwise be provided.
- 3.10.8 The following localised landscape impacts of greater severity are predicted. At Baldersby, works including the construction of new roundabouts and the widening of slip roads would require the loss of existing vegetation, leaving

the new embankments exposed and prominent. There would also be new lighting columns on the upper level of the junction, vertical elements which would be at odds with the surrounding landscape. In mitigation, new screen vegetation, trees and shrubs would be planted. While these would provide little mitigation on scheme opening, by 2025 the maturing vegetation is predicted to have taken effect so that few of the intrusive elements would remain visible, and so that, compared with the poor integration of the existing junction, there would be a slight or moderate beneficial impact on landscape. The progress of the proposed mitigation for this part of the scheme and for others is illustrated in the series of photomontages which form Figure 12 in the Appendices to HA/P5.

3.10.9 At Catterick Central, the visual impacts would arise from the route diversion off-line to avoid Baines Farm SAM, the construction of the new junction, a new overbridge for Tunstall Road and the new link road to Catterick, and the provision of a gantry and message boards. There are a relatively high number of visual receptors in this area. However, diversion of the route away from Catterick would have an immediate beneficial effect on the majority of properties there but at a cost of moderate or substantial impacts on a small number of properties west of Catterick. Proposed new planting would be of little initial mitigating benefit. By 2025, however, maturing screening would match the integration of the existing A1 and provide moderate beneficial effects for the majority of receptors.

3.10.10 By the summer of 2025 with all mitigation measures in place, it is predicted that there would be no subsisting impacts worse than moderate adverse and these would remain at only 5 locations. At 89 properties there would be moderate beneficial visual impacts associated with the scheme being better screened and integrated into the landscape than the existing A1. The limited adverse impacts of the scheme on landscape are anticipated to be outweighed by its benefits.

3.10.11 Temporary impacts on landscape would arise during the three-year construction period by reason of movement of construction traffic, excavations, stockpiles of soil and construction materials, work areas and construction compounds, and road signage. Where appropriate, temporary earth bunds could be constructed to mitigate the visual impacts during the construction period. A summary of likely construction impacts by route section is contained in Table 5.3 of HA/P5.

Ecology

3.10.12 The existing habitats and significant species have been assessed within a corridor extending to 500m on each side of the line of the proposed motorway in accordance with government guidance. The main habitat along this corridor is characterised by intensively-managed arable farmland consisting of large fields bounded by grassland strips or hedgerows. The latter are also intensively-managed and species-poor, though providing habitat for birds, small mammals and amphibians. The hedgerows along the side roads and lanes are generally more species-diverse.

3.10.13 The main watercourses in the study area are the River Swale, and the

Bedale, Healam, Brough and Tunstall Becks. All of these except the last are crossed by the existing A1. A total of 43 ponds have been identified in the study corridor.

- 3.10.14 As to habitats, a total of 22.5 kilometres of hedgerow would be lost to the scheme, but this loss would be compensated for by the planting of 69 kilometres of new hedgerow. Improvement works would be carried out to retained existing hedgerows. 1.41 hectares of low value woodland would be lost but compensated for by the planting of 38 hectares of new native woodland. The loss of 29.9 hectares of semi-improved natural grassland would be compensated for by the provision as landscape planting of some 50 hectares of wildflower meadow grassland.
- 3.10.15 There are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest or other statutory nature conservation sites within the corridor. Pallet Hill SINC, which supports a large population of wetland birds, is a non-statutory site adjacent to the existing A1.
- 3.10.16 As a result of the assessment, the following protected species have been identified within the study area: bats, otters, badgers and great crested newts. The scheme has been developed so as to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on ecology, and wherever possible so as to enhance existing habitats. For example, proposals for the Catterick Central Junction have been revised to limit encroachment on the Pallet Hill SINC to the edge of the Site where the habitat is of low value and not used by the bird population. The decision to widen the A1 offline to the east of the existing route in the Melmerby area minimises a potential impact on great crested newts.
- 3.10.17 Nevertheless, some adverse impacts would arise from the scheme, and mitigation is accordingly proposed. The demolition of buildings would result in the loss of a total of 14 bat roosts. Artificial roosts would be constructed. Licences would then be obtained and the existing roosts would be removed under the supervision of Natural England ("NE")(formerly English Nature). There would also be some disturbance of bat foraging routes during the construction phase.
- 3.10.18 The new bridge proposed at Healam Beck would result in the loss of an otter holt. An artificial holt would be created, with adjacent grass- and woodland. A DEFRA licence would be required. Similarly, a currently disused badger sett would be lost. Arrangements for the provision of an artificial sett have been agreed with NE. The badger population in the study area is dynamic and a further study would be required before construction begins, and the mitigation strategy would be revised if appropriate.
- 3.10.19 The great crested newt is the species considered most vulnerable to disturbance, being small, unable to flee from danger and having a small range based on the breeding pond. The scheme would cause the loss of two breeding ponds. Mitigation has been agreed in the form of new ponds, with rough grassland and scrub habitat. Existing habitat would be enhanced, and refuge habitats would be created to provide immediate cover. DEFRA licences would be required, but, in view of the mitigation agreed, are anticipated to be forthcoming without delay or difficulty.

3.10.20 With the proposed mitigation in place, the overall residual impact of the scheme on ecology in the Design Year is assessed as slight adverse. There is no objection to the scheme from NE.

Water quality and flooding

3.10.21 The scheme is predicted to have a significant beneficial impact on water quality. The present A1 has no active treatment of the highway drainage. As part of the scheme, initial runoff would be trapped by gullies or catch-pits before draining into balancing ponds via petrol interceptors. Further mitigation is likely to be developed during the detailed design stage.

3.10.22 Any potential increased flood risk has been assessed by considering the impact on watercourses and the loss of floodplain by reason of structures such as embankments and bridge abutments. With appropriate mitigation as agreed with the Environment Agency ("EA"), the impact of the scheme on flood risk is predicted to be neutral. There is no objection to the scheme from the EA.

Noise and vibration

3.10.23 A traffic noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken using the guidance set out in the DMRB. The study area extended to 300 metres on either side of the proposed motorway and to 300 metres south and north respectively of the existing Dishforth and Barton junctions. Levels of traffic noise have been predicted, using the scheme traffic model. The assessment has considered traffic noise in the base year, 2004, the opening year, 2010, and the design year, 2025. In 2010 and 2025, traffic noise has been predicted in both the Do Minimum (scheme not implemented) and Do Something (scheme implemented) scenarios.

3.10.24 The assessment is based on the use of low noise surfacing. The study has addressed noise increases greater than 1dB(A). For 2010 and 2025, properties have been banded according to predicted noise increases or decreases 1 to 3dB(A)(not significant), 3 to 5dB(A)(slight), 5 to 10dB(A) (moderate), 10 to 15dB(A)(substantial), and 15dB(A) or more (severe). A noise nuisance assessment has then been carried out in all cases where there is predicted to be an increase of 1dB(A) or more. Since, however, the minimum change discernible to the human ear is considered to be 3dB(A), this assessment is considered to be exceptionally robust.

3.10.25 Currently, the principal source of noise in the study area is traffic noise from the existing A1. The military airfields at Leeming and Catterick also contribute towards ambient noise levels. Apart from Brompton-on-Swale primary school, which lies about 300 metres from the line of the proposed motorway, there are no especially sensitive receptors (as defined in the DMRB) along the route.

3.10.26 The assessment has used the dB(A)_{LA10, 18 hr} metric which is accepted as the most appropriate for the assessment of traffic noise. The metric represents the arithmetic mean of noise levels exceeded for 10% of the time in each of the 18 periods of one hour between 0600 and midnight. Road traffic noise has been predicted in accordance with guidance, using a computer software programme and taking account of a range of factors, including the

predicted number of vehicles and proportion of HGVs, road gradient, distance from the road, barriers where recommended (see Table 6-1 in HA/P8), and intervening ground cover.

3.10.27 546 residential properties have been identified within the 300m corridor of both the existing and the proposed carriageway, and noise levels have been calculated for all of these by selecting appropriate receptor locations in the noise model. These levels are set out in Appendix 15.1 of the ES (DD169).

3.10.28 In summary (see Table 9.5 in HA/P8), in the Do Minimum scenario, 478 dwellings are predicted to experience an increase in noise levels between 2004 and the worst affected year following the scheme opening, and none to experience a decrease. These increases in noise levels are the result of a general rise in traffic flows. 6 dwellings would experience an increase in noise levels of more than 5 dB(A).

3.10.29 In the Do Something scenario, 359 dwellings are predicted to experience an increase in noise levels in the same period. 13 of these would experience an increase of more than 3dB(A) and 1 an increase of more than 10dB(A). However, a smaller number of dwellings overall are expected to experience an increase in noise levels, and 43 dwellings would experience lower noise levels. A list of properties predicted to suffer an increase in noise levels in 2025 in the Do Something compared with the Do Minimum scenario forms HA/21. Of these the largest and the only increase to exceed 10dB(A) is at Northcroft near Brompton-on-Swale.

3.10.30 Dwellings may qualify for noise insulation. The criteria are set out in the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975, as amended (DD248). They apply to properties within 300 metres of a new or altered carriageway, where noise levels in the Design Year are predicted to be at least 68dB(A), which level must be predicted to have increased by at least 1dB(A), of which increase the new road must contribute at least 1dB(A). Judged against these criteria, up to 39 dwellings may qualify for noise insulation if the scheme proceeds.

3.10.31 It is of particular note that the Regulations apply only to noise increases resulting from construction of a new road or alterations to an existing road. Dwellings which are predicted to suffer increases in noise levels in the Do Minimum scenario could not therefore qualify under the Regulations.

3.10.32 As to vibration, the improved alignment, removal of surface discontinuities and use of low noise surfacing would minimise vibration. There are 44 dwellings within 40 metres of the proposed motorway. Of these, at only 10 dwellings is there likely to be an increase in the number of persons bothered by vibration.

3.10.33 It is accepted that there may be short-term significant noise impacts during the construction period. These would mainly occur during the initial establishment stage when the ground is being excavated and prepared. The District Council and affected residents would be kept informed of the proposed works, and the contractor would be required to operate a complaints procedure to ensure that complaints are remedied and enquiries addressed promptly. Working restrictions would be imposed on the contractor adopting

the Typical Council Construction Criteria contained in HA/34.

3.10.34 The AST records a small but significant net benefit.

Air quality

3.10.35 No evidence was given at the inquiry with regard to air quality. The assessment is set out in the ES and compares pollutant levels in the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios in 2010 and 2025. In neither scenario is any exceedence of national air quality objectives predicted. Overall, the scheme is predicted to improve air quality at properties compared with the Do Minimum scenario and would therefore be beneficial in air quality terms. This is because of the reduction of the number of dwellings within 200 metres of the proposed motorway compared with the existing situation. Limited additional greenhouse gas emissions are predicted as a result of higher vehicle speeds.

Cultural Heritage

3.10.36 The HA's case on cultural heritage addresses the potential impacts of the scheme on archaeology, the built heritage and historic landscape. The assessment has been conducted in consultation with English Heritage ("EH") and the North Yorkshire County Archaeologist.

3.10.37 A study area for cultural heritage purposes was established extending to 500m on either side of the existing A1 where on-line widening is proposed and to a similar distance on either side of any off-line section. While it is the archaeological connections of the Roman period with what is now the A1 corridor and the surrounding area that are best known, the route appears to have been settled as far back as the 6th millennium BC. There are significant concentrations of later Neolithic and Bronze Age sites, as well as the better-known Roman monuments.

3.10.38 A brief account of the archaeology of the area is set out in section 3.2 of HA/P6. Within the study area there are 3 SAMs, all dating principally from the Roman period. There are 9 listed buildings and other structures. No designated historic landscapes are affected. There has been repeated disturbance of the archaeology of the area resulting from earlier works to the road, most notoriously the demolition of a Roman bathhouse and other structures which lay in the path of the Catterick bypass constructed in 1959/60.

3.10.39 The scheme has been designed to minimise adverse impact on archaeological sites. At Healam Bridge Roman fort and settlement, located between the proposed Baldesby and Leeming junctions, the alignment would pass to the east of the focus of the main settlement and traverse an area containing very few archaeological features. South of Catterick, the alignment diverts significantly off-line at Bainsesse Roman roadside settlement, passing to the west and impacting only on the southwest corner and the northernmost part of the SAM. At the third SAM, Catterick Roman fort and town, the proposed alignment follows that of the existing A1. Between the proposed Catterick Central Junction and the Fort Bridge to its north, a slight widening of the existing cutting would be required, intruding slightly into the western edge of the SAM. Investigation suggests that few archaeological remains are present. There would

be no new impact between Fort Bridge and Agricola Bridge as the proposals are all within the existing limits. Where, as with the southbound slip road at the proposed Catterick North Junction, new embankment is required, any archaeological features would be preserved *in situ* under the embankment.

3.10.40 With one exception, there would be no direct impact on any listed structure. The exception is the listed milestone thought to be located on the central reservation of the A1, investigation of which is currently considered too dangerous. It is proposed to remove this during construction and to replace it thereafter in an appropriate location. There would be an adverse visual impact on Healam Bridge, a listed structure, where, in addition to construction of the new motorway, the southbound carriageway of the existing A1 is to be retained as a local access road.

3.11 Compulsory acquisition of land

3.11.1 The extent of land and rights over land to be acquired is set out in the Schedule to the Compulsory Purchase Order. This includes the acquisition of 23 dwellings. All of the land and rights over land to be acquired are needed for the purposes of the scheme, and care has been taken in designing the scheme to ensure that land take is minimised. The land and rights over land to be acquired are for the purposes of constructing the motorway, constructing and improving other highways including PRoWs, the provision of new means of access to premises, the carrying out of works to watercourses, and to permit works to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts of the scheme. Having regard to Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and to Article 1 of Protocol 1 (Protection of property) of the European Convention on Human Rights, any interference with human rights arising from the compulsory acquisition proposed is proportionate to the public interest which is being furthered.

3.12 Modifications

3.12.1 The HA proposes 16 minor modifications to the scheme. M1-15 are set out in the August 2006 public notice of modifications and Objectors' Alternatives (DD222). They are shown on the plans contained in DD222A, which also contains a summary of the modifications proposed and the consent of the landowner where obtained.

3.12.2 Modifications 1 to 15 are:

M1: Relocation of the proposed balancing pond north of Sleights Lane in the vicinity of Rainton Bridge at the request of the landowner. The modification is cost neutral and can be accommodated with no detriment to the scheme (Site Plan No 2).

M2: Access to OS Parcel 4931 from the A61 near the Baldersby junction: New means of access to field omitted from published Orders in error (Site Plan No 3).

M3: Minor alignment changes to slip roads at Baldersby due to change in Highways Agency standard TD22/06 (Site Plan No 3).

-
- M4: Minor modifications to the roundabout at Butcher House Bridge south-west of Sinderby to accommodate horse corrals, following consultation with BHS (Site Plan No 6).
- M5: Access No 3 from A684 at Leeming Bar rerouted at request of landowner (Site Plan No 13).
- M6: Minor alignment changes to slip roads at Leeming due to change in Highways Agency standard TD22/06 (Site Plan No 13).
- M7: Bridleway created on the short stopped-up section of Back Lane near the proposed Leeming junction; the full stopping-up was an error and this modification allows continued use by NMUs (Site Plan No 13).
- M8: Label (7) omitted, in error, on the published Order plan for access to balancing pond off Back Lane (Site Plan No 13).
- M9: Relocation of the proposed balancing pond south of Bowbridge Lane east of Hackforth at the request of the landowner. The relocation is within the same land ownership. The modification is cost neutral and can be accommodated with no detriment to the scheme (Site Plan No 15).
- M10: Provision of a new bridleway between Lords Lane and Leases Lane south of Catterick. The bridleway link between Lords Lane and Leases Lane, although desirable, was originally omitted because of the impact on bats and badgers in the area. Subsequent surveys have shown that the width of the bridleway would not impact on these species and rationalization of the bridleway network was therefore preferred (Site Plans Nos 16 & 17).
- M11: Provision of a new bridleway from Tunstall Road Bridge northwards to join Bridleway No 20.10/4, following further consultation with NMU groups. It is considered appropriate to make this provision to rationalise the network, replacing the north/south route on the A1 verge (Site Plans Nos 18 & 19).
- M12: Stopping-up of the Bridleway under existing A1 at Brompton-on-Swale, omitted in error from published Orders (Site Plan No 20).
- M13: Provision of a new bridleway from Gatherley Road to Scurragh House Lane. Representations regarding the suitability of Scotch Corner Junction for equestrians led to a reappraisal of NMU provision and the bridleway link in the M13 proposal is the result. The modification allows for greater accessibility of the Catterick North grade-separated crossing of the A1 (Site Plans Nos 21 & 22).
- M14: North of Scotch Corner, accesses to Violet Grange Farm and the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency site to be stopped-up. This was omitted from the published Orders in error (Site Plans Nos 23 & 24).
- M15: Section of the Old Great North Road north of Scotch Corner reopened as a private means of access to Kneeton Hall Quarry. This had erroneously been understood to be an existing public highway (Site Plan No 25).

3.12.3 M16 is the realignment of the LAR joining the western roundabout at Leeming referred to in paragraph 4.1.2. It has not been advertised and does not require additional land acquisition.

3.12.4 Of the modifications, there are three which would involve acquisition of land where the agreement of the owner has not been obtained. These are M10, M13 and M15, which are objected to by the affected landowners. However, if OA10 is adopted (see paragraph 5.2.1), M10 would no longer be relevant.

4. THE CASE OF THE OBJECTORS

The material points are:

4.1 North Yorkshire County Council (Ob35)

4.1.1 NYCC is the local highways authority. Discussions between the HA and NYCC both before and during the inquiry narrowed the matters in issue between them. NYCC's position as at the closing of the inquiry is set out in the Closing Submissions made on its behalf (Ob35/CS). NYCC's original objections principally related to three issues:

- The lack of new parallel LARs between the Dishforth and Baldersby, the Leeming and Catterick Central and the Scotch Corner and Barton junctions. NYCC is supported in respect of these additional LARs by a number of other objectors, including, with regard to the Leeming to Catterick LAR, the Hackforth and Ainderby Miers with Holtby Parish Council (Ob31);
- The incompatibility of the scheme with the projected Bedale-Aiskew-Leeming Bypass ("BALB"); and
- The adverse impact of the scheme on certain junctions on the local road network.

4.1.2 NYCC now accepts that, with the minor modification (M16) proposed by the HA, the scheme would be able to accommodate the BALB. The modification proposed would effect a minor re-alignment of the LAR approach from the south to Leeming Junction and widen the bridge at the Junction by 1 metre. Both of these changes can be accommodated within the existing Orders. A note regarding the compatibility of the scheme with the BALB forms HA/4. The HA has also now accepted that a parallel LAR should be provided between Leeming and Catterick, adopting the alternative proposal which forms OA10. Provided that the BALB modification and OA10 are included in the scheme as built, NYCC's objection on this ground is withdrawn. NYCC continues to support OA1, which proposes an LAR between Dishforth and Baldersby.

4.1.3 NYCC remains convinced of the need for an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton. This conviction is based on the likely additional traffic which would be generated by the scheme on the local road network in this area and particularly through the villages of Melsonby and Middleton Tyas. There would be extra traffic flows on a daily basis consisting of motorway-prohibited traffic and other drivers who choose not to use the motorway. The grid-locking of these villages

arising when there is a partial or total blocking of the existing dual-carriageway A1 as a result of an incident would be more frequent. The HA's assessment of traffic flows in both these respects is flawed.

4.1.4 The HA's assessment of the likely levels of drivers choosing not to use the motorway (including motorway-prohibited traffic) is based on the survey of traffic undertaken on the A168 south of Dishforth. The level is assessed by the HA as plus or minus 200 vehicles per day. On this basis the traffic levels entered into the model by the HA is zero. NYCC believes that there would be other categories of driver choosing not to use the motorway which should have been taken into account, and which might lead to the conclusion, contrary to that of the HA, that the local road network is not capable of accommodating the additional flows which would divert on to it with the motorway in place. In any event, the HA's analysis that the local roads can accommodate all such flows in traffic terms appears to take no or insufficient account of the substandard geometry of the local roads, especially those through Middleton Tyas.

4.1.5 As to junctions on the local road network, clarification of some of the modelling and, in particular, removal of some elements of double-counting in the traffic forecasts (see HA/P3Rev1), have met some of NYCC's concerns. NYCC maintains its objection in respect of:

- The junction on the A684 west of Leeming Bar: It is currently envisaged that this would be signal-controlled. The traffic modelling suggests that the peak hour traffic queuing from the west on the A684 would back up towards the Wensleydale Railway level crossing on the A684 located some 200 metres to the west of the junction. If proper provision is made to permit pedestrians to cross the A684 in the vicinity of this junction, traffic queues are likely to extend back over the crossing, increasing the likelihood of a conflict between this traffic and the operation of the Railway. Unless this apparent conflict can be shown not to cause a problem, the signal-controlled junction should be replaced with a roundabout. This proposal is supported by other objectors, including the Bedale and Villages Community Plan Forum (Ob16).
- The junction between the link road from Catterick Central junction and the A6136 in the vicinity of Catterick Racecourse: This junction as proposed by the HA would be a T-junction with a right-turn ghost island. The junction assumes critical importance on Race Days and on Sundays when a market is held on the Racecourse. NYCC believes that this junction has not been adequately modelled. The HA itself accepts that the junction is operating at a level where its own predictions are unreliable. A roundabout at this junction would ensure that, in all scenarios in the Design Year including peak period events, there would be no queuing.

4.1.6 At 2.99, the BCR for the scheme is robustly positive, representing "high value for money". The HA cannot therefore claim that the improvements to the scheme which NYCC continues to propose could not be included on grounds of cost, or that their incorporation would undermine the economic viability of the scheme.

4.2 Hambleton District Council (Ob75) ("HDC")

- 4.2.1 HDC strongly supports the provision of an LAR alongside the full length of the motorway between the proposed Leeming and Catterick Central junctions. The Council's objection on this ground would be met by the incorporation into the scheme of OA10.
- 4.2.2 Although not raised during its evidence to the inquiry, HDC returns in its closing submission (Ob75/CS) to the impact of the scheme on traffic in Leeming Bar previously raised in correspondence with the HA. The BALB is included in the North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan, but HDC understands that no funding has been made available for its construction. To construct the Leeming junction and the proposed link to Leases Road without also constructing the BALB would lead to an almost 30-fold increase in traffic at the northern end of Leases Road, north of the industrial estate, that is, from the present level of 290 vpd to 7,900 vpd. Measures need to be put in place to address this unacceptable impact either by postponing construction of the link until the BALB is in place and/or by clear signage at Leeming junction directing traffic south along the proposed LAR to the A684 junction west of the motorway.
- 4.2.3 The Cowfold Bridge crosses the A1 about 1.5 kilometres south-west of Leeming village and provides the most direct route between the villages of Leeming and Exelby. It should be retained as a link for NMUs as proposed in OA8. The HA's survey of use of the Bridge is misleading; the Bridge was closed to vehicles at the time of the survey as a result of damage following an incident in February 2004. It remained partially closed to traffic until October 2005. NMUs may well also have been deterred from using it as there was a barrier across the access to prevent vehicular use. Removal of the Bridge would create significant severance.
- 4.2.4 The alternative routes proposed by the HA would result in significantly extended distances and be less convenient. The route via the proposed Bedale Beck underpass, for example, would extend the distance between the villages of Exelby and Leeming by about 1 kilometre. The Beck has an annual flood risk of up to 0.5%. An underpass may also give rise to fear of crime and may be intimidating to equestrians. Another alternative route via the replacement Londonderry bridge would add nearly 600 metres to the distance between the villages.
- 4.2.5 HDC's objection regarding the need to retain the Cowfold Bridge is strongly supported by **Exelby, Leeming and Newton Parish Council (Ob29)**. The loss of the Cowfold Bridge would separate Exelby from the rest of the Parish. Among the consequences might be the closure of Leeming Village School which has only 39 pupils. The alternatives proposed by the HA are unsatisfactory. The Leeming village playing field is in the vicinity of the Bedale Beck and the proposed route via the underpass would be an encouragement to children to play near the Beck and the proposed nearby balancing pond. Retention of the Cowfold Bridge would permit direct public non-motorised access to the other facilities in Leeming village, which include the church, the post office and a playgroup. A petition requesting retention of the Bridge was presented at the inquiry by the Parish Council (attached to Ob29/P).

4.3 Richmondshire District Council (Ob74) (“RDC”)

- 4.3.1 RDC strongly supports the construction of the proposed motorway. Its remaining concerns as to detailed elements of the scheme are set out in the following paragraphs.
- 4.3.2 The LAR proposed by Middleton Tyas PC and others between Scotch Corner and Barton is essential. There is otherwise a real risk that Middleton Tyas would be severely affected by increased traffic both routinely and when an incident blocks the A1. It is particularly difficult for local residents to understand the omission of this element from the scheme now promoted, as it was part of the 1990s upgrade proposals.
- 4.3.3 The Council supports NYCC’s case regarding the A6136 junction at Catterick Bridge and the case of Scurragh Lane Residents and others for an NMU bridge at the Scurragh Lane/Scurragh House Lane crossing. At a time of increasing concerns about global warming and about the need to promote healthy living through exercise, a major road scheme of this kind represents an opportunity to encourage non-motorised travel which should not be neglected.
- 4.3.4 RDC objects to the use of Harris (UK) land for the proposed balancing pond to the east of the proposed motorway on the Brompton Industrial Estate. All brownfield development land is important to the future prosperity of Richmondshire. This is a prime site and to carve an area of 1 hectare out of it for the purposes of the pond is undesirable. The pond could and should be relocated to a greenfield site on the western side of the proposed motorway.
- 4.3.5 The disused railway underpass in the vicinity of Brompton-on Swale should be retained for future use as an NMU link. Recent and proposed residential development to the east of the A1 in the Parish of Brompton creates a clear need for a connection along this route to the centre of Brompton village and its facilities west of the A1. The alternative routes suggested by the HA are neither as attractive nor as direct. RDC’s case in this respect is supported by **Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council (Ob58)** and others. Although there is currently no public access along the most direct route through the commercial premises on the eastern side of the A1, agreement for it may well result from on-going discussion between the Council and the landowners. Retention of the underpass forms OA18.
- 4.3.6 The proposed off-line scheme section in the vicinity of Baines Farm would carry the proposed motorway significantly closer to Limekiln Wood, which is occupied by a park for static caravans. RDC remains concerned at the potential adverse impact on the caravan park of additional noise. It acknowledges that the HA has agreed that the impact of noise on occupants of the Wood would be reassessed, and noise mitigation provided, if appropriate.

4.4 Local access roads

Dishforth to Baldersby

- 4.4.1 A proposal that there should be an LAR from the existing Dishforth junction along the western side of the proposed motorway to a junction with the A61 to

the west of the proposed Baldersby motorway junction forms OA1. Lack of LAR provision would add some 3 kilometres to the journey length between Dishforth and Baldersby for non-motorway traffic. The Alternative is supported by J E Swiers Limited (Ob87). Lack of an LAR along this section would severely impact on the farming business of the company, which uses the A1 to move its combine harvester from the main farm at Norton-le-Clay to other land farmed at Sharow. Use of local roads by large machinery would create a safety hazard.

Leeming to Catterick

4.4.2 The scheme provides for a parallel LAR along only part of the section between the proposed Leeming and Catterick Central junctions, a distance of some 9 kilometres. Under the scheme as promoted, a full LAR would be provided only between the northward extension of Low Street and Catterick Central junction. The HA's proposal for a single track access road with passing spaces extending from Leeming junction only to Bowbridge Lane would not provide a through route, and would not be adequate for the traffic predicted or of adoptable standard.

4.4.3 A full 5.5-metre LAR along the whole of this route section forms OA10. This would run north from the west side of the Leeming junction to an overbridge near the existing A1/Low Street junction. East of the bridge, the route would connect with the proposed northward extension of Low Street, and thereby to Catterick village.

Scotch Corner to Barton

Melsonby Parish Council (Ob108) ***Middleton Tyas Parish Council (Ob62)***

4.4.4 The villages of Melsonby and Middleton Tyas lie respectively to the west and east of the A1 in the vicinity of the section of the A1 (approximately 3 kilometres in length) between Scotch Corner and Barton. Melsonby is located in the north-west quadrant between the A1 and the A66, about 2 kilometres north of the A66 and 1.5 kilometres west of the Barton junction. The village centre of Middleton Tyas is situated a little over 1 kilometre east of Scotch Corner and is accessed by an unclassified road direct from the junction. It can also be accessed from Barton junction via an unclassified road some 3 kilometres in length. From Middleton Tyas, a further unclassified road leads south to Moulton and Scorton whence the A1 can and could continue to be accessed via Catterick and the proposed Catterick Central junction.

4.4.5 Both villages experience problems from increasing traffic flows generally, from the use of the routes through the villages by HGVs and other inappropriately large vehicles, and from the diversion of traffic off the A1 when it is partly or wholly blocked as a result of an incident, as on 3 November 2006, the last day of the inquiry.

4.4.6 **Melsonby:** During a previous upgrade of the A1, a miscalculation in the height of the Kneeton Hall overbridge created an unintended height restriction on the A1 between Scotch Corner and Barton. A route via the A66, Melsonby and the Barton junction is the designated high load route for A1 traffic avoiding this restriction. This special route is used up to 10 times each year, and Melsonby

has for 35 years suffered the consequences in terms of disruption, congestion and damage to properties and road infrastructure.

4.4.7 The omission from the scheme of an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton would amount to a similar mistake resulting in even more traffic using Melsonby as a means of avoiding the A1(M). In addition, the village suffers severe disruption when, following an incident on either the A66 or the A1, traffic is diverted through Melsonby. Provision of an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton would mean that vehicles would no longer need to be diverted through the village.

4.4.8 The village school with 50 pupils is located near the centre of the village. Each day, children walk to and from school and to and from their separate canteen for lunch, and several times each week to and from their sports field. The traffic through Melsonby places these children at risk. The roads through the village, though narrow, are generally straight and there is a downhill approach from the south. This encourages speeding. The routes through the village would be increasingly attractive as a "rat-run" between the A66 and the A1 north, as well as providing a route for motorway-prohibited traffic and those who choose not to use the motorway. This traffic would include large agricultural machines and military traffic.

4.4.9 The lane-loss/lane gain at Scotch Corner is likely to create a pinch point causing congestion and further traffic flows through Melsonby arising from drivers avoiding queueing traffic. In the view of the Parish Council, the HA's assessment fails to take into account likely increases in volumes of traffic resulting from a decision to convert the M62 into a toll road.

4.4.10 **Middleton Tyas:** The village contains a conservation area and 23 listed buildings, 15 of which front the main route through the village. The HA's own assessment identifies Middleton Tyas as an historic village and rates its scenic quality as very attractive and its landscape sensitivity as high. The village school is located on the northern approach to the village from Barton. It caters for children from other villages, and there are high levels of local traffic and parking in the vicinity of the school associated with dropping and collecting children. The impact of traffic through the village has been recognized by the introduction of traffic-calming measures, including a 20mph zone, a priority scheme and speed humps.

4.4.11 The Parish Council believes that the HA's survey materially understates the volume of traffic through the village and the proportion thereof which consists of goods vehicles and agricultural machinery. The Council's own survey, conducted during the 12-hour period between 0800 and 2000 on 12 September 2006, records a total of 2,058 vehicles, of which 73 were lorries and 92 were agricultural vehicles/machines. This total, projected to the opening year, 2010, by the same method adopted by the HA, produces a total of 2,601 vehicles. This is to be compared with the HA's projection of 1,900 vehicles in total with some 25 to 50 motorway-prohibited vehicles.

4.4.12 The alignment of the roads through Middleton Tyas also creates problems. Traffic approaching from Scotch Corner and wishing to travel north in the direction of Barton must execute a 90-degree left turn at the Memorial Hall in

the centre of the village. The Hall accommodates the post office/shop. The village also incorporates a one-way system and some of the roads leading out of the village are very narrow, rendering U-turns by drivers who have made an error as to their route very difficult.

4.4.13 Recent damage to village infrastructure has included a fractured water main, the removal by a passing vehicle of one arm of the village finger post, damage to walls (especially at the sharp turn in the centre of the village), broken kerb stones, and severe damage to one property following an incident involving a runaway lorry.

4.4.14 The existing problems are likely to be exacerbated by developments proposed in the vicinity. Planning permission has been granted for a new business park on a site adjacent to Scotch Corner. A planning application is pending for a new quarry and large tourist facility at Middleton Lodge, which is located on the unclassified road between the village and Barton. It is reported that this development would attract some 50,000 visitors each year, generating significant extra traffic in the area, in addition to the truck movements associated with the quarry. Development is also anticipated at Croft-on-Tees, situated some 8 kilometres east of Middleton Tyas. These developments are likely further to add significantly to traffic congestion in the village.

4.4.15 Of special concern to the Parish Council is the impact on the village when an incident partly or wholly blocks the A1. The incident which took place on the last day of the inquiry is a case in point, when the total closure of one carriageway and the serious obstruction of the other caused hours of gridlock in Middleton Tyas. The strategic diversions put in place by the authorities on these occasions do not prevent those with knowledge of the road network or equipped with satellite navigation systems from devising a route through the village, nor do they deal with traffic avoiding queues on the motorway in the immediate aftermath of the incident and before the diversions have been put in place.

4.4.16 While accepting that the general upgrading proposed to full three-lane motorway standard would, as stated by the HA, be likely to reduce the number of occasions on which the A1 is closed, a lane gain and loss is proposed at either end of the Scotch Corner to Barton motorway section which is only 3 kilometres in length. At Scotch Corner, the gain/loss is proposed to permit the existing overbridge and roundabout to be retained. The necessary lane-changing and weaving would inherently add to the risk that this short section of the proposed A1(M) would be subject to a disproportionate level of closures.

4.4.17 In a letter dated 8 June 2006 (in Ob62/1), North Yorkshire Police expressly supports the provision of a parallel LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton. In a letter dated 1 August 2005, the Police commented that Middleton Tyas is particularly sensitive and should not be used by non-motorway traffic. The concerns of the Police were confirmed in the course of an interview conducted by Middleton Tyas Parish Councillors on 30 October 2006, a minute of which is contained in the same document.

4.4.18 **Both Parish Councils:** support the proposed upgrading of the A1 to motorway standards. However, they strongly support OAs23 and 24, the adoption of either of which would provide a dedicated LAR parallel to the proposed motorway. This

stretch of LAR would be only some 3 kilometres in length and is estimated by the HA to cost no more than £3.6m. This sum is acceptable in the context of the benefits which its provision would bring to the inhabitants of these two villages and to others. The provision of an LAR along this route section was included in the 1990s scheme, and it is unclear why, with worsening traffic problems, it has now been thought right to discard it. The absence of such provision is symptomatic of the approach of the HA which is to build the scheme at minimum cost whatever the impact on local people.

4.4.19 Provision of an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton is supported by the County and District Councils, and by a significant number of written objections.

4.4.20 **OAs23 and 24:** Objectors put forward two Alternatives for the Scotch Corner to Barton LAR. OA23 would lie on the western side of the proposed motorway throughout and would run parallel to it between the existing northbound slip road from the Scotch Corner roundabout to the B6275 Piercebridge road to the west of the Barton junction. OA24 would follow the route of OA23 for about 1 kilometre north from Scotch Corner and then cross the motorway on a realigned Kneeton Hall bridge before joining the Middleton Tyas to Barton road at a T-junction east of the motorway.

4.5 Non-motorised users

General points

4.5.1 The HA has approached the impact of the scheme on NMUs from a modern baseline. The very substantial severance created by the A1 has been a cumulative process extending back for at least 40 years. It is unsurprising that HA surveys show a low level of use by NMUs of the existing crossings. Existing at-grade crossings are unsafe and intimidating, as are grade-separated crossings which are currently shared by vehicular and non-vehicular traffic. The dual carriageway A1 already creates a noisy and generally unpleasant environment for NMUs. The HA should have sought to create a baseline for NMU provision as if the A1 had not created such severance.

4.5.2 Guidance is given in the DMRB (TA91/05: "Provision for Non-Motorised Users") to the effect that diversion should not increase the length of NMU routes by more than 10%. The length of many of the NMU route diversions on which the scheme relies would be extended by a proportion well in excess of this maximum.

British Horse Society(Ob39)("BHS")

Mrs Y Brookes (Ob 52)

Mrs R Connolly (Ob 86)

4.5.3 It is unacceptable that the HA seeks to base its assessment on the situation now faced by NMUs, following the extreme severance created by repeated upgrades to the A1 during the last forty years or so. In the course of these upgrades, the HA should have introduced a series of crossings for equestrians, controlled by traffic signals and speed monitoring cameras along the section of the A1 dual carriageway in issue. The traffic signals would have brought traffic to a halt so as to allow NMUs, including equestrians, to cross. Such provision would have revealed the strength of the continuing demand for NMU routes

crossing the A1.

4.5.4 Although the HA claims that the scheme would improve provision for NMUs, the current proposals do not meet the criterion in the Scheme Brief of ensuring that “the needs of non-motorised users and public transport ... are catered for”. The refusal to create a proper historical baseline for NMU provision is the principal cause of this failure. Guidance in TA91/05 states that the provision of NMU facilities, including new routes and crossings, should be regarded as an integral element of the overall cost of a scheme, not requiring to be separately justified. The HA’s approach requiring NMU provision to meet cost/benefit criteria runs counter to this.

4.5.5 As a minimum, the BHS seeks the following additional crossings for equestrians:

- A crossing in the vicinity of Baldersby, retaining the existing dismantled railway underpass, to link Hergill Lane on the eastern side of the A1 to the proposed Baldersby to Leeming LAR on its western side, with a connecting bridleway between Hergill Lane and Mask Lane along the eastern side of the motorway. A study of journey distances between villages located near this section of the proposed motorway indicates that, absent such a crossing, mean distances would increase by 2.7 kilometres or 56%;
- A new grade-separated crossing (whether underpass or bridge) at Scurragh Lane/Scurragh House Lane. The HA accepts that it would not be safe or practical for equestrians to use the junction at Scotch Corner, even when controlled by traffic signals. Failure to provide the crossing proposed by the BHS and other objectors would result in equestrians having to travel south from Scurragh House Lane to cross the A1 at Catterick North bridge and return north to Scurragh Lane via the LAR west of the motorway, a distance of over 4 kilometres, a long and unpleasant ride alongside the motorway. The distance between the villages of Moulton and Skeeby by this route would be more than double that by a direct route across the A1; and
- The retention of the Leases Bridge at the northern end of Leases Road, some 1.5 kilometres north of Leeming Bar, in its present form. The replacement of this crossing by the Leeming junction would require equestrians to negotiate a busy motorway intersection.

4.5.6 The BHS accepts the removal of Cowfold Bridge, given the availability of an alternative route via the proposed Bedale Beck bridleway underpass. However, an NMU route should be provided linking Mill Lane and the side road some 200 metres to the south. The Society also accepts that many of its other concerns would fall to be addressed during the detailed design stage. However, crossings of the A1 by way of roundabouts and bridges shared with other traffic, however carefully designed, are unlikely to prove safe for or attractive to equestrians.

4.5.7 Mrs Brookes and Mrs Connolly generally support the case of the BHS. They both seek traffic signal controls, lighting and the provision of a widened footway capable of accommodating two riders abreast in the Brompton South underpass, given that it would be extended from its existing length of about 27 metres to a total length, under the motorway and the LAR, of some 37 metres. Best practice

suggests that equestrians are safer when riding two abreast. They believe that the Scurragh Lane crossing is vital if unacceptably long and inconvenient diversions for equestrians are to be avoided. An informal survey conducted by Mrs Brookes suggests that there may be as many as 300 horse owners in the Catterick to Scotch Corner corridor many of whom are located to the east of the A1 and would use this crossing if provided. The potential to open a Brompton North bridleway route should be protected, as proposed by RDC and others, by preserving the disused former Richmond railway underpass.

4.5.8 Mrs Connolly remains concerned that the use of the LAR verges by equestrians would be unsafe. The speed of passing traffic would represent an obvious danger unless riders were provided with fenced tracks within the verges. The position would be similar to that which currently exists along Low Street where there is a combination of inadequate verge width and high vehicle speeds encouraged by the straight alignment of the road. If the risks of using the LARs are too great, riders would not be able to reach the motorway crossing points proposed by the HA, and would not wish to use the LARs as part of additional circular routes identified by the HA, which Mrs Connolly welcomes. Overall, however, there would be increased severance for NMUs if the scheme is implemented as presently proposed.

4.5.9 More and safer crossings of the A1 are needed to permit use of linear routes. Mrs Connolly proposes OA15 which relates to the Manor House Bridge, located to the south of the proposed Catterick Central junction. The bridge is to be retained but would cross only the LAR and not the motorway itself. As a result, NMUs would be required to cross the LAR and then travel between the LAR and the motorway to cross the latter at the motorway junction. The bridge should be extended to cross both the LAR and the proposed motorway, providing immediate access to the western side of the motorway.

Cyclists Touring Club (Ob12 and 17) ("CTC")

4.5.10 The National Cycle Strategy has been in place since 1996, following strenuous efforts on the part of the CTC and other campaigners. Among the main aims of the Strategy are to achieve convenient cycle access to key destinations, to improve cycle safety and use, and to reallocate road space to cyclists. In recent years the Strategy has been largely ignored. The United Kingdom's policies to support cycling are poor by comparison with those in other European countries.

4.5.11 The scope for cycling in the area, including on routes crossing the proposed motorway, is considerable because of tourist sites on both sides of the A1. The CTC's assessment of NMU provision set out in the Comparison Table at Appendix C of Ob12/P1 establishes that the impact of the scheme would be at best neutral with regard to cyclists. In the Table, the CTC identifies 14 positive and 14 negative impacts. Journeys between villages to east and west of the A1 would be markedly longer via the HA's proposed routes than via the direct crossings advocated by the CTC.

4.5.12 At the time of the closure of the Scurragh Lane crossing in the 1990s, the CTC had no headquarters or advertisement-monitoring staff. If the CTC had been consulted it would have objected strenuously. The CTC strongly supports the retention/reinstatement of an NMU crossing at Scurragh Lane. The alternative

route via Scotch Corner would increase the length of a journey between Moulton and the A6108 near Skeeby by over 3 kilometres. For cyclists, an underpass as proposed by OA22 would be preferable to a bridge, though the latter represents the CTC's fall-back position.

4.5.13 An informal survey of cyclists carried out by CTC reveals significant suppressed demand for this crossing. The survey was conducted by handing round a questionnaire to known cyclists. The results of the survey show that before closure of the crossing in the 1990s, 22 people claimed to have used it once or twice per year, 46 up to 10 times, and 49 more than 10 times. The equivalent post-closure figures were 19, 43, and 69. Almost all of those who completed the questionnaire said that they would use a crossing at Scurragh Lane if provided, and many stated that they had used the crossing in the past.

4.5.14 Use by cyclists of the alternative route via Scotch Corner, as proposed by the HA, would be intimidating and unsafe, even if traffic signals were installed at the junction and a segregated cycleway provided. Use of the route via the Catterick North overbridge would add unacceptably to journey length.

4.5.15 The other minimum additional provision sought by the CTC is:

- An additional NMU crossing near Baldersby: There are currently a number of at-grade crossings between the Baldersby junction and Sinderby. Their loss should be at least partially compensated for by an additional NMU crossing some 700 metres north of Baldersby junction which would connect Baldersby St James and Melmerby via Humphrey Balk Lane east of the A1 and Underlands Lane to its west. Such provision would obviate the need for cyclists to use the Baldersby motorway intersection. A possible alternative route via the to-be-retained Rainton Bridge is uncomfortable for cyclists because of the elevated and exposed nature of the Bridge;
- An NMU link between the Dishforth Road west of the Dishforth junction north along the west side of the motorway to Shambles Lane to the north of Rainton services, completing a continuous route for cyclists between Marton le Moor and Melmerby and Rainton; and
- A link at Hergill Lane using the disused railway underpass, similar to that sought by the BHS.

4.5.16 The remaining provision sought by the CTC and relating to Back Lane, Aiskew would be met by incorporating proposed minor modification M7. The proposed additional crossing at Humphrey Balk Lane is supported in the written objections submitted by the **Ripon Loiters Cycling Club (Ob59)**. The Club also considers that segregated cycle lanes should be provided on the proposed LARs.

Ramblers' Association (Obs 33, 36 and 100) ("RA")

4.5.17 The proposed motorway crosses three RA areas. The Northallerton Group was represented at the inquiry, and written objections were lodged by the Richmondshire and Ripon Groups.

4.5.18 The Northallerton Group seeks further NMU crossings of the proposed

motorway between:

- Ghyll Lane and the northern end of Low Street south of Catterick, connecting the PRoW networks of Appleton, Killerby and Kirby Fleetham. This proposal is OA11; and
- Silcar Lane and Mask Lane north-west of Baldersby. Mask Lane to the east of the A1 is already a bridleway connected with the network of PRoWs in the Howe area. The crossing proposed by the RA would create a connection with the unclassified road network west of the A1 and with Middleton Quernhow, Wath and Melmerby. This crossing is promoted as OA3.

4.5.19 The Richmondshire Group supports the crossing proposed by the HA between Tickergate Lane and Bowbridge Lane. It seeks an additional crossing at Low Street to maintain or restore a connection with Bridleway 10.61/3 which runs west from the A1 to the Catterick to Hackforth road. Though not initially seeking such provision, in an e-mailed response to the Scurragh Lane Residents on 1 November 2006 the RA supported the overbridge proposed by the Residents and others at Scurragh Lane.

4.5.20 The Ripon Group sets out six alternatives for an additional crossing, on balance selecting the Silcar Lane/Mask Lane crossing proposed by the Northallerton Group (OA3).

North Yorkshire Local Access Forum (Ob83)

4.5.21 The additional NMU crossings of the motorway proposed by other objectors at Baldersby, Manor House bridge and Scurragh Lane are supported by the Forum in its written objection.

4.6 Councillor T Pelton (Ob40)

4.6.1 Richmondshire District Councillor Pelton proposes a link road (generally referred to as the Pallet Hill link and published as OA16) between the A6136 near Catterick racecourse and the eastern roundabout of the proposed Catterick Central motorway junction. Provision of this link would obviate the proposed Catterick Racecourse bridge and would make significant cost savings, as well as improving local traffic flows. A recommendation that this Alternative warrants further consideration would allow a full debate as to its merits, including the holding, if necessary, of a further public inquiry.

4.7 Eastern Harvesters Limited (Ob66)

4.7.1 Eastern Harvesters owns and operates an agricultural machinery sales and maintenance outlet in the Sinderby area. The premises currently have direct access to and from the southbound carriageway of the A1 as well as an access track leading from the B6267 Sinderby Lane. At a meeting between the agent for the company and representatives of the HA in the course of the inquiry, it was agreed that the minimum width of both of these accesses is 11 metres between hedges, although the surfaced access track widths are narrower and there are gates which also limit the continuous overall width. The HA's proposals would close the direct access from the A1 and reduce the width of the access

track from the B6267 to a width between boundaries of only 6.5 metres. The access track from the B6267 is about 150 metres in length.

4.7.2 Traffic to and from the premises varies between a minimum of some 50 vehicles per day out of season to a maximum of about 100 in season. A proportion of these are large agricultural vehicles. It not infrequently happens that agricultural machines or lorries carrying them meet on the access track. Lorries carrying combine harvesters are some 4 metres wide. These visitors to the site can currently be accommodated because they can use the full width of the access track, including the verges, to pass. The narrower access track proposed by the HA would not permit this.

4.7.3 The company also remains concerned that, in the alternative, no provision is made for a protected right turn into the access track from the B6267. The effect of this would be that drivers arriving at the site would have to commit themselves to the turn without first being able to check that the access track is unobstructed. If wide vehicles meet on the access track, unsafe reversing would be necessary, including potentially reversing into the B6267 which has limited visibility in the area of the access track junction. The B6267 junction proposal has been advertised as OA7.

4.7.4 The company would withdraw its objection based on the safety issue at the junction with the B6267 if a full width access track were provided. This could be achieved by widening the access track along its full length on the eastern side. The adjoining landowner, Mr C G Littleboy, has consented to acquisition of the necessary land in a letter dated 31 October 2006 from his agents, Messrs Greenwood and Co., to the company's agents (in Ob66/P/Supp2).

4.8 Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Limited ("Huntsman")(Ob64)

4.8.1 Huntsman owns and operates the Trans-Pennine Ethylene Pipeline between Runcorn in Cheshire and Redcar in Cleveland which passes beneath the existing A1 in the vicinity of Leeming Bar. An agreement protecting the Pipeline in the event that the scheme is implemented has been reached between the parties, though this had not been reduced to writing when the inquiry closed. At the inquiry on 2 November 2006, Counsel on behalf of Huntsman formally withdrew its objection.

4.9 W G Baker Baker and the Trustees of the W G Baker Baker 1990 Settlement (Ob23)

4.9.1 These objectors are the freehold owners of the Sedbury Estate adjacent to Scotch Corner. The Estate includes Violet Grange Farm and Kneeton Hall Farm, both of which lie to the west of the A1 between Scotch Corner and Barton. As far as access to Violet Grange Farm is concerned, the alternative proposed to that to be stopped up would involve vehicles travelling west along the A66 and crossing its eastbound carriageway to the private means of access proposed as part of the A66 upgrade scheme. The tenant of the Farm lives in a cottage in Middleton Tyas, and the proposal would add significantly to his travelling time. It would also involve the use and crossing of the dual carriageway A66 by slow-moving tractors and agricultural machinery.

4.9.2 Of further concern are the proposals with regard to Kneeton Hall Bridge. The Bridge is used by vehicles transporting stone extracted at Kneeton Quarry to the processing plant at Barton. The Bridge is also the sole means of access to Kneeton Hall farmhouse. There are difficulties relating to the use of the Bridge by farm vehicles by reason of quarry detritus and surface wear, and occasional conflicts between quarry and other vehicles seeking to use the Bridge. The proposed reconstruction of the Bridge as part of the scheme would not resolve these. There would also be potential conflicts with NMUs.

4.9.3 OA25, proposed by this objector, would segregate the Bridge and create a route for residential and NMUs separate from that for agricultural and quarry traffic. These Objectors also support OA23 (see paragraph 4.4.20). This would provide an alternative access to Kneeton Hall Farm and permit the continued use of the existing access to Violet Grange Farm, maintaining the direct access by the tenant from his home in Middleton Tyas.

4.10 Scurragh Lane Residents (Ob91)

4.10.1 Scurragh Lane is located about 2 kilometres south of Scotch Corner and runs west from the A1 to a junction with the A6108 Richmond road north-east of Skeeby. The garden of the eastern-most property in Scurragh Lane is contiguous with the verge of the northbound carriageway of the existing A1. The Residents object to the scheme on grounds of the impact of increased noise and pollution levels. Over many years, they have suffered a moderate adverse impact as a result of each of a series of schemes, cumulatively creating a dramatic deterioration in their quality of life.

4.10.2 The main changes sought by the Residents are that:

- the line of the motorway in the vicinity of Scurragh Lane be moved further east;
- an earth bund be provided between the proposed motorway and the LAR;
- the bund be used as the foundation for the western end of an NMU overbridge; and
- the opportunity be taken to create a wildlife corridor between the Skeeby and High Street plantations providing a "breathing space" for Residents and NMUs.

4.10.3 These changes would restore essential elements of the upgrade proposals put forward in the 1990s. They would provide Residents with significant relief from the impact of noise and pollution. They therefore propose OA20, which broadly replicates the 1990s scheme. OA20 would also provide an overbridge across the motorway, the western end of which would be located between the western side of the motorway and the eastern side of the LAR. The amended line of the motorway and bunding along its western side which this Alternative would accommodate would significantly reduce the adverse impact of additional noise at the Scurragh Lane properties, and especially at those closest to the western side of the motorway.

4.10.4 The HA's Strategic Plan includes the objective of taking practical steps to minimise noise and disturbance. The simplest step would be to increase the distance between the source of noise and the receptor properties. With the

assistance of RDC, the Residents conducted their own noise survey on 7 September 2006. This established how noise levels outside Scurragh Lane properties diminished as distance from the existing A1 dual carriageway increased. The resulting table is at paragraph 2.3 of Ob91/P. A small realignment of the motorway as proposed in OA20 would benefit Residents by significantly reducing noise levels. The adverse impact of additional air pollution would similarly be mitigated. Use of the northbound carriageway of the existing A1 for the LAR would allow a 3.6-metre earthbund to be accommodated on the southbound carriageway, again in accordance with the 1990s proposals, affording considerable protection against noise. OA20 offers environmental improvements at little additional cost.

4.10.5 A scheme modified in this way would do more to protect the amenities of residents than quieter road surfacing, which would not address HGV engine noise. The uphill northbound motorway carriageway towards Scotch Corner would create the worst noise impact, and is the carriageway closer to Scurragh Lane properties. Double-glazing is an inappropriate solution, not least in hot weather.

4.10.6 In the view of Mr Henderson, who represented the Residents at the inquiry, the HA's traffic assessment is flawed. Since noise and pollution levels are in large part a function of the volume of traffic, the inadequacies of the traffic assessment place the Residents at risk of even greater adverse impacts over the life of the scheme. The HA's traffic flow predictions fail to take proper account of the increase likely to flow from future trends. A joint report by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (as it then was) and the Countryside Agency: "Beyond Transport Infrastructure - lessons for the future from recent road projects", draws attention to the persistent failure by the HA to predict traffic flows with any accuracy.

4.10.7 Freight traffic is set to increase by 50% by 2015 across Europe, and this is not reflected in the HA's predictions. The current upgrade of the A66 will make the A1 the preferred route for freight traffic heading for the west coast ports and Ireland. This is confirmed in the North West Regional Assembly's Review of Regional Planning Guidance (Ob91/PSupp3) where it is noted that this "land bridge" is not included in the Trans-European Road Network nor is its importance recognized by the Assembly.

4.10.8 The HA's model appears to take no account of induced traffic. It also fails to take proper account of the impact of marginal journey time advantages, which, especially in the context of the massive and increasing uptake of global positioning systems, will permit more finely-judged route decisions to be taken in the future. The result of these shortcomings may well be a substantial under-prediction by the HA of the flow of traffic on the A1(M) by 2025.

4.10.9 The HA's modelling should have employed the British National Traffic Model, and its failure to do so undermines the reliability of its predictions. It is likely that the motorway would be further upgraded in the future, further impacting on the Residents. Traffic would divert from the M6 and M62, because the A1 would be seen as a shorter and more attractive route. This could lead to an additional 50,000 vehicles per day along the section of motorway passing Scurragh Lane. Individual outturns of the traffic model also appear unreliable, with missing flows

and unlikely travel decisions.

4.10.10 The government-commissioned Standing Advisory Committee on Trunk Road Assessment ("SACTRA") report (summary at Ob91/PSupp2), published in 1999, draws attention to serious deficiencies in the DfT's forecasting of freight vehicle flows in trunk road appraisals. These concerns have not been addressed in the HA's traffic appraisal of the scheme. This failure further undermines the reliability of predicted traffic flows.

4.10.11 The motorway may well provide national benefits, but insufficient thought has been given to providing benefits for local people and protecting them from the scheme's adverse impacts. Among the other disbenefits resulting from building the motorway as presently proposed would be the decline in property values at Scurragh Lane. In addition to the direct financial loss to the owners of these properties, this would have an additional impact on the local economy, as residents would be unable to use their properties as security for raising funds to finance their businesses.

4.10.12 The Residents support the provision of an NMU crossing at Scurragh Lane as proposed by other objectors. Such a crossing would encourage sustainable local journeys, for example, by bicycle to the primary school in Middleton Tyas, and leisure trips. The HA proposes to replace the 28 existing crossings between Dishforth and Barton with only 22; this cannot be characterised (as the HA claims it should be) as an improvement. The HA's surveys of NMUs are flawed and misleading. Failure to make proper provision would lead to a decrease in the value to the area of its substantial tourist trade. Despite its closure to vehicular traffic, the Scurragh Lane crossing is still used by local people on foot and by occasional cyclists, and should be retained. On any basis, the diversions proposed by the HA using the Catterick North (also known as Gatherley) overbridge are unreasonably long.

4.10.13 If OA20 is not adopted, the Residents propose OA21, an overbridge spanning both the motorway and the LAR to its west. It was accepted on the Residents' behalf at the inquiry that OA22, an underpass at the same location, was not feasible.

4.10.14 The Residents also have subsisting concerns regarding the loss of a local pond which supports a great crested newt population and the loss of bat roosts as a result of the demolition of Scurragh House. More could be done by the HA to avoid demolition of some of the farm buildings to the east of the motorway which are currently used as bat roosts.

4.11 T M Jopling & Partners (Ob65) and others

4.11.1 The concerns of these objectors relate to motorway service area ("MSA") provision. Three on-line facilities, at Rainton, Sinderby and Brough Moor, would be lost as a result of the scheme. An application for judicial review of the planning permission granted for an MSA at Kirk Deighton to the north of Wetherby has now been withdrawn, and it is accepted that this facility will be built. There would, however, be no motorway service facilities between Kirk Deighton and Scotch Corner, a distance of some 60 kilometres.

4.11.2 Minor amendments to the scheme in the vicinity of Sinderby would in due course permit the construction there of an MSA by the owners of the service facilities which would be lost, thus mitigating their losses and reducing the compensation payable. The cost of the scheme would accordingly be reduced. An outline plan showing the necessary A1(M) connections forms Appendix 2 to Ob65/P. With the same object in view, the objectors are also the promoters of OA5 and OA6 which propose alternative locations for the balancing pond near Sinderby. The HA's estimate of the additional cost arising from incorporating OA5, £176,800, appears wholly out of proportion to extra land take and works which would result from its incorporation in the scheme.

4.12 Tunstall Road Action Committee ("TRAC")(Ob72)

4.12.1 TRAC represents a number of residents of the village of Tunstall, which is located some 3 kilometres west of the A1 via Tunstall Road. The list supplied shows a Committee membership of 23. TRAC's objection is repeated in duplicated letters of objection from 14 Tunstall residents, and a separate objection from a further resident.

4.12.2 The scheme would have a serious adverse impact on the village by reason of increased traffic flows and a likely increase in traffic speeds passing through it. At present, the access to Tunstall from the A1 is via a link road from the Catterick South junction, which meets the Catterick-Tunstall road at a T-junction. The need to slow down or stop at this junction has a restraining effect on traffic speeds through Tunstall.

4.12.3 The HA's proposals include a realignment of this route which would obviate the T-junction, offering motorists a relatively straight and mainly down hill route to Tunstall. This would also induce more drivers, including commuters, to choose the route through Tunstall, a rural village which is unsuitable for the purpose. Removal of the T-junction would also increase traffic speeds through the village. A traffic survey carried out by NYCC shows that more than 30% of traffic is exceeding the 30mph speed limit through the village.

4.12.4 The road through Tunstall has a sub-standard width and lacks a footway in places. It already carries AADT flows of 2,800 vpd, and this is predicted to increase by 550 vpd by 2010. The route through Tunstall is suitable neither for the existing traffic levels nor for the likely future levels of traffic if the scheme is implemented as currently promoted.

4.12.5 Further concerns are raised by the prospect of a significant expansion at Catterick Garrison and/or Marne Barracks, perhaps doubling the number of personnel stationed there. The route through Tunstall is preferred by drivers to the parallel route between Catterick and Catterick Garrison to the north via the A6136. The latter is seen as less attractive by motorists because of the number of speed-restricting roundabouts along it. These result in longer journey times than via Tunstall.

4.12.6 TRAC accordingly strongly supports OA14. This Alternative is proposed by Mr P F Donaldson, the owner of part of the land over which the realigned Tunstall Road would run. It would permit the existing alignment of Tunstall Road to be retained, instead providing a link west from the A6136 which would cross the

motorway to meet a new road running between Catterick Lane and Tunstall road at a T-junction. The existing T-junction on the Tunstall Road further north would be retained as a right-angled bend, its eastern arm becoming redundant. The effect of the T-junction and bend would be to restrain traffic speeds.

4.12.7 The HA states that this Alternative is unacceptable because of the sub-standard bend which would be retained at the existing T-junction. TRAC proposes that there be additional land-take in this vicinity to allow the radius of the bend to be significantly increased. The owner of the land has expressed agreement to its acquisition. In the view of TRAC, the Alternative has manifest advantages, in addition to its calming effect on traffic through Tunstall: it would require less land-take; it would create less severance and have a smaller impact on landscape; there would be less impact on the environment; and it would cost some £0.3m less. The HA's concerns about increased flood risk appear misplaced, since the Alternative retains many of the existing features of the road layout, and, to the landowner's knowledge, there has been no flooding in the vicinity for some 50 years.

4.13 Mr P and Mrs J Chapman (Ob11)

4.13.1 Mr Chapman owns Sowber Hill Farm which lies to the west of the existing A1 south of Catterick. The Farm currently has a direct access to the northbound carriageway of the A1. He also owns Bainesse Farm, jointly with Mrs Chapman. This lies to the north of Sowber Hill Farm and the two Farms are managed as a single business unit. He objects to the proposed alignment of the motorway in the vicinity as this would sever the two Farms. The land to be compulsorily acquired amounts to some 18 hectares, or 10% of the total area of the two Farms. This includes Plots 17/1A and B which are being acquired solely to provide a new bridleway where none currently exists. These Plots should be deleted from the CPO.

4.13.2 There would be further impacts on field shapes and boundaries. Loss of direct access to Sowber Hill Farm and the requirement to access it via Leases Lane and a new access track would turn Sowber Hill into a lower value backland farm. Access by HGVs of up to 44 tonnes weight is required for the Farm's potato enterprise, and Leases Lane would appear inadequate for the purpose. There would be adverse visual, noise and air quality impacts at both Farms.

4.13.3 Mr Chapman supports OA10. He also proposes OA13 which would use the southbound rather than the northbound carriageway of the existing A1 for the LAR. He objects to OA12 because it would blight Bainesse Farmhouse by bringing the motorway even closer, would require a larger land take from Sowber Hill Farm and would create greater severance.

4.14 Mr & Mrs J McIntyre (Ob24)

4.14.1 Mr and Mrs McIntyre own Theakston Farm, in the vicinity of Gatenby Bridge, south of Exelby. Gatenby Bridge is to be retained. Mr and Mrs McIntyre object to the proposed reopening of Bridleway No. 10.415/1. The bridleway is currently stopped-up on safety grounds at its junction with the western slip road to the Bridge. Reopening the bridleway so as to allow equestrians to use the Bridge as a motorway crossing point would be unacceptably hazardous.

4.15 Mr J D Middleton (Ob135)

4.15.1 Mr Middleton is the owner of the site of the former Bedale Hunt Inn located near Mask Lane on the eastern side of the A1 in the vicinity of Sinderby. The site currently has direct access to the southbound carriageway of the A1 along a 100-metre frontage. Failure to preserve this access would landlock the site and damage its redevelopment potential. In Table 8-8 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement, the HA appears to recognise the impact of the potential loss of direct access from the A1 in the case of the Kneeton Hall Quarry, but fails to recognise this in the case of Mr Middleton's site. Mr Middleton puts forward OA4, which would extend the access track proposed for the Croft by some 850 metres to provide access to his site.

4.16 Mr F and Mr J Pinkney (Ob117)

4.16.1 These objectors oppose the creation of a bridleway along the eastern side of the proposed motorway south of Moulton Lane, proposed by the HA as M13. This is unnecessary as other public rights of way already exist and the modification would mean compulsory acquisition of land in their ownership. A bridleway alongside a motorway is unlikely to be much used. They also object to the loss of the Scurragh Lane crossing which currently provides a valuable route from Moulton to Skeeby and Richmond. The alternative route via Scotch Corner would be up to 5 kilometres longer.

4.17 Mr H Proom (Ob128)

4.17.1 Mr Proom is a former County, District and Parish Councillor. Earlier improvements of the A1 had failed satisfactorily to detrunk the former A1 through Catterick. Footpaths are too narrow and the carriageway too wide. The current scheme does nothing to redress this. The scheme plans and documents do not use local, historic names. The Catterick Central junction could merely be called "Catterick" and should be located as in the 1990s scheme. The road numbers currently used on signage are confusing and the proposals do not appear to remedy this.

4.18 Written objections

The material points, in addition to those set out above, are:

Countryside Agency (Ob73)

4.18.1 Despite on-going discussions with the HA, the Countryside Agency remains concerned as to the impact of the scheme on landscape and the rights of way network. In particular, though recognising the importance of strategic messaging on the proposed motorway, the CA is concerned at the negative impact on a relatively flat, predominantly rural landscape of the necessary "rattle" signs and gantries. It also regrets the failure of the proposals to address the rights of way potential of the disused railway crossings at Baldersby, Sinderby, and Brompton, and has concerns over a number of other detailed NMU issues raised by other objectors and set out elsewhere in this report. It supports the view of a number of objectors that demand for and provision of NMU crossings should be assessed without taking into account the severance

caused by the existing A1.

4.18.2 The CA welcomes the proposal to limit lighting to the proposed motorway junctions. It urges the HA to apply low-noise surfacing.

**Travelodge Hotels Limited (Ob68)
Peoples Restaurant Group Limited (Little Chef Limited)(Ob67)**

4.18.3 Travelodge owns a hotel near Skeeby, direct access to which would be lost if the A1 is upgraded to a motorway. Access would be available only from the LAR with a significant operational impact on the hotel. No mitigation has been proposed.

4.18.4 The Peoples Restaurant Group owns a restaurant on each side of the A1 in the vicinity of Rainton, and a third near Skeeby. The restaurant on the eastern side at Rainton would be demolished, and direct access from the A1 would be lost to the other two. No mitigation has been provided. It is unclear whether alternative alignments have been considered which would avoid the loss of the Rainton east restaurant. Direct access could be provided from the motorway to the Rainton west restaurant, and proper signage at Skeeby would help to maintain trade.

4.18.5 Since the ES does not address these impacts, it must be regarded as incomplete and therefore non-compliant.

Shell (UK) Limited (Ob54) and BP Oil UK Limited (Ob55)

4.18.6 These objectors are respectively the freehold owners of the A1 service stations at Brough Moor and Southway. The closure of these stations as part of the scheme would leave an unacceptable gap in MSA provision.

Gatherley Road/Catterick North junction (Hambleton Steel Limited (Ob71) and others)

4.18.7 A number of objectors are concerned at the closure of access to the proposed motorway via the existing Catterick North junction, and propose that the junction should be redesigned so that access to the A1 when upgraded is retained. This has been published as OA19.

4.18.8 The A6136 Gatherley Road which leads north from the Race Course to Catterick North junction serves an industrial estate in addition to local housing. Planning permission for a residential development of 200 houses has been granted, and it is likely that there would in due time be other developments further to the east, in accordance with the Richmondshire District Local Plan. The junctions with Gatherley Road are controlled by traffic signals, and it is already congested especially at peak times. The Road is used to access Catterick North junction by HGVs serving the industrial estate. The residential developments and the introduction of motorway traffic would unacceptably exacerbate the existing congestion. Removing direct access to the A1 at Catterick North junction would lead to a large increase in the number of commercial vehicles passing through Brompton-on-Swale.

4.18.9 Consideration should also be given to providing a link between the Catterick Central and Catterick North junctions running to the west of Brompton-on-

Swale. This has been published as OA17.

Mr P Donaldson (Ob49)

Mr F Donaldson (Ob42)

4.18.10 Mr P Donaldson is the owner of Cowstand Farm, part of which would be compulsorily acquired for the purpose of the realigned Tunstall Road. Mr F Donaldson is his father and the owner of other land nearby. The radical realignment proposed by the HA is unnecessary and would lead to excessive speeds, as well as providing, in the stopped up section of road, a camp-site for travellers and a dumping-ground for those seeking to dispose of rubbish.

4.18.11 Mr P and Mr F Donaldson therefore propose OA14, on the same grounds as those put forward by TRAC, and because less agricultural land would need to be acquired. OA14 would require the compulsory acquisition of part of Mr F Donaldson's land, to which he consents.

Leases Road and Crossways Junction, Leeming Bar

4.18.12 Leases Road runs north from a junction (Crossways junction) with the A684 Bedale to Northallerton road in Leeming Bar. A number of dwellings lie towards its southern end, an industrial estate is situated to its west, and to its east there is the Pembroke Caravan Park. The Road is currently lightly trafficked.

4.18.13 The scheme envisages the use of Leases Road to connect Leeming Bar and the A684 with the proposed Leeming motorway junction. The additional traffic would have severe adverse noise and air quality impacts. The resultant loss of clientele would have a severe impact on the Caravan Park. The owners of the Park (Ob150) object to the proposal on these grounds, and because the resultant loss of clientele would severely affect their business. They submit a petition signed by visitors. There are further written objections on this ground, including that of Mr and Mrs Thomas (Ob10). The objection of HDC on similar grounds is set out in paragraph 4.2.2.

4.18.14 The Aiskew and Leeming Bar Parish Council (Ob118) also expresses alarm at the impact of the scheme on traffic in Leeming Bar, as do individual Parish Councillors in separate objections. Failure to build the BALB at the same time as upgrading the A1 as was previously envisaged would be a recipe for chaos at the local road junctions in Leeming Bar.

Mr G C Reay (Ob34)

4.18.15 In addition to matters of objection set out elsewhere, Mr Reay's objection relates to the lack of proposals to retain crossings over the dismantled Ripon-Thirsk, Ripon-Northallerton, Richmond-Catterick and Darlington-Richmond railways. The scheme provides only for replacement of the bridge over the Wensleydale railway at Leeming Bar. It would be prudent to provide against the possible future reinstatement of these lines by replacing the existing bridges.

Mr A Woodhead (Ob95)

4.18.16 More could be done to mitigate the adverse noise and visual impacts of the

scheme in the vicinity of the Baldersby junction, both as they affect local residents such as Mr Woodhead, and users of PRowS in the area. The scheme would bring the A1 nearer to Mr Woodhead's property which is located on a west-facing hillside to the east of the A1 and downwind of prevailing westerlies.

4.19 Objectors' alternative proposals

4.19.1 There are a total of 25 alternatives proposed by objectors. These are set out in Document PI/5, and the HA's response to each of them is contained in Documents HA/R/OA1 to /OA25. Most of the Alternatives have already been set out in the reporting above of objectors' cases.

4.19.2 The OAs not reported above are:

- OA2: Proposes an alternative location to the east of the proposed motorway for the Dishforth balancing pond, which is proposed to be located to the west in the promoted scheme.
- OA9: These are four alternative layouts for the junction in the vicinity of Leeming Services, proposed by Motel Leeming Limited and withdrawn, together with the company's objection to the scheme, by letter dated 25 October 2006 (in PI/8); and
- OAs 12 and 13: These are proposed by Mr R Brooksbank (Ob61). They concern the alignment of the motorway and LAR in the Catterick area. Mr Brooksbank lives about 1.5 kilometres west of the existing A1. The proposed alignment would bring the motorway to within about 1 kilometre. OA12 provides for the upgrade to remain on-line between Low Street and the Catterick Central junction, with the widening on the eastern side to avoid impacting on the Baines Farm SAM. OA13 proposes the use of the southbound A1 carriageway as the LAR along the same section of the proposed motorway. In Mr Brooksbank's view, these alternatives, which mirror the 1990s upgrade proposals, would avoid taking the new road into the countryside, while having a minimal impact on the SAM and on the Farm itself.

4.20 Counter-objections to Objectors' Alternatives

OA10

4.20.1 **Mr and Mrs D Hutton-Squire (Ob27):** Mr and Mrs Hutton-Squire own Holtby Hall, which lies immediately to the west of the A1 about 3 kilometres north of Leeming Bar. They object to the provision of an LAR along the full length of the Leeming to Catterick section of the proposed motorway on grounds of the threat to security at their property. Thefts already take place from their outbuildings. Such a provision has been proposed as a result of public pressure about a perceived rather than a real problem. Blockages of motorways are very rare and, in any event, the proposed LAR would be inadequate to deal with the full volume of traffic displaced from the motorway on the occasion of such a blockage.

OA23

4.20.2 **Mr C Hall (Ob151)**: Mr Hall is the owner of the Thorndale Trout Farm located to the west of Dere Street in the vicinity of the Barton junction. OA23 would utilise Dere Street as part of the parallel LAR west of the A1 between Scotch Corner and Barton. This LAR proposal formed part of the 1990s scheme and was successfully opposed by Mr Hall and others. The proposal would involve loss of land to compulsory acquisition and unacceptable levels of additional traffic on a road already periodically blocked by trucks queueing to access the nearby motorway maintenance depot. If an LAR is to be constructed between Scotch Corner and Barton, OA24, which uses the proposed reconstructed Kneeton Hall Bridge to cross to the eastern side of the proposed motorway, is to be preferred.

4.21 Objections to HA proposed modifications

- **M7**: The modification is objected to by the British Driving Society (Ob153) on the ground that the proposed PRow should be a restricted byway rather than a bridleway;
- **M10**: This modification is objected to by Messrs K N & J Wyrill and Sons (Ob51), who own Leases Farm. Use of the bridleway by NMUs, and especially by equestrians, would conflict with heavy machinery using the Lane and create a hazard. The modification is also objected to on compulsory purchase grounds by J M Greensit & Son Limited (Ob13); and
- **M13 and 15**: are objected to by affected landowners.

5. THE RESPONSE OF THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY

The material points, in addition to those set out in section 3, are:

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 There are no sustained in-principle objections to the scheme. The objections of Northern Electric Distribution Limited, a statutory undertaker, and that of Huntsman, akin to a statutory undertaker, have both been withdrawn. Save for the written objection of the Countryside Agency, there is no objection from any statutory body. NYCC and all the District and Parish Councils are supporters in principle of the scheme. Indeed, there is no suggestion by any party that, subject to addressing their concerns as to the detail of the proposed upgrade, the scheme should not be implemented.

5.1.2 There is also no sustained objection to many aspects of the HA's case. The economic assessment is not challenged and the traffic appraisal is challenged only by the Scurragh Lane Residents and, as to two of the detailed junction proposals, by NYCC. There is no sustained challenge to the HA's evidence on issues of landscape, ecology, cultural heritage and air and water quality. The HA's conclusions on noise and vibration are generally accepted, though there are objections outstanding which include concerns as to adverse noise impacts.

5.2 North Yorkshire County Council

5.2.1 The remaining matters of dispute between NYCC and the HA are limited. A

minor modification has been agreed to accommodate future construction of the BALB. The HA has agreed to promote OA10, thus providing an LAR along the whole of the motorway section between the Leeming and Catterick Central junctions.

5.2.2 The issue of an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton is addressed below in the HA's response to Melsonby and Middleton Tyas Parish Councils (paragraphs 5.5.9 to 5.5.12). As to the issue of traffic displaced from the A1 following its upgrade to motorway status, however, the displacement has been carefully modelled by the HA using inputs from the survey conducted in the parallel circumstances on the A168 in the vicinity of the existing Dishforth junction. Mr Roberts, the NYCC traffic witness, asserted that the routine displacement might be up to 1,000 vehicles per day, but provided no evidence and had apparently carried out no modelling work to support this assertion. In cross-examination, he conceded that the HA's traffic model was generally robust.

5.2.3 Moreover, the HA's modelled outturns are supported by common sense. It is unlikely that any drivers who are not currently intimidated by the existing poorly-aligned dual two lane carriageway A1, with its 70mph speed limit and numerous side roads and other accesses, would not be prepared to use the proposed three-lane motorway, built in compliance with modern standards. If such people exist, they were not identified in the A168 survey; their numbers are likely in any event to be very small. It remains the HA's position that the impact on Melsonby and Middleton Tyas of traffic routinely displaced from the motorway is insufficient by a large margin to warrant the expenditure of an additional £3.9m on an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton.

5.2.4 The Leeming Services junction: There is no dispute between the parties that a roundabout at this junction is achievable within the Orders as published and would accommodate traffic flows adequately. The HA believes that a signal-controlled junction would also operate acceptably and would cost less. As to the level crossing, NYCC's concern is that queueing traffic would extend back towards the crossing, but, in order to create a scenario where the queue might extend across it, was forced at the inquiry to postulate an additional pedestrian phase in the proposed junction traffic signals to accommodate what is predicted to be only a very small number of persons wishing to cross. NYCC's witness again agreed in cross-examination that a technical solution to this issue could if necessary be found at detailed design stage.

5.2.5 The A6136 junction at Catterick: NYCC's initial concern regarding this junction related to traffic queueing back to the roundabout at the proposed Catterick Central motorway junction on event days. That aspect of the objection is no longer pursued. NYCC now raises fresh concerns based on the acknowledged fact that the traffic model predicts a very long queue when the Ratio of Flow to Capacity ("RFC") exceeds 1. When the RFC falls below unity, queueing is predicted to fall significantly. From the apparent discrepancy between these two figures, Mr Mason asserts on behalf of NYCC that it must be the lower figure which is unreliable. There is, however, general acceptance that the reliability of the modelling declines when the RFC is greater than unity. It is accordingly more likely that it is the higher result which is unreliable. There would be on-going modelling of this junction, and, again, a different configuration could be included at detailed design stage if shown to be necessary.

5.2.6 The robust outturn of the economic appraisal does not absolve the HA from seeking the best value for money, consonant with appropriate provision in line with the Scheme Brief, in respect of all aspects of the scheme.

5.3 Hambleton District Council

5.3.1 HDC's objection with regard to the need for an LAR between Leeming and Catterick would be met by the HA's proposed modification (OA10) incorporating such provision.

5.3.2 The HA's response with regard to Leases Road is set out in paragraphs 5.18.9 to 5.18.12. While appropriate signage would be agreed with NYCC and HDC at detailed design stage, the HA does not accept that it would be appropriate, with the motorway in place, to leave the Leeming junction unconnected to Leases Road and the remainder of the industrial estate.

5.3.3 As to Cowfold Bridge, the existing bridge could not accommodate the extended width of the motorway, and would have to be demolished. The estimated cost of a replacement NMU bridge as proposed by OA8, including additional land take, is some £560,000 and could not be justified by the level of usage. To meet design standards, the new bridge would need to be some 1.5 metres higher than the existing bridge and its construction would require vegetation to be cleared from the embankment and cause disturbance to wildlife identified in that vicinity. It would thus have an adverse impact on landscape and ecology.

5.3.4 The NMU surveys conducted in June and September 2004 show minimal use of the existing bridge. Over a 10-hour period on each of 4 days, including weekdays and weekends, about 12 pedestrians, and a maximum of 8 cyclists and 4 equestrians used the Bridge. Clearly the Bridge was not closed to NMUs at the time of the June survey, as alleged by HDC and Exelby, Leeming and Newton Parish Council, since there is clear evidence of use on both days. Neither the District nor the Parish Council submits user evidence to challenge the survey evidence adduced by the HA. Given the very low level of use, the Parish Council's claim that removal of the bridge would sever Exelby from the remainder of the Parish is not accepted.

5.3.5 Alternative NMU crossings would be provided via a new bridleway alongside Bedale Beck, and via Londonderry Bridge and these would be reasonably convenient. It is accepted that Bedale Beck is periodically flooded; the risk, equivalent to 1 in 75, represents an average tendency to flood on only five days each year. The route via the proposed new path would be about 1 kilometre further; the use of the route via Londonderry Bridge would add some 570 metres to the journey. The existing route via Cowfold Bridge is principally used for leisure and, in that context, the additional length is not considered to be a significant adverse impact nor a breach of guidance. It is to be noted that the loss of the bridge is accepted by the BHS.

5.4 Richmondshire District Council

5.4.1 The HA's response on the issue of the Scurragh Lane crossing is set out in

paragraphs 5.6.7 to 5.6.12. Similarly, its response regarding a Scotch Corner to Barton LAR is set out in paragraphs 5.5.9 to 5.5.12. RDC's concerns regarding the impact of extra traffic in Middleton Tyas sit uneasily with the recent grant by the Council of planning permission for a business park at Scotch Corner, notwithstanding the additional 230 vehicles per day which the traffic assessment prepared in relation to the planning application predicts on Middleton Tyas Lane. This additional traffic is greater by a factor of nearly eight than that routinely predicted to be displaced from the proposed motorway.

5.4.2 As to the balancing pond on the Brompton Industrial Estate, alternative locations have been considered. The HA's position is set out in HA/35. While there is no absolute bar to relocating the balancing pond on the western side of the proposed motorway as suggested by RDC, the Harris land is more suitable as it is some 5 to 6 metres lower than the alternative site west of the motorway. Placing it on the Harris land is in engineering terms the simplest option and therefore provides the best value for money.

5.4.3 It may be possible at detailed design stage to reduce the land take, for example, by increasing the depth of the pond or reducing the extent of environmental mitigation. The main aim must remain to provide proper attenuation of rain-water run-off from the proposed motorway. There is no sustained objection to the proposal from Harris, nor is there any support for the location proposed by RDC from the owner of the alternative site. It was conceded on behalf of RDC in cross-examination that there is no development land shortage in the District; nor is there any national guidance that a balancing pond should not be located on a brownfield site.

5.4.4 There is currently no public right of way through the Brompton underpass as proposed in OA18. Immediately east of the underpass, the route abuts on a high earth mound and the rear fence of commercial premises. There is no agreement from the owners of these premises to open a right of way across their land and they have security concerns regarding a route along the toe of the embankment northwards on the eastern side of the proposed motorway. Inspection suggests that the principal current use of the underpass is by graffiti artists. There is an existing informal path leading south along the toe of the embankment on the western side of the A1 which links Footpath 20.9/15, which leads to the railway underpass, with Station Road, Brompton.

5.4.5 The offline section of proposed motorway in the vicinity of Baines Farm has been designed in the interests of minimising the impact of the scheme on the SAM. The motorway would run closer to Limekiln Wood than the existing A1. However, this part of the proposed motorway would be in cutting, mitigating to some extent any additional impact.

5.5 Local Access Roads

General points

5.5.1 The HA's approach has been governed by the Scheme Brief (Appendix B of HA/P1) which states as a Special Requirement that single carriageway LARs are to be provided, as appropriate, to meet the needs of local and non-motorway traffic. The HA recognizes the concerns of those who live in close proximity to

the A1 regarding displacement of traffic from the proposed motorway both generally and following a major incident.

5.5.2 As is confirmed by NY Police, it is not the function of the LARs to accommodate traffic displaced by a major incident. A single carriageway road would clearly not be able to accommodate more than a small proportion of all the traffic diverted from a 3-lane motorway following an incident.

5.5.3 Moreover, objectors, including NYCC and Middleton Tyas PC, fail to take proper account of the improvements in both capacity and safety which the upgrade to motorway would afford. In place of the existing two-lane carriageway, there would be four lanes of traffic capacity, that is, three lanes and the hard shoulder. That would effectively double the ability of the route to continue to function following a major incident. At present, a fire or breakdown affecting only one lane reduces the capacity of the road by half. Following the proposed upgrade, a similar incident is likely to be limited to the hard shoulder leaving the three lanes of the carriageway open to traffic.

5.5.4 Safety would be improved not only by providing carriageways which meet all current standards, including horizontal and vertical alignment, but by reducing the existing multiplicity of sub-standard junctions with and accesses to/from the A1 between Dishforth and Barton to four junctions of grade-separated motorway standard. This reduction in the number of accesses would also assist the authorities in the event of a major incident to control exits from the motorway on to the local road network. Following a major incident, traffic congestion on the proposed motorway would continue principally to be managed using the network of tactical diversions agreed with the police, and discussed in HA/5 and HA/19.

5.5.5 The closure of this section of the A1 following an incident is a very rare event. In 2005, one carriageway was closed on 3 occasions, and there was a full closure of the road on only one occasion (see HA/25).

5.5.6 The HA's appraisal of the appropriateness of providing LARs therefore continues to rely on its forecasts of traffic likely to be displaced from the motorway in normal circumstances. Although some objectors assert that these forecasts understate the extent of the likely displacement, the HA's evidence has not been cogently challenged by the presentation of any evidence to the contrary.

Dishforth to Baldersby

5.5.7 The proposal to provide this section of new LAR forms OA1. The HA remains satisfied that adding this provision to the scheme at a cost of £2.9m is not justified by its likely use. It is predicted that fewer than 100 vpd would use the LAR if provided. The proposal would require the additional acquisition of 8.1 hectares of land from 10 different owners. There are reasonably convenient alternative routes available for all users, and the local road network is capable of accommodating the limited amount of displaced traffic. The Alternative does not have widespread support, and, although supported by NYCC (see HA/26), it was not relied on as a ground of objection in NYCC's Closing Submission (Ob35/CS), No evidence has been provided to meet the HA's considered view that the level

of traffic using the proposed LAR would not justify the cost and other adverse impacts of providing it. There is no evidence from J E Swiers Limited of the extent of use of the local road network by its agricultural machinery. The Alternative does not warrant further investigation.

Leeming to Catterick

5.5.8 The proposal to provide this section of new LAR in full forms OA10. Since publication of the Orders, further guidance has been published (IAN 68/06 - HA/3B) which recommends, in respect of motorway sections exceeding 5 kilometres in length, the incorporation of access for emergency vehicles and to assist with the release of vehicles trapped on the motorway following an incident. In the light of this guidance and following discussions with NY Police, the HA has reassessed the provision of a parallel LAR along the western side of this section of motorway. The additional benefit arising from the ability to provide emergency access via the LAR shifts the balance in favour of providing the LAR. The HA therefore seeks a recommendation that OA10 be included in the scheme, recognizing, however, that this would amount to a substantial change which would require further procedures to be followed pursuant to the 1980 Act.

Scotch Corner to Barton

5.5.9 There are two Alternatives proposed by objectors with regard to this section of new LAR, OA23 and OA24. These are described in paragraph 4.4.20. The HA recognises the concerns of a number of objectors with regard to LAR provision along this 3-kilometre-long section of the proposed motorway. It is accepted that an LAR along this section formed part of the scheme promoted in the 1990s, but re-assessment in the course of preparing the present scheme shows that the expense is not warranted. The HA also accepts the vulnerabilities of the two villages as set out in the cases of the two Parish Councils.

5.5.10 The HA does not accept for reasons set out in paragraph 5.5.2 that the infrequent occasions on which traffic would use Melsonby and Middleton Tyas to avoid obstruction on or closure of the A1(M) is the primary issue. Moreover as the section length is less than 5 kilometres, the new guidance in IAN 68/06 does not apply to it. It is the impact of non-motorway traffic likely routinely to use the local road network which is the basis for the assessment of the need for an LAR. The HA remains satisfied from its own survey evidence and modelling that the impact of such traffic would be insignificant (paragraph 3.8.4). Indeed, if the traffic survey results presented by Middleton Tyas PC (paragraph 4.4.11) should prove more accurate than those of the HA, the impact of the small amount of additional traffic would be proportionally even less significant. None of the other proponents of this additional section of new LAR presents any evidence to challenge the survey evidence and conclusions of the HA.

5.5.11 The village of Melsonby would benefit to some degree from implementation of the scheme as the current high load diversion route would cease to be required following the rebuilding of the Kneeton Hall Bridge.

5.5.12 As to the further anticipated developments in the vicinity of Middleton Tyas, the traffic impact of such proposals would fall to be addressed as part of the planning application process.

5.6 Provision for NMUs

General points

- 5.6.1 For the reasons set out in paragraphs 3.3.13 to 3.3.24, the HA's proposed NMu provision would represent a significant improvement over the existing provision. The HA has fully reviewed the proposed provision for NMUs, and is satisfied that this meets the criterion contained in the Scheme Brief. By any standard, the provision of 22 grade-separated crossings along a section of motorway only 40 kilometres in length must be regarded as satisfactory. In addition, the currently largely unusable at-grade crossings would be linked into the PRoW network and the LARs to provide a significant number of new usable NMu routes. Objectors confirmed in their evidence that, as shown by the HA's NMu surveys, the existing at-grade crossings were little used.
- 5.6.2 NMu groups and individual objectors seek to argue that the HA should have sought to assess not the current or future demand for crossings of the A1, but the latent demand for crossings as it might have been without the severance caused by the existing A1. With the exception of the flawed survey evidence presented by the CTC (see below) and Mrs Brookes' evidence of horse owners likely to use a crossing at Scurragh Lane, no evidence to support the claim for latent demand has been put forward. If such demand exists, it is difficult to understand why there was so little opposition to closure of this crossing in the 1990s; the necessary order was fully publicised, but attracted no objection.
- 5.6.3 Past and present PRoW officers employed by NYCC, the authority with responsibility for PRoWs, have not supported the approach advocated by these objectors or sought further A1 crossing points. NYCC makes no objection to the scheme in relation to the proposals for NMUs. Moreover, even where grade-separated crossing points exist at present, their use is very limited, as confirmed by the survey evidence in HA/P4A. This further undermines the claims of latent demand made by objectors.
- 5.6.4 The latent demand approach was considered by the Inspector who conducted the A1 Walshford to Dishforth inquiry. He concluded that justification for providing bridleway bridges was a matter of nice judgment and that he had received no evidence of considerable usage such as would warrant further provision (HA18). He declined to adopt the latent demand approach.
- 5.6.5 User groups and individual NMu objectors quote selectively from guidance in TA91/05: Provision for Non-Motorised Users (DD106) to suggest that diversions caused by the scheme should not add more than 10% to the length of existing NMu routes. The guidance in TA91/05, however, clearly distinguishes between essential journeys, where 10% should generally be the limit, and leisure journeys, where no such limit is imposed. The survey evidence confirms that the majority of NMu trips are for leisure purposes, most frequently on circular routes based on the main centres of population. Objectors confirmed this in evidence and most welcomed the new routes to be provided. The 10% calculation is, in any event, problematic and requires knowledge of starting point and destination. For example, the NMu route diversion via Catterick North to be provided at Scurragh Lane (see paragraph 5.6.12), amounting to about 4 kilometres in length, would represent a large percentage increase in the length of a journey

between Moulton and Skeeby, but a very small proportionate extension to a Teesside to Yorkshire Dales cycle route referred to in evidence by the CTC.

5.6.6 In August 2006, the HA published an NMU Audit (Appendix C in HA/P4A). This addresses 13 issues raised by NMUs groups in the course of consultations and assesses proposed NMU provision against 9 key objectives. It remains the HA's position that the scheme as now promoted (with the inclusion of OA10 and the minor modifications) represents a significant improvement for NMUs compared with the current situation. That this is the case was accepted in cross-examination by all NMU objectors, including the representatives of the CTC, notwithstanding their claim that the impact of the scheme on NMUs was at best neutral (paragraph 4.5.11).

The Scurragh Lane crossing

5.6.7 A crossing at Scurragh Lane is the additional NMU provision most sought by objectors. Three Alternatives are put forward (OAs20 to 22). The HA remains satisfied that the likely use of such a crossing, compared with its cost and other adverse impacts do not justify its provision. Despite anecdotal evidence of continuing use of the at-grade crossing at this point, there is no evidence to suggest that this is more than sporadic and infrequent. Most objectors on NMU grounds agreed in evidence that use of the at-grade crossings was dangerous and intimidating. The HA's NMU surveys included use of this crossing; the relevant survey locations in Appendix A of HA/P4 are 57 and 58. The survey results show an average use by pedestrians of less than 5 crossings per day both on weekdays and at weekends. There was no other use by NMUs on weekdays and there was an average total number of only 3 crossings (eastward and westward) by cyclists on weekend days.

5.6.8 The methodology applied by the CTC in conducting its survey is flawed. The survey is essentially self-selecting and self-serving. As the CTC's representative agreed in cross-examination, the questionnaires had simply been passed around among local cyclists. Those who responded would inevitably be limited almost exclusively to those who claimed to have used the crossing whether currently or in the past. Unsurprisingly, almost none of the respondents gave negative answers to such questions as: "How often did you use the route?" and: "If a safe grade separated crossing were provided ... what would be your estimated future usage?" It would be unacceptable to seek to extrapolate from the results of such a survey.

5.6.9 The CTC's claimed use of the Scurragh Lane crossing, whether before or after closure, is thus very significantly overstated. However, even accepting the CTC's evidence on its face, of those who responded, only 57 claimed that they would use the crossing once a month. Even accepting the evidence at its face value for the purposes of the argument, it would not justify the provision of an NMU bridge or underpass, given the two alternatives available or to be made available (see below).

5.6.10 When, in the 1990s, formal steps were taken to close this crossing, no objection was lodged. If, as she claims, Mrs Brookes' survey indicates strong demand for an equestrian crossing at this point, then it is surprising that none of the horse owners she identifies thought it appropriate to object. The CTC states

that it then had no capacity to monitor the publication of closure proposals, but, again, it is surprising, if the CTC's claims of strong demand for and heavy use of a crossing at this point were true, that individual cyclists did not take the opportunity to object.

5.6.11 The cost of an overbridge crossing and of the other elements of OA20 is estimated at £3.6m. This expense is not justified by the demand. Moreover, a bridge of sufficient height to provide full clearance would have a significant adverse visual impact in a relatively flat landscape. It would occupy an area east of the motorway identified as essential compensatory habitat for great crested newts. It would also impact on field systems of archaeological note in the vicinity.

5.6.12 Cyclists and pedestrians would be catered for by the improvements proposed at the Scotch Corner junction. A proposed modification (M13) to the scheme would provide an equestrian route south from Scurragh House Lane to Gatherley Road and across the Caterrick North bridge to join the LAR north to Scurragh Lane. This route would also be available to cyclists and pedestrians. These alternatives make appropriate provision, given the low level of demand.

Cowfold Bridge

5.6.13 The HA's response to this proposal (OA8) is set out in paragraphs 5.3.3 to 5.3.5.

The BHS, Mrs Connolly and Mrs Brookes

5.6.14 The suggestion on behalf of the BHS that the HA should have installed a series of traffic signals along the A1 to preserve the ability of equestrians to cross does not bear the hallmarks of practicality. The provision for NMUs is required to meet cost/benefit criteria as with any other aspect of the scheme. The surveys show that there is very little demand by equestrians wishing to cross the A1 on existing routes.

5.6.15 The proposal to reduce traffic through the Brompton South underpass to a single traffic signal-controlled lane is unacceptable, and is opposed by the Parish Council and local residents. Use by equestrians of this existing grade-separated crossing is insufficient to warrant the disruption which would be caused to other users of the underpass. Provision would be made for equestrians in the underpass in line with current standards, and the underpass would be lit.

5.6.16 As to Mrs Connolly's concerns about the LAR verges, the HA's proposals are well in excess of minimum standards and the LARs would generally be relatively lightly trafficked. Maintenance of the LAR verges would become the responsibility of NYCC. The expense of providing fenced equestrian routes is not warranted, would interfere with use of the verges by others, and would add to the difficulty and expense of verge maintenance.

5.6.17 Mrs Connolly proposes an extension of the proposed bridge at Manor House to allow NMUs to cross the proposed motorway as well as the LAR (OA15). The demand for this crossing is shown to be very small, and its provision cannot therefore be justified on grounds of the additional cost (£0.67m) and adverse

impact on landscape. The HA now puts forward as minor modification M11 a new bridleway from the proposed new Tunstall Road Bridge along the western side of the motorway, connecting to Bridleway No. 20.10/4 and thence to other PRowS to the west.

Cyclists Touring Club

5.6.18 The proposed additional crossing near Baldersby cannot be justified where other crossings would be available in the immediate vicinity. The Baldersby motorway junction would be provided with a surfaced 3-metre-wide NMU route, segregated from road traffic by a 0.5-metre-wide verge. The crossings via the Rainton Bridge to the south and the B6267 Butcher House Bridge to the north would remain in place. The latter would become more readily usable via the proposed Baldersby to Leeming LAR, which provides a link with the B6267 immediately west of the Bridge.

5.6.19 The cost of other provision sought by the CTC is not justified in terms of likely usage, and given that alternative routes would be available with the scheme in place.

Ramblers' Association

5.6.20 The Ghyll Lane crossing (OA11): There is no evidence of significant demand for a crossing at this point. The cost is estimated at some £1.2m and the bridge would have an adverse visual impact and be intrusive on nearby properties. The additional crossing is accordingly not justified in cost or environmental terms. Alternative NMU routes would be available via the LAR and the Tickergate Bridge.

5.6.21 The Silcar Lane crossing (OA3): The surveys recorded no NMU crossings at this point and this additional crossing is therefore not warranted by the demand. The cost of the proposed overbridge would be about £1m and there would be an adverse visual impact in an otherwise generally flat landscape, as well as potential adverse cultural heritage and short-term ecological impacts.

5.7 Councillor Pelton

5.7.1 The Pallet Hill link (OA16) proposed by Councillor Pelton does not command support from any of the relevant authorities, the HA, NYCC or RDC. Its provision cannot be justified either in terms of cost/benefit or environmentally. In the published scheme there are two routes from the Catterick Central junction into the Catterick area. The first of these is the link road from the eastern junction roundabout south along a carriageway of the existing A1 providing access to Catterick village via a junction adjacent to Marne Barracks. The second access would be to northern parts of the Catterick area, including the Race Course, and would run from the western junction roundabout northwards to join the A6136 Catterick Road. These two routes would significantly reduce traffic flows passing through Catterick village and along Gatherley Road.

5.7.2 The cost of the link would be between £3.7m and £4.85m, depending on its detailed design, and cannot be justified by the benefits provided. It would encroach severely on the Pallet Hill SINC and would be visually intrusive for

properties on the north side of Catterick and the Race Course.

5.8 Eastern Harvesters Limited

5.8.1 The HA does not regard either the B6267 junction reconfiguration (OA7) or the additional access track width as giving good value for money. The scheme is designed to cater for standard 16.5-metre articulated lorries and combine harvesters at the junction. Articulated vehicles would be able to pass on the access track by using the verges. Only combine harvesters would not be able to pass. Given that the maximum daily flow is no more than about 100 vehicles, of which large machines form only a proportion, the HA does not accept that such encounters would occur more than rarely. DMRB guidance would not predicate a ghost island at the junction for flows of this magnitude. There would be intervisibility along the full length of the proposed access track. It would be for reasonably competent drivers of incoming or outgoing large vehicles to check that the track was clear before committing themselves to using it.

5.8.2 Adoption of the revised B6267 junction (OA7) is estimated to add £146,000 to the cost of the scheme by reason of additional land take and road construction costs. The provision of the wider access track would require the acquisition of about 423 square metres of additional land.

5.9 W G Baker Baker and others

5.9.1 The proposed Kneeton Hall Bridge would provide adequately for all users. Both the carriageway and the two verges would be wider than on the existing bridge. 1.8-metre-high parapets with a solid panel at the bottom would be provided for equestrians. The Bridge would bear vehicles up to 40-tonne weight. The new bridge would obviate the current high load diversion through Melsonby. The bridge proposed as OA25 would be wider than the bridge in the published scheme by more than 1.5 metres. The additional cost would be more than £300,000.

5.9.2 NMU user of the existing bridge is shown by the surveys to be very low. The bridge is also used by fewer than 25 cars and farm vehicles per day. It is accepted that when the quarry is in operation, there may be up to 40 lorry movements per day both in and out. However, the quarry operates only infrequently. The additional cost is not justified by this level of user.

5.9.3 As agreed by the representative of these objectors in the course of cross-examination, a decision regarding the upgrading of Bridleway 20.46/2 for private access use is for the objectors themselves to take in the interests of improving efficiency, should Sedbury Home, Kneeton Hall and Violet Grange Farms come to be operated as a single unit. It is not a matter relevant to the scheme.

5.10 Scurragh Lane Residents

5.10.1 Alone among objectors, the representative of the Residents, Mr Henderson, sought to challenge the assumptions and modelling on which the traffic and economic appraisal of the scheme is based. The HA traffic model follows best current practice in all respects. Though seeking to impugn the HA's traffic flow

predictions, Mr Henderson produces no evidence to challenge that of the HA. None of the issues raised by Mr Henderson during his cross examination of the HA's traffic witness identified any shortcoming in the modelling and forecasting.

5.10.2 Among Mr Henderson's assertions are claims that the model takes no account of the potential for induced traffic. The HA's modelling confirms that no significant induced traffic would be created by the scheme. It reveals no material difference between traffic forecast in the Do Minimum scenario and in the Do Something scenario, that is to say, the construction of the motorway would not release significant currently suppressed trip demand.

5.10.3 Mr Henderson also asserts that implementation of the scheme would cause drivers in large numbers to opt for the eastern north-south route via the A1 rather than the western route via the M6. This was, in his view, already a finely balanced decision. Traffic flows past Scurragh Lane were likely to be much higher than predicted. However, the HA's evidence has taken this effect into account and shows that drivers finding the eastern route more attractive are unlikely to exceed 4,000 per day, a number which would have a negligible impact on the issues of concern to the Residents. If it were proposed to introduce road charging on the M62, the potential displacement of traffic, including displacement on to the upgraded A1, would fall to be considered in the course of the assessment of any such proposal.

5.10.4 The use by the HA of the National Road Traffic Forecasts rather than the British National Traffic Model is entirely in accordance with current government guidance. Mr Henderson's claims with regard to the BNTM are misinformed. The HA modelling has, moreover, taken full account of local land-use planning data down to District level. An uncertainty factor was then built in. As to the A66, the works have commenced and the upgrade is fully taken into account in the HA's model.

5.10.5 Among the recommendations of the SACTRA Report not accepted by the government is that relied on by Mr Henderson. The government's response forms HA/17. This expresses doubts that such complex modelling as proposed in the SACTRA Report could provide robust outputs or that it would be practical and cost-effective to develop and maintain a sufficiently rigorous model for purely transport reasons.

5.10.6 The noise and other environmental impacts of the scheme have been assessed using the high traffic growth scenario and are accordingly robust. In any event, and as accepted by Mr Henderson in cross-examination, even if the traffic forecasts were inaccurate by as much as 50%, this would have an impact on noise levels of only about 1.5dB(A), an increase barely perceptible to the human ear.

5.10.7 The Residents put forward more than one Alternative, but it was clear at the inquiry that it is on OA20 that they mainly rely. OA20 is based on the scheme published in the 1990s and subsequently abandoned. The upgrade proposals have since been fundamentally reviewed. Moving the motorway further to the east would reduce the potential to re-use of the existing road, adding to the cost of the scheme; the additional cost of incorporating OA20 is estimated at £3.6m. As described in paragraph 5.6.11, there would also be an adverse impact on

archaeology and the Alternative would require use of land needed for essential ecological mitigation.

5.10.8 With the scheme in place, there would be a small reduction in noise levels and probably a small improvement in air quality at Scurragh Lane in both the Opening and Design Years. The Catterick to Scotch Corner LAR would be located between the eastern end of Scurragh Lane and the northbound carriageway of the motorway. It would broadly occupy the northbound carriageway of the existing A1. Traffic levels on the LAR would be much lower than on the existing A1, and it would provide a buffer between the dwellings in Scurragh Lane and the motorway, also providing a direct route to Scotch Corner and Catterick North without using the A1.

5.10.9 A 1.5-metre-high bund is proposed between the motorway and the LAR as an anti-glare measure, and is predicted to have a further small attenuating impact on noise levels. Notwithstanding the comments of the Residents regarding the impact of HGV engine noise, the proposed low noise surfacing would provide additional noise mitigation. The HA does not accept that its proposals in the vicinity of Scurragh Lane are manifestly unsatisfactory. OAs20 to 22 do not therefore merit further investigation.

5.10.10 As explained in paragraphs 3.10.17 and 3.10.19, full mitigation for loss of great crested newt and bat habitats is to be provided in accordance with advice from NE. The HA's response with regard to the Scurragh Lane crossing is set out in paragraphs 5.6.7 to 5.6.12.

5.11 T M Jopling & Partners and others

5.11.1 The essence of this objection appears to be that, if an MSA were built on the objectors' land, this would reduce the compensation payable and therefore the cost of the scheme. Provision should therefore be made for a possible MSA by providing a replacement private means of access and for the relocation of the balancing pond proposed nearby.

5.11.2 There is, however, as yet no proposal for an MSA on the site. Following the withdrawal of the application for judicial review, it is likely that the MSA proposed at Kirk Deighton will now be built. The Barton Park Service Area near Scotch Corner has already been designated as an MSA following an earlier inquiry. These facilities meet the general guidance that MSAs be provided at minimum intervals of about 50 kilometres. There is accordingly no basis on which a recommendation could be made for these alternatives (OA5 and OA6) to be adopted.

5.12 Tunstall Road Action Committee

5.12.1 TRAC's concerns relate to the volume and speed of traffic through Tunstall, including the potential for increased traffic flows through the village as a result of the scheme and of the expansion of Marne Barracks and/or Catterick Garrison. It is not accepted, however, that the introduction of the scheme would lead to a material increase in traffic flows through Tunstall beyond that attributable to general traffic growth. The traffic assessment shows that in 2010 AADT flows on Tunstall Road would be the same, 3,350 vpd, in both the Do

Minimum and the Do Something scenarios. Existing and predicted traffic flows through the village are within the design parameters for the standard of road.

- 5.12.2 An assessment of the alternative routes between Marne Barracks, Catterick village and Catterick Garrison has been carried out. This establishes that, with the scheme in place, the shortest and quickest route would be via the new LAR, Catterick Central junction and the A6136. This route would be 1 kilometre shorter than the existing route through Catterick, and the LAR would be subject to the national 60mph speed limit rather than the 30 mph limit which applies through Catterick. The scheme may therefore be expected to lead to some reduction in traffic flows through the village compared with the Do Minimum scenario.
- 5.12.3 The HA and TRAC have together examined three versions of OA14 (see HA/R/Ob72Add). The HA accepts that an alternative could be developed which would incorporate a bend of larger radius than the right-angled bend originally proposed in OA14. However, it remains the HA's view that none of these versions is acceptable since they would all require at least one sub-standard feature as well as an unnecessary T-junction on the link road.
- 5.12.4 The existing Tunstall Road T-junction is located some 2 kilometres from the village. The removal of this T-junction is therefore unlikely to have any material impact on the speed of traffic in the village. Equally, the introduction of a new T-junction and of a bend or bends as informal traffic-calming measures at this distance from Tunstall would have a negligible impact on traffic speeds in the village itself. Traffic-calming measures have only a local effect and to be effective would need to be installed in Tunstall itself and on the immediate approaches to the village. NYCC has confirmed that funding has been allocated in 2006/7 for traffic calming measures to be introduced in Tunstall in consultation with the police and other consultees, including the residents.
- 5.12.5 The proposed alignment of the Tunstall Road link has been discussed and agreed with NYCC which would adopt it on completion of the scheme. NYCC also takes the view that a bend as proposed in OA14 in close proximity to the motorway junction is unacceptable on safety grounds. It is to be noted that NYCC has no objection to the scheme arising from the issues raised by TRAC.
- 5.12.6 Traffic growth as a result of any expansion of local military establishments is a matter to be taken into account by NYCC as highway authority. The need for additional infrastructure and/or traffic-calming in Tunstall would also fall to be addressed in the context of any relevant application for planning permission.

5.13 Mr P and Mrs J Chapman

- 5.13.1 The alignment of the proposed motorway in the vicinity of Bainesse and Sowber Hill Farms has been designed to minimise adverse impacts on the SAM and on Marne Barracks. The proposed land take is required for the purposes of the scheme, including replacement NMU rights for those lost on the A1 and access to the Farms. Leases Lane would be upgraded to a 3.5-metre-wide carriageway with passing places, which would be commensurate with anticipated flows of traffic, including HGVs accessing the Farms.

5.13.2 It is accepted that the motorway would pass closer to Sowber Hill Farm than the existing A1. A false cutting and other landscaping would reduce this adverse impact. There would be no perceptible additional noise impact on Sowber Hill Farm. The visual impact on Bainesse Farm would also be mitigated by the motorway being in cutting in the immediate vicinity, and by the use of other landscaping. In 2025, much of Bainesse Farm would experience a reduction in noise levels compared with the Do Minimum scenario in the base year, 2004. Other matters raised by Mr Chapman go to compensation.

5.13.3 The published scheme would reuse the existing southbound A1 carriageway for the local access road. Adoption of OA13 would preclude landscaping to screen the motorway from Marne Barracks. It would also move the motorway closer to Catterick village with less benefit to residents than the published scheme. Any benefit for the Farms would be at best marginal.

5.14 Mr and Mrs McIntyre

5.14.1 This objection overlooks the generous provision of highway verge at the foot of the Gatenby Bridge embankment, as well as the minimum provision alongside the approach road. For these reasons, the proposed reopening of the bridleway would not be unsafe.

5.15 Mr J D Middleton

5.15.1 There are currently no credible proposals for the redevelopment of the site of the former Bedale Hunt Inn. When the site was conveyed by the HA to Mr Middleton in or about 2000, a claw-back clause of 50% of the increase in value of the site attributable to any grant of planning permission was included. It is also understood that the local planning authority, HDC, would not permit any development involving the erection of buildings on the site. Accordingly, the site has limited value and the cost of providing access to it, whether by an extension to the access track to the Croft (as proposed in OA4) or otherwise, cannot be justified. The cost of OA4 is estimated at £48,000.

5.16 Messrs Pinkney

5.16.1 The proposed bridleway is an important proposed modification providing a route for equestrians avoiding Scotch Corner. The issue of the Scurragh Lane crossing has been addressed above.

5.17 Mr H Proom

5.17.1 A major benefit of the scheme would be a direct route between Marne Barracks and Catterick Garrison which does not pass through Catterick village. The traffic flow through the village is predicted to decrease with the scheme in place, and no improvement of this route is therefore proposed. Names for features of the scheme have been drawn from the Ordnance Survey in accordance with guidance; signage of local roads is a matter for NYCC as highway authority.

5.18 Written objections

The Countryside Agency

5.18.1 Of the 19 detailed issues raised by the CA, 2 are no longer pursued, and a further 9 are issues of detail where agreement has been reached with NYCC, the authority responsible for the PRoW network, and minor amendments to the scheme will be made at detailed design stage where necessary. In line with other objectors, the CA believes that the need for further crossings and other PRoW provision should be assessed ignoring the severance caused by the existing A1. The HA rejects this argument for the reasons set out in section 5.6 of this report. The CA's remaining concerns are reflected in issues raised by other objectors and addressed elsewhere in this section of the report. These concerns are set out as Issues 12 to 19 in HA/R/Ob73 together in each case with the HA's response.

Travelodge Hotels Limited and Another

5.18.2 There is no scope for providing direct access to these premises from the proposed motorway. Access would be maintained via the local road network. Since the premises are not MSAs, they cannot be signed from the motorway itself. It may be possible to sign the Skeeby premises from the Scotch Corner junction. At the request of the objector, this would be considered at detailed design stage. It is claimed that the ES is non-compliant, because it fails to assess the scheme's socio-economic effects. However, such an assessment is required only when all or part of business premises are to be lost, which is not the case at Skeeby. Chapter 13 of the ES assesses traveller facilities, identifying the loss of some services.

5.18.3 As to the Rainton facilities operated by Little Chef, the widening cannot be achieved without impacting on either the northbound or southbound premises. Under the scheme, the southbound Little Chef would be lost, but there would be no direct impact on the larger northbound facilities. Alternative access to the northbound facilities would be provided from the proposed LAR. As to the criticism of the ES, there would be no impact on the northbound facilities and the southbound facilities were not operational when the ES was prepared.

Shell (UK) Limited and Another

5.18.4 The objections of these fuel supply companies relate to loss of service stations. The position as to MSA provision is set out in paragraph 5.11.2.

Gatherley Road/Catterick North junction

5.18.5 Guidance in the DMRB requires motorway junctions to be separated on safety grounds by at least 2 kilometres. Catterick North junction (which OA19 proposes should be retained as a full grade-separated motorway junction) would be less than 2 kilometres from the proposed junction at Catterick Central, and would represent a significant departure from current design standards. Moreover, the Catterick Central junction would rationalise junction provision in the area, and would provide the best overall solution operationally, economically and environmentally. The HA's traffic modelling establishes that, with the scheme in place, traffic flows on Gatherley Road would be significantly lower.

Residual two-way AADT flows are predicted at 1,800 vpd.

5.18.6 Traffic seeking to access the A1 northbound would do so at Scotch Corner via Gatherley Road, the Catterick North overbridge and the proposed LAR on the western side of the motorway. The distance would not be materially different; journey time would be a little greater, because of lower speeds on the LAR compared with the A1, though the section of this route which runs along the LAR is only some 3 kilometres in length. Traffic seeking to join the A1 southbound would have a much nearer point of access at the Catterick Central junction, reducing journey distance from about 5.4 kilometres to some 2.5 kilometres. It is accepted that the proportion of HGVs in the traffic using the southern part of Gatherley Road may increase. However, with the scheme in place, two-way traffic flows at Catterick Bridge are predicted to reduce from 8,900 vehicles per day to 3,400 vehicles. There is therefore unlikely to be any additional congestion or pressure on the Catterick Bridge junction.

5.18.7 As to OA17, the proposal involves the construction of 2.9 kilometres of new road in the flood plain of the River Swale. The cost would be between £6.2m and £14.2m depending on the standard adopted for the road and on the other infrastructure required. The adverse environmental impacts would be substantial, including visual intrusion and noise impacts on residents not affected by the published scheme, impacts on the flood plain, on archaeology, and a significant take of agricultural land. There would be community severance between Brompton-on-Swale and Colburn to its west. The Alternative was strongly opposed by Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council during its appearance at the inquiry. Traffic flows on such a link are predicted to be very small, probably no more than as 200 vehicles per day. The Alternative cannot be justified on any grounds.

Messrs P and F Donaldson

5.18.8 The HA's response to OA14 is set out in paragraph 5.12.3. While accepting that OA14 offers reduced land take, severance and environmental impact at Tunstall Beck, the combination of likely speeds, and limited visibility at the bend proposed as part of OA14 would introduce an unacceptable level of risk.

Leeming Bar

5.18.9 The HA acknowledges that there will be increases in traffic flows and therefore in noise and possibly air pollution in Leases Road. This arises in large part from the completion of Phase 4 of the Leases Road Industrial Estate and from the failure as originally envisaged to construct the BALB at the same time as the A1 upgrade scheme. It is at the northern end of Leases Road that the increase in noise levels is predicted to be substantial and is mainly the result of commercial traffic passing between the proposed Leeming junction and the industrial estate.

5.18.10 The new Leeming junction would have two connections with the local road network, including the new link via the LAR and the A684 at Leeming services. This dual provision creates the best balance of traffic and of other benefits in the Leeming area, and has been devised following guidance from HDC as local planning authority and NYCC as local highways authority.

5.18.11 A direct link from Leeming junction into the new section of the Industrial Estate has been considered. However, the new and existing sections of the Estate are not connected, and the link could therefore only serve the new section and the traffic flow along Leases Road to the new junction would therefore be similar to that predicted under the scheme as proposed. Traffic from the east in particular would still use Leases Road as the shorter route to the Leeming junction.

5.18.12 It is predicted that traffic flows at the Crossways junction would reduce by reason of the direct access on to the proposed motorway at the Leeming junction at the northern end of Leases Road.

Mr G C Reay

5.18.13 The HA accepts that no provision is made to retain bridges over the four dismantled railways mentioned by Mr Reay. Consultation with NYCC confirms that the prospect of these lines being reinstated is extremely low, and that provision is therefore inappropriate on cost and environmental grounds. The scheme as proposed would render possible without undue expense the future restoration of crossings of the proposed A1(M) for the Ripon-Northallerton and Darlington-Richmond lines.

Mr A Woodhead

5.18.14 This objector's property is some 700 metres from the A1. It is predicted that any increase in traffic noise there as a result of the scheme would be imperceptible. Surveys show that there is little use of PRowS in the area and the provision of noise barriers is therefore not warranted on cost grounds and because of the adverse visual impact of substantial earth mounding or fencing.

5.19 Response to Objectors' Alternatives

5.19.1 The HA's response to most OAs is set out above. As to the remaining OAs:

- OA2: The alternative location would involve the laying of an additional 50 metres of drain. An access track would also need to be provided, whereas the track to the western location would be required in any event for field access. The additional cost is estimated at £49,000, and cannot be justified since the alternative location proposed would provide no benefit over the published proposals.
- OAs 12 and 13: Among the disadvantages of these Alternatives compared with the published scheme are their greater cost and adverse environmental impact, especially on the Baines Farm SAM. English Heritage has expressed a strong preference for the HA's offline proposals. The Alternatives would impact on land at Marne Barracks, and the MoD has expressed concerns about the higher security risk for personnel and buildings. A majority of properties in Catterick village would suffer a greater adverse noise and air quality impact.

5.20 Modifications

5.20.1 In addition to the proposed minor modifications set out in paragraph 3.12.2 and in DD222 and 222A, the HA proposes M16 (see section 3.12). The HA also now accepts that the scheme should be modified by the incorporation of OA10 (see paragraph 5.5.8), conceding that this would amount to a substantial change triggering further 1980 Act procedures.

5.21 Objections to modifications

- M7: British Driving Society. The HA has no legal power to create a restricted byway.
- M10: K N and J Wyrill and Sons and J M Greensit and Son Limited. If OA10 is adopted, M10 would not be pursued. In the absence of OA10, the HA considers the bridleway proposed by M10 to be an essential additional NMU provision.
- M13 and 15: These landowner objections are noted and would be addressed in the course of the necessary further procedures.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 Having regard to the foregoing, I have reached the following conclusions, references being given in square brackets to earlier paragraphs and sections of this report where appropriate. In these conclusions, I first consider the economic appraisal of the scheme, before turning to the objections to the scheme and the Alternatives put forward by objectors. I then address the environmental impacts of the scheme, before reaching an overall conclusion, which is summarised in section 6.7.

6.1.2 If I am to recommend that the scheme proceed, it needs to be shown that, on balance and having regard to potential adverse impacts, it is expedient and in the public interest. There is no sustained objection to the principle of upgrading the Dishforth to Barton section of the A1 Trunk Road to a motorway [5.1.1]. There is no objection to the Detrunking Order, or to the Section and Connecting Roads Scheme. The objections to various detailed elements of the scheme fall to be addressed as objections to the draft Appropriation, Side Roads and Compulsory Purchase Orders.

6.1.3 In the case of the Appropriation Order, I need to be satisfied that another convenient route is available for traffic which would no longer be permitted to use the proposed motorway. If the Side Roads Order is to be made, I need to be satisfied that alternative routes to highways proposed to be stopped up are reasonably convenient, and that, where private accesses are to be stopped up, another reasonably convenient access is available or would be provided.

6.1.4 In relation to the Compulsory Purchase Order, having regard to the guidance set out in ODPM Circular 6 of 2004, I need to be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition of the land affected by the Order, which renders proportionate any interference with the human rights of those with an interest in the land, having regard to Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and/or Article 1 of Protocol 1 (Possession of property) of the European Convention on Human Rights. I need further to be satisfied that the HA has a clear idea of how it intends to use the land to be acquired, that there is a reasonable prospect of funding to implement the scheme, that there is no obstacle to implementation of the scheme, that the land acquisition proposed would not be premature, and that all of the land contained in the draft Order is required for the purposes of the scheme.

6.2 The economic appraisal

6.2.1 The HA's traffic and economic evidence has not generally been challenged. In summary, this is to the effect that the three-lane motorway proposed would accommodate all predicted traffic flows in the Design Year, 2025, even in the high growth scenario [3.8.3]. The cost/benefit analysis has, in the interests of greater robustness, been carried out for the realistic mid growth scenario [3.9.1]. Even so, the economic out-turn is strongly positive, with an Net Present Value of £432m and a Benefit Cost Ratio of 2.99 [3.9.2], representing high value for money.

6.2.2 The sole challenge to this appraisal is on behalf of the Scurragh Lane Residents [section 4.10]. It is claimed on their behalf that the traffic assessment should have been carried out using a different modelling methodology and that the assessment fails to take account of a number of additional factors, including induced traffic, the impact of global positioning systems, the upgrade of the A66, and anticipated Europe-wide growth of freight traffic. The main thrust of the Residents' case in this respect is that growth in traffic flows may exceed the HA's predictions by a considerable margin, and that these still higher flows would have a more severe impact on those living in Scurragh Lane than is admitted by the HA. The Residents do not, however, suggest that these claimed under-predictions undermine the economic case for the scheme. Indeed, if the Residents are correct, then their even-higher traffic growth scenario would provide greater safety and journey time and reliability benefits, further enhancing the economic out-turn.

6.2.3 The response of the HA is that the traffic model complies in all respects with current guidance [5.10.1]. As I explained at the inquiry, government policy, including all current methodologies and guidance, is not for discussion at inquiries into individual schemes. Notwithstanding the assertions made on behalf of the Residents, there is no evidence before me from which I could conclude that the modelling does not comply with current guidance or that it is not robust. In my view, the traffic and economics evidence of the HA is clear and cogent. It was not materially challenged in the course of a full cross-examination of the HA's evidence on these issues or in the submissions made on the Residents' behalf [5.10.1]. Moreover, the Residents' representative accepted in the course of cross-examination that the traffic predictions would need to be wrong by a very significant margin, probably more than 50%, to have any perceptible additional adverse impact on the Residents [5.10.6]. I address the concerns of the Residents as to the impact of the scheme on Scurragh Lane later in this report.

6.2.4 The scheme is included in the Targeted Programme of Improvements [3.7.1]. It has been granted provisional funding. Construction would commence in 2008, as soon as reasonably practicable after completion of the necessary statutory requirements [3.7.3]. It is the subject of Early Contractor Involvement in the form of an Amec/Alfred McAlpine joint venture [3.7.2].

6.2.5 This evidence establishes to my mind that the scheme is economically sound, reasonably assured of attracting funding and likely to be constructed within or close to the time-frame indicated.

6.3 Objections

6.3.1 Introduction

6.3.1.1 I remind myself that the primary purpose of this report is to address the scheme promoted by the HA. It is not part of my remit to put forward a different scheme drawing on alternative detailed proposals made by objectors. Only if I conclude that an element in the HA's scheme is unsatisfactory should I recommend that an Alternative to that element put forward by an objector warrants further investigation.

6.3.1.2 Among the objections to individual elements of the scheme and the alternatives put forward to meet claimed shortcomings of the scheme, there are two themes of general objection, which potentially call into question the appraisal of the scheme's impact on severance and therefore whether the scheme meets the criteria for the making of the SRO [6.1.3]. These are the provision of LARs and the provision for NMUs, and I turn to them next.

6.3.2 Local access roads

6.3.2.1 In my view, the HA's approach to this issue as set out in paragraph 3.3.11 is correct, in that it seeks to strike an appropriate balance between the likely usage of a new LAR against the financial and environmental costs of providing it.

Leeming to Catterick (OA10)

6.3.2.2 It is no longer in dispute that there is a need for an LAR along the full section length between the proposed Leeming to Catterick Central junctions. In the view of the HA, the additional factor which has shifted the balance in favour of this provision is the request of the NY Police, following new government guidance [5.5.8], for a means of emergency access and an exit route for some of the trapped traffic in the event of an incident blocking the proposed motorway.

6.3.2.3 It is to be noted that a limited form of access road was already to be provided between Leeming and Bowbridge Lane, and a full LAR was to be provided from the northern end of Low Street, as proposed to be realigned, to Catterick Central [3.3.11]. The additional cost of upgrading the Leeming to Bowbridge Lane section and of the new section between Bowbridge Lane and Low Street is estimated at some £600,000. The HA now accepts that the LAR along the full length of the Leeming to Catterick section, as proposed in OA10 [4.4.3], should be included in the scheme [5.5.8]. I agree both with the view of objectors who support this Alternative and with the revised view of the HA.

6.3.2.4 It seems clear to me (and indeed it is conceded by the HA) that to propose to amend the scheme to incorporate OA10 would amount to a substantial modification to the scheme. Moreover, it is likely to require an extension of the land required to be compulsorily acquired, and the agreement of the landowners in question is not before me. Supplementary orders may well be required. There is one subsisting counter-objection to the proposal [4.20.1]. I can therefore make no formal recommendation in respect of it. However, the cumulative benefits which its inclusion would bring in my view outweigh its cost and this leads me to conclude that I should recommend that it be further investigated.

6.3.2.5 I now turn to the two sections of LAR which remain matters of dispute between the parties.

Dishforth to Baldersby (OA1)

6.3.2.6 The HA's evidence as to the very limited impact on the local road network of the opening of the motorway as regards motorway-prohibited and

other diverted traffic has not been challenged [5.5.7]. There is equally no challenge to the HA's evidence as to cost and as to the extent and complexity of the consequent further land acquisition. The proponents of OA1 did not sustain their objection by an appearance at the inquiry. They have adduced no evidence of their own of likely use of such an LAR, if provided, nor is there any cogent evidence that there would be any significant adverse impact on the local road network [4.4.1]. I note that NYCC as local highway authority supports this provision, but it was not a matter relied on in the closing submission made on its behalf [5.5.7]. There is no basis on which I could therefore conclude that the HA's proposals are unsatisfactory in this regard and that OA1 therefore warrants further investigation.

Scotch Corner to Barton (OAs 23 and 24)

6.3.2.7 The case for an LAR along the most northern section of the scheme has strong support among objectors. Provision of this section of new LAR is supported by the County, District and Parish Councils [4.1.3, 4.3.2 and 4.4.4 to 4.4.20]. While this motorway section, less than 5 kilometres in length, does not fall within the new guidance [5.5.10], the NY Police have expressed a clear view that the provision of an LAR is desirable [4.4.17].

6.3.2.8 I was able to confirm in the course of my site inspections [1.2] that the villages of Melsonby and Middleton Tyas, and especially the latter, are vulnerable to traffic, and especially to HGVs, agricultural machinery and other large vehicles. Their respective vulnerabilities arise from different road configurations. Melsonby's roads, though by no means commodious, are generally straight and present some temptation to excessive speeds [4.4.8]. The roads in Middleton Tyas are by contrast tortuous and narrower, and there is clear evidence of physical damage to property and road furniture from large vehicles and other traffic [4.4.10, 4.4.12 and 4.4.13]. There is strong evidence that the impact of traffic, both literally, in the sense of this damage, and environmentally, through severance, noise and pollution, is severe. The vulnerability particularly of Middleton Tyas, which contains a large number of listed buildings and a conservation area, is recognised by the HA [5.5.9].

6.3.2.9 Coincidentally, I was also able to observe the impact of a serious incident on the existing A1 early on the closing day of the inquiry [4.4.5] when a northbound HGV crossed the central reservation, causing total closure of the A1 for a period of hours, followed by intermittent carriageway closures for the remainder of the day. I accept that an LAR could not be expected to accommodate more than a fraction of the traffic displaced from the motorway following a major incident. I also accept that such incidents are rare, and that, notwithstanding significant traffic growth, are likely to be less frequent following implementation of the scheme, by virtue of the increased number of carriageway lanes and the safer standard of the motorway generally [5.5.3].

6.3.2.10 The design of the Scotch Corner motorway junction would entail a lane loss and a lane gain [3.3.7]. I accept that this proposal would accommodate predicted traffic flows. Scotch Corner is a major road junction, with traffic leaving the A1 to join other routes, including the newly upgraded A66, and joining the A1 from these other routes. The lane gain/loss would permit the existing overbridge and roundabout infrastructure to be retained, resulting in

a significant cost saving. However, it is my view that the necessary lane-changing resulting from the gain and loss would create some additional hazard [4.4.16]. There would be a further lane gain/loss at the Barton junction only some 3 kilometres to the north [3.3.8]. The length of this motorway section would be little more than the minimum distance between junctions required to meet safety standards [5.18.5].

6.3.2.11 There therefore seem to me to be substantial grounds for believing that the provision of an LAR along this section of the motorway is advisable to assist on the occasion of a major incident. It seems to me that the arguments for an LAR to provide emergency access and egress for trapped traffic are, if anything, stronger in respect of the Scotch Corner to Barton section than the Leeming and Catterick, save only that the Scotch Corner to Barton section, being less than 5 kilometres long, does not fall within the new guidance.

6.3.2.12 I accept that the replacement of the Kneeton Hall bridge would obviate the need to use the current high load diversion route through Melsonby [5.5.11]. There would be some benefit to the village from this change, though the route is used only infrequently and the benefit would therefore be comparatively small [4.4.6].

6.3.2.13 The sole evidence before me as to traffic likely to be routinely displaced from the proposed motorway is that of the HA [5.5.10]. This is challenged by a number of objectors including NYCC and the Parish Councils, but these objectors provide no evidence to call that of the HA into cogent question. It seems to me, however, that even a marginal increase in through traffic would have a disproportionately adverse impact on Melsonby and Middleton Tyas. It is also to be borne in mind that, by their nature, motorway prohibited vehicles, such as learner drivers and agricultural machinery, may be expected to have an obstructive impact disproportionate to their numbers. The HA states that its modelling has taken into account all known development proposals [5.10.4], but it is clear that the proposed business park at Scotch Corner, for which planning permission has now been granted, will lead to a higher flow of traffic through Middleton Tyas [5.4.1].

6.3.2.14 There is also the issue of access provision in respect of the Sedbury Estate [4.9.1]. I do not accept, given the likely level of routine usage of the new Kneeton Hall bridge, that the segregation of this bridge is necessary as proposed in OA25 [4.9.2]. However, a small additional factor in favour of an LAR alongside this route section is the easier access which it could provide to Kneeton Hall and Violet Grange Farm and for the tenant of Violet Grange Farm who lives in Middleton Tyas [4.9.3].

6.3.2.15 None of these considerations or of the other matters raised by objectors with regard to this issue, taken alone, would be sufficient to cause me to conclude that an LAR as proposed between Scotch Corner and Barton would be appropriate. To my mind, however, their cumulative effect is to predicate further investigation. For these reasons, I conclude that the failure to provide an LAR along the Scotch Corner to Barton section of the proposed motorway is an unsatisfactory element of the scheme and that the Objectors' Alternatives therefore warrant further investigation.

6.3.2.16 Objectors put forward two Alternatives, OAs23 and 24. These are described in paragraph 4.4.20. In my view, both Alternatives should be fully investigated. I note the support for OA23 from Mr W G Baker Baker and the Baker Baker Settlement [4.9.3]. I also note the objection to this Alternative from Mr Hall and his lack of objection to OA24 [4.20.2]. These objections would fall to be considered in the course of further investigation of the Alternatives.

6.3.3 Provision for Non-Motorised Users

General points

6.3.3.1 A number of user groups and individual objectors have subsisting concerns regarding the provision under the scheme for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. A number of Objectors' Alternatives relate to further NMU provision. None of these is supported by NYCC, which as local highways authority, has responsibility for PRoWs. Neither the current NYCC PRoW Officer nor his predecessor supports any of the additional provisions put forward by objectors, or the latent demand approach advocated by some objectors [5.6.3]. In a number of cases, however, these additional provisions are supported by the relevant District and/or Parish Council.

6.3.3.2 I have considered carefully the latent demand approach urged on me by some objectors [4.5.1, 4.5.3, 4.5.13 and 4.18.1]. My task, however, is to assess the impact of this scheme on the existing PRoWs and on the other routes on the local road network available to and used by NMUs. I do not therefore accept as a principle that I should seek to turn back the clock in an attempt to assess the demand for and use of NMU crossings of the A1 at an earlier time. Nor, indeed, do I accept that would be practical to do so. To seek to assess demand as it might have been 40 years ago in a markedly different economic and social context would to my mind be an impossible task. With the exception of the informal survey conducted by the CTC [4.5.13], moreover, there is no evidence from which I might draw any such conclusions. I agree with the HA's submission as to the limited weight which it is possible to afford the CTC survey for the reasons set out in paragraph 5.6.8.

6.3.3.3 As conceded by all those who objected on NMU grounds, the HA's scheme represents a material improvement in NMU provision [5.6.6]. While the total number of crossings would decrease, those lost are at-grade crossings. While there is anecdotal evidence of limited continuing use of these crossings, NMU groups and individual objectors agreed in evidence that they are dangerous and intimidating, and that little use is made of them. This confirms the HA's survey evidence [5.6.7]. The maintenance and improvement of grade-separated crossings, taken with proposals to link up PRoWs which are currently cul-de-sacs, in some cases using the proposed LARs, amounts to my mind to a significant improvement in NMU provision. The existing A1 is also little used by NMUs, and the HA's proposals would materially improve NMU north-south accessibility [3.3.19]

6.3.3.4 I have had regard to the guidance set out in TA91/05, relied on by a number of objectors [4.5.2 and 5.6.5]. It is not disputed by objectors that most of the use of NMU routes is for leisure purposes, and it is clear that the

10% limit set out in TA91/05 applies only to essential trips. I also accept that calculation of the extent of a PRoW diversion is not without its difficulties and logically requires knowledge of starting point and destination [5.6.5].

6.3.3.5 With these considerations in mind, I have considered the survey evidence presented by the HA. Though some objectors expressed concerns as to its accuracy, there is no cogent evidence before me from which I could conclude that the level of demand for NMU crossings is materially greater than is claimed by the HA. In my view, the case for additional NMU crossings in general is therefore not made out on the evidence of very limited use before me.

6.3.3.6 I nevertheless consider the principal additional crossings proposed by objectors in the ensuing paragraphs.

Cowfold Bridge

6.3.3.7 The replacement of Cowfold Bridge is supported by Hambleton District Council, Exelby, Leeming and Newton Parish Council, and other objectors [4.2.3 to 4.2.5]. The Parish Council states that the HA's survey results significantly understate use of the Bridge by NMUs and that its loss would cause Exelby to be severed from the remainder of the Parish. If this were the case, I should have expected to see evidence of very substantial use of the existing bridge. I recognise that the HA's surveys coincided with closure of the Bridge to vehicular traffic [4.2.3]. Clearly, however, it was not closed to non-vehicular traffic, because the survey results record such use during both survey periods [5.3.4]. There is, moreover, no evidence before me from which I could conclude that the level of use of the Bridge has at any time in recent years been significantly greater than that recorded by the HA's surveys. The HA's survey was conducted some two years prior to the inquiry, and it has been open to objectors, including the District and Parish Councils, to conduct their own survey to challenge the evidence of the HA.

6.3.3.8 The alternative crossings to be provided are to my mind reasonably convenient. That both alternative routes are longer does not seem to me of much significance given that their main use is for leisure purposes. It is to be noted that the BHS accepts that the Bedale Beck underpass is an acceptable alternative [4.5.6]. The limited risk of flooding would not render the Bedale Beck route unusable on more than a few days per year on average [5.3.5], nor would there be to my mind any unacceptable risk to appropriately supervised children [4.2.5].

6.3.3.9 Given the additional cost and the adverse impacts of the replacement bridge proposed by objectors [5.3.3], I conclude that the proposal to replace the Cowfold Bridge (OA8) does not warrant further investigation.

Scurragh Lane

6.3.3.10 Many of the same arguments apply to the Objectors' Alternatives (OA20 to 22) which propose an NMU crossing between Scurragh Lane and Scurragh House Lane. There is very limited evidence of current use of this crossing. As I have concluded above, the survey of past and latent demand conducted by

the CTC is flawed. While there is anecdotal evidence of pedestrians and cyclists continuing to cross the A1 at-grade at this point, there is no evidence that such use is more than limited and sporadic [5.6.7]. It is to be noted that the formal closure of the crossing in the 1990s went without objection [5.6.10]. Mrs Brookes' informal survey suggests the presence of a large number of horse-owners, especially to the east of this section of the A1 [4.5.7], yet none objected to the closure of the crossing in the 1990s, and, with the exception of the BHS, Mrs Connolly and Mrs Brookes, none felt impelled to come to the inquiry to object to the failure of the promoted scheme to provide a new grade-separated NMU crossing at this point.

6.3.3.11 The scheme as proposed to be modified would provide two alternative NMU routes. A bridleway along the eastern side of the proposed motorway and the new LAR to its west would link both sides of this crossing point to Scotch Corner and to the to-be-retained Catterick North Bridge. I accept that it is unlikely that equestrians would wish to use the Scotch Corner junction [3.3.22]. I also accept that, depending on starting point and destination, the diversion via Catterick North may add significantly to journey length [4.5.5 and 4.5.12]. The evidence is that journeys using this proposed diversion would be for leisure purposes to which the 10% limit in the guidance does not apply [5.6.5]. It is therefore my view that the likely use of a crossing if provided at Scurragh Lane would not justify the additional cost or outweigh the adverse visual and ecological impacts [5.6.11].

Other proposed NMU provision

6.3.3.12 I have considered the other additional crossings proposed by NMU groups and individual objectors. I have, however, concluded above that the scheme as promoted by the HA would improve NMU provision compared with the current situation, and that it is the current situation and not some other historical base against which the scheme's NMU provision should be assessed. With the motorway in place there would be an NMU crossing (including those shared with other traffic) on average every 2 kilometres or so [5.6.1]. Moreover, I can identify no unacceptable gap between the crossings proposed which might need to be filled with one of the extra crossings proposed by objectors. While I recognise the preference of NMUs for segregated crossings, there is no evidence to suggest that, as proposed to be designed [5.6.18], crossings shared with other traffic could not generally be made safe for use by NMUs.

6.3.3.13 Mrs Connolly considers that the LAR verges should be provided with fully segregated, fenced provision for equestrians [4.5.8]. However, the scheme proposals provide verges significantly in excess of those predicated by government guidance, with only very limited exceptions [3.3.20]. There would be very clear advantages to NMUs from the LAR provision, both by reason of the reconnection of currently unusable PRoW and minor road crossings of the A1 and of the marked improvement in the availability of north-south NMU routes [3.3.19]. The LAR provision would be further enhanced if OA10 is adopted. The provision of verges at both the foot and the top of the embankment approaching Gatenby Bridge would to my mind meet the concerns of Mr and Mrs McIntyre regarding the proposed re-opening of Bridleway No. 10.415/1 [4.14.1 and 5.14.1]. I note that a strip would be

provided on both sides of the LARs between the carriageway and the verge for the use of cyclists [3.3.20].

6.3.3.14 There is no evidence from which I could conclude that there is any prospect that the four dismantled railways crossed by the A1 will be reinstated [4.18.15 and 5.18.13], and that the crossings should therefore be retained. Two of the crossings could be reconstructed at a reasonable cost if ever required [5.18.13]. One of these is the disused Richmond railway underpass retention of which is sought by RDC as OA18 [4.3.5]. There is again no evidence that a PRow using the underpass might foreseeably be established and the proposal does not have the support of NYCC [5.18.13]. In my view, the additional expense of reinstating this underpass in the course of the upgrade cannot therefore be justified.

6.3.3.15 Mrs Brookes and Mrs Connolly propose special provision for equestrians in the Brompton South underpass [4.5.7]. This would require other traffic to come to a halt and would clearly have an adverse impact on traffic flows. The proposal is opposed by the Parish Council and local residents [5.6.15]. There is no evidence before me, for example as to current use of the underpass by equestrians, from which I could conclude that such provision is warranted by its likely future use; nor is there evidence to support Mrs Brookes' contention that extending the underpass by 10 metres or about 35% would add unacceptably to the risk to equestrians of using it [4.5.7]. I have noted that the underpass would be lit and that provision would be made for equestrians in accordance with current design standards [5.6.15].

6.3.3.16 I conclude that the NMU provision in the scheme as proposed to be modified amounts to an improvement over the current situation and is satisfactory. I do not therefore consider that any of the additional provisions put forward by objectors, including OAs 3, 11 and 15, warrants further investigation.

6.3.3.17 Having addressed the two general issues raised by objectors, I now turn to individual cases of objection.

6.3.4 Scurragh Lane Residents

6.3.4.1 I have addressed above the challenges made on behalf of these objectors to the HA's traffic modelling [6.2.2 and 6.2.3]. I turn therefore to assessing the impact of the scheme on the Residents. The northbound carriageway of the existing A1 passes the eastern end of Scurragh Lane, and the garden of the nearest property is contiguous with the nearside verge [4.10.1]. I was able to observe the layout of the Lane and its relationship to the existing A1 and the proposed line of the motorway in the course of my site inspections [1.2].

6.3.4.2 With the scheme in place, the north-bound carriageway of the existing A1 would become the LAR, and the mainline A1 would be moved to the east so that the western edge of the northbound motorway carriageway would roughly equate to the western edge of the existing southbound carriageway [5.10.8]. In both the Opening and Design Years the LAR would carry very substantially less traffic than either the proposed motorway or the existing A1

in the Do Minimum scenario [5.10.8]. Moving the mainline A1 further east would somewhat reduce noise levels at Scurragh Lane, and would also reduce the general impact which the proximity of this major trunk route has on properties in Scurragh Lane. Among other benefits would be the provision of access via the LAR both north to Scotch Corner and south to Catterick without joining the A1.

6.3.4.3 I am therefore unable to conclude that the HA's scheme as promoted is unsatisfactory in its impact on the Residents. The Alternatives put forward by these objectors would all add significantly to the cost of the scheme, would thwart the HA's aim of re-using existing infrastructure wherever possible, would increase the extent of compulsory land acquisition, and have an additional adverse impact on landscape and ecology [5.10.7]. For these reasons, I am unable to conclude that the Alternatives merit further investigation.

6.3.4.4 An anti-glare barrier is to be provided on the western side of the proposed motorway between the LAR and the northbound carriageway [5.10.9]. It seems to me that there may be scope for providing a more substantial noise barrier in this location. I accept, however, that the scope to do so would be limited by space and also by landscape considerations.

6.3.4.5 I have addressed at paragraph 6.3.3.10 and 6.3.3.11 the additional NMU crossing proposed at Scurragh Lane which forms part of OAs20 to 22. The Residents' concerns as to ecological impacts [4.10.14] seem to me to be met by the mitigation proposed by the HA [3.10.12 to 3.10.20]. I can make no recommendation regarding provisions such as the offline "breathing space" proposed by the Residents [4.10.2], since this would clearly not be for the purposes of the scheme.

6.3.5 Tunstall Road Action Committee

6.3.5.1 TRAC takes the view that traffic flows through Tunstall are likely to be significantly higher, compared with the Do Minimum scenario, if the scheme is put in place [4.12.2]. There is, however, no evidence to support this assertion or to challenge the HA's evidence that the scheme would cause no material additional traffic flow through the village, and that it may lead to some reduction compared with the Do Minimum scenario by reason of the more convenient alternative route to be provided via the A6136 [5.12.2].

6.3.5.2 As I was able to confirm in the course of my site visits [1.2], the existing T-junction on the Tunstall Road is separated from the village by a considerable distance [5.12.4], and also by a low intervening ridge. I do not accept that retention of this junction in the form of a substandard bend would have any significant traffic-calming impact in Tunstall itself. If speeds are to be reduced and the route through Tunstall thereby perhaps rendered less attractive to drivers than the alternative via the A6136, then to my mind the appropriate action would be to install traffic-calming measures in the village itself, as now proposed by NYCC [5.12.4].

6.3.5.3 The promoted straightened and more direct alignment of Tunstall Road would provide safety and journey time benefits. The HA's proposals in this

respect are therefore not unsatisfactory and I do not propose to recommend that OA14 merits further investigation. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the submission of Mr P and Mr F Donaldson [4.18.10 and 4.18.11]. I accept that moving the alignment of Tunstall Road as proposed in OA14 would result in a smaller land take from the Farm. There is, however, no evidence before me to suggest that the extent of compulsory acquisition proposed would create undue hardship or render the Farm non-viable, or that this objection is therefore more than a compensation issue, which, as I explained at the inquiry, is not for me to address.

6.3.6 Private means of access

6.3.6.1 With regard to the provision of private means of access, there are two aspects of the SRO which cause me concern.

Eastern Harvesters Limited

6.3.6.2 There are currently two accesses to this objector's premises from which an agricultural machinery repair and supply business is conducted. It is not in dispute that both of these accesses are currently of adequate width (subject to restrictions at certain points) to allow two exceptionally wide loads to pass [4.7.2]. Although traffic flows to and from the premises are small, it is a not-unusual event for such vehicles to need to pass on the access tracks.

6.3.6.3 A single access would be provided under the scheme [5.8.1]. This, however, would be of insufficient width to allow two wide loads to pass. In my view, this inadequate width, taken with the lack of a protected right turn at the junction of the access with the B6267, would render the alternative significantly less convenient than the existing two full-width accesses. There is in my view a real prospect that conflicting wide loads would create an impasse on the access track and/or an obstruction on the B6267. To my mind therefore, the access track as promoted in the scheme does not meet the criteria set out above with regard to the SRO. Widening the access track would require the acquisition of some 423 square metres of additional land [5.8.2], an acquisition to which the relevant landowner now consents [4.7.4]. This provision would obviate a protected right turn at the B6267 junction, and OA7 would not therefore merit further investigation. I propose to recommend that the scheme be modified in this respect.

Mr J D Middleton

6.3.6.4 The sole access to the site owned by Mr Middleton is currently direct from the southbound carriageway of the A1 [4.15.1] and it would be necessary to stop this up as part of the upgrade to motorway status. I have had full regard to the HA's response to this objection and to OA4 [5.15.1]. I accept that the HA may well be correct when it states that the value of the site, given the restrictions placed on it, does not warrant expenditure of £48,000 on extending the proposed access to the Croft so as to provide access to the site.

6.3.6.5 This is essentially a matter of legal interpretation, and therefore not for me to determine. However, I find it difficult to accept that stopping up the sole existing access and providing no replacement for it could satisfy the requirement that "another reasonably convenient access is available or will be

provided" [6.1.3]. It may therefore be a legal requirement that an alternative access be provided, whether in the form of OA4 or otherwise. I make no recommendation with regard to OA4.

6.3.7 Other issues raised by objectors

6.3.7.1 North Yorkshire County Council: In addition to the Scotch Corner to Barton LAR addressed above, NYCC has unresolved concerns as to the adequacy of two junctions on the local road network [4.1.5]. No cogent evidence or argument has been adduced to support NYCC's submission that the HA's proposals are so significantly flawed as to require modification of the Orders. In my view, any changes to the layout of the junctions which might prove necessary as a result of on-going modelling, could, as suggested by the HA [5.2.4 and 5.2.5], be incorporated at detailed design stage without formal modification of the Orders. The robustly positive out-turn of the scheme's economic appraisal does not seem to me to absolve the HA from obtaining the best value for money [4.1.6 and 5.2.6].

6.3.7.2 Hambleton District Council: I have had regard to the objections relating to the impact on the local road network in the Leeming Bar area [4.2.2 and 4.18.12 to 4.18.14]. I accept that the impact of additional traffic on Leases Road, especially at its northern end, is likely to be substantial. This impact in large part flows from the completion of the industrial estate, combined with the failure to construct the BALB contemporaneously with the A1 improvement scheme as was originally envisaged [5.18.9]. Clearly, construction of the BALB in early course is desirable, contained in Local Transport Plan policy as it is, but the BALB does not form part of the scheme before me. Construction of the proposed link between the industrial estate and the motorway junction at Leeming is in my view necessary so as to permit commercial vehicles to exit the estate in a northerly direction, reducing the pressure on the Crossways junction which is currently operating beyond its capacity [3.8.7, third bullet]. Construction of a link which would serve only part of the Industrial Estate does not seem to me to provide a workable solution [4.2.2], and would not significantly reduce traffic levels in Leases Road. Pending the construction of the BALB, measures to control traffic levels in Leases Road, including the use of appropriate signage, falls to be exercised by NYCC as local highway authority.

6.3.7.3 Richmondshire District Council: Locating the balancing pond [4.3.4] on the Harris land as proposed by the HA represents the more efficient engineering solution [5.4.2]. There is no guidance predicating the location of this pond on a greenfield site, nor any suggestion that there is a current or foreseeable shortage of development land in the District [5.4.3]. As to the caravan park at Limekiln Wood [4.3.6], there is no evidence from which I could conclude that the adverse impact of additional noise with mitigation in place [5.4.5] would be unacceptable. The alignment has been chosen, correctly in my view, to minimise the impact on the Baines Farm SAM.

6.3.7.4 Councillor Pelton: The cost and adverse environmental impacts of OA16 [5.7.2] were not disputed by Councillor Pelton. The scheme as promoted by the HA appears to me to deal satisfactorily with traffic flows in the Catterick area [4.6.1, 5.7.1 and 5.7.2]. I conclude that OA16 does not warrant further

investigation.

6.3.7.5 Motorway Service Areas: MSA issues are raised by T M Jopling & Partners and others [4.11] and by the Shell and BP oil companies [4.18.6]. While there has been some consideration of MSA provision [5.11.2], it does not form part of the scheme before me. There is no basis accordingly on which I could make any recommendation in this regard, or propose that OAs5 and 6 warrant further investigation. Other issues raised by these objectors are matters of compensation.

6.3.7.6 Mr P and Mrs J Chapman: I address OAs12 and 13 at paragraph 6.3.8.1. The HA's proposals with regard to access to Sowber Hill and Bainesse Farms seem to me satisfactory [4.13.2 and 5.13.1]. The mitigation proposed by the HA would reduce any additional adverse impact on the Farms to an acceptable level. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the farming enterprise would be rendered non-viable by the acquisition of land, or that any of the land proposed to be acquired is not required for the purposes of the scheme, including appropriate NMU provision.

6.3.7.7 Gatherley Road/Catterick North Junction: I am satisfied that the Catterick Central junction best rationalises A1 junction provision in the Catterick area. A second junction in the Catterick area would not meet safety standards, and, in any event, the use of Catterick North overbridge and the LAR to Scotch Corner provides a reasonably convenient alternative route [4.18.7, 4.18.8, and 5.18.5 to 5.18.7]. I do not therefore propose to recommend that there be further investigation of OA19. The likely usage, cost and the severe environmental impact of OA17 [4.18.9 and 5.18.7] in my view also preclude its incorporation in the scheme. The issue regarding signage raised by Mr Proom [4.17.1] is or will be, following detrunking, a matter for NYCC as local highway authority.

6.3.7.8 Mr Woodhead: In my view the mitigation proposed at Baldersby would minimise the long-term impact on landscape [4.18.16 and 3.10.8]. In seeking to achieve a balance between landscape and noise mitigation, the HA has had regard to the low level of use of the NMU routes in the vicinity [5.18.14]. Given the distance between the proposed motorway and Mr Woodhead's property, there is unlikely to be any perceptible additional noise impact arising from the scheme.

6.3.8 Objectors' Alternatives

6.3.8.1 I have considered all of the Alternatives proposed by objectors, and have addressed most of them earlier in this section of the report. In my view, the alignment of the proposed motorway in the vicinity of Bainesse Farm represents the best balance achievable and I do not therefore believe that OAs 12 and 13 warrant further investigation [4.19.2 and 5.19.1]. As to OA2, I conclude that the additional expense would not be warranted by any improvement to the scheme [4.19.2 and 5.19.1].

6.3.9 Objections to modifications proposed by the HA

6.3.9.1 I have had regard to the written objection of Mr and Mrs Hutton-Squire

to OA10 [4.20.1]. However, for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.3.2.4, I take the view that an LAR should be provided throughout the Leeming to Catterick motorway section, though for reasons set out in the same paragraph, I can make no formal recommendation in this regard.

6.3.9.2 I have also noted Mr Hall's objection regarding OA23 [4.20.2]. I propose to recommend that the issue of the provision of an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton be further investigated. Mr Hall would have the opportunity of having his objection to OA23 and his preference for OA24 taken into account as part of that process.

6.3.9.3 As to the objection of Messrs Pinkney [4.16], I have addressed the question of the Scurragh Lane crossing at paragraph 6.3.3.11. In the absence of a crossing at Scurragh Lane, the bridleway proposed as M13 seems to me necessary so as to provide a reasonably convenient alternative NMU route, for equestrians in particular. In the absence of the agreement of the landowner, however, I can make no formal recommendation in this respect. There is also no basis on which I could recommend that the bridleway proposed as M7 should be designated as a restricted byway [4.21 and 5.21].

6.4 Environmental Assessment

The Environmental Statement and the Appraisal Summary Table

6.4.1 Having addressed the detailed concerns of objectors, I turn to the assessment of the general environmental impacts of the scheme. I have taken the ES and the substantial range of supporting environmental evidence (see Annex B) into account in reaching my conclusions. There is little sustained challenge to the environmental evidence adduced by the HA. I have had regard to the responses of statutory consultees. The limited issues raised regarding the ES by Travelodge and another [4.18.3 to 4.18.5 and 5.18.2 to 5.18.3] do not in my view suffice to render it non-compliant. There was also no sustained challenge to any of the general conclusions in the Appraisal Summary Table, and they have not been altered as a result of the inquiry.

6.4.2 With mitigation in place where appropriate, none of the adverse impacts of the scheme is greater than moderate adverse. There are also a number of beneficial impacts both in absolute terms, and in relative terms compared with the Do Minimum scenario.

Landscape

6.4.3 As far as the impact on landscape is concerned, I recognise that in the scheme Opening Year there would be a number of significant adverse impacts, not least at the Baldersby and Catterick Central junctions [3.10.8 and 3.10.9]. The mitigating effect over time of the screening proposed would by 2025 reduce the locations where there would be a subsisting moderate adverse impact to only five, while a significant number of properties would enjoy a moderate beneficial impact [3.10.10]. By 2025, those benefiting would outweigh those suffering an adverse impact, justifying, in my view, the AST overall assessment of moderate beneficial.

Ecology

6.4.4 There are no SSSIs or other statutory nature conservation sites affected by the scheme [3.10.15]. The impact on the Pallet Hill SINC, a non-statutory site of importance for wetland birds, has been minimised by a revision to the proposed location of the Catterick Central junction [3.10.16]. The scheme would nevertheless have a potential adverse impact on protected species. In the case of the great crested newt, which is considered the species most vulnerable to an adverse impact [3.10.19], the mitigation includes the provision of new pond and ancillary habitat. Proposals for the mitigation of the impacts on ecology have been agreed with Natural England, which has no objection to the scheme [3.10.20]. The AST assessment of the ecological impact of the scheme in 2025 with mitigation in place as slight adverse seems to me correct.

Water quality and flooding

6.4.5 In my view, the opportunity provided by the scheme to introduce modern methods of dealing with rain water run-off and protecting the water environment against pollution from spillages would, as stated in the AST, amount to a significant beneficial impact [3.10.21]. The scheme would have no impact on flood risk [3.10.22]. There is no objection from the Environment Agency.

Noise and vibration

6.4.6 The HA's case with regard to noise is that while some properties would experience an increase in noise impact if the scheme is constructed, more would experience such an impact in the Do Minimum scenario as a result of traffic growth on the existing A1 [3.10.28 and 3.10.29]. Among the beneficial impacts of the scheme are that:

- Some properties would experience a reduction in noise levels as a result of the scheme, whereas none would do so if the scheme does not proceed; and
- Because the Noise Insulation Regulations apply only where new roads are built or existing roads altered, properties predicted to suffer a substantial noise impact may qualify for insulation. Under the Regulations none could qualify in the Do Minimum scenario.

6.4.7 In the case of those properties where there would be a substantial increase in noise levels, appropriate mitigation would be provided [3.10.30]. The AST records, correctly in my view, a net improvement in the noise environment.

6.4.8 The short-term impacts of noise and vibration during construction would also be minimised through the terms of the construction contract, in consultation and by agreement with the District Councils [3.10.33].

Air Quality

6.4.9 With the scheme in place there would be a net reduction in public exposure to air pollution compared with the Do Minimum scenario [3.10.35] This is

mainly by reason of the reduction in the number of properties within 200 metres of the carriageway of the proposed motorway compared with the number at present within 200 metres of the A1 trunk road. The predicted additional CO₂ emissions are the result of higher average vehicle speeds [3.10.35].

Cultural Heritage

6.4.10 The A1 corridor is rich in cultural heritage, especially but not exclusively dating from the period of the Roman occupation [3.10.37]. The A1 has been a major north-south route for many centuries. In the last century, the A1 was widened and realigned on more than one occasion, with major adverse impacts on archaeological remains [3.10.38]. The current scheme has been designed to avoid further significant impacts on identified sites of archaeological interest, especially in the vicinity of the three SAMs along the route [3.10.39]. There would be no impact on any listed building. The direct impact on the listed milestone would to my mind be adequately mitigated by its proposed relocation [3.10.40]. The cultural heritage assessment and the on-going mitigation strategy have been agreed with English Heritage and the County Archaeologist, and there is no objection from either party [3.10.36].

6.5 Compulsory acquisition of land

6.5.1 I have considered the extent of land proposed to be acquired in the light of the criteria set out in paragraph 6.1.4, and I have had regard to the case of the HA in this respect [3.11] which has not been materially challenged. I have satisfied myself that all the land contained in the CPO is required for the purposes of the scheme. As I conclude in paragraph 6.7.1, there are clear and substantial public benefits which would arise from implementation of the scheme, and these to my mind constitute a compelling reason in the public interest for compulsory acquisition of the land required.

6.5.2 I am satisfied by the HA's case that it has a clear idea of how it intends to use the land to be acquired, that there is a reasonable prospect of funding to implement the scheme, that there is no obstacle to implementation of the scheme, that the land acquisition proposed would not be premature, and that all of the land contained in the draft Order is required for the purposes of the scheme.

6.6 Modifications

6.6.1 Including the incorporation of OA10, the HA now proposes 17 modifications to the scheme. OA10 is described in paragraph 4.4.3, modifications M1-15 are detailed in paragraph 3.12.2, and M16 is described in paragraph 4.1.2.

6.6.2 I accept that incorporating OA10 would amount to a substantial modification and that it would therefore be subject to the provisions of paragraph 8(3) of Schedule 1 to the 1980 Act. In my view, provision of the additional LAR proposed would effect a significant improvement to the scheme, but, pending completion of these further procedures, I am unable to make any formal recommendation. I note that if OA10 is adopted modification M10 would no longer be required.

6.6.3 As to the other proposed modifications, all appear to me desirable as either representing improvements to the scheme, or, in the cases of M7, M8 and M15, correcting errors.

6.6.4 M1-9, and M11, M12, M14 and M16 either require no additional land acquisition, or the written consent of the landowner has been obtained and is contained in DD222A [3.12.1]. I propose to recommend that the scheme be modified in these respects.

6.6.5 In the case of modifications M10, M13 and M15, additional land take is required and the written consents of the landowners have not been obtained. Indeed, these modifications are objected to by the landowners [3.12.4]. As noted above, M10 would not be required if OA10 is adopted. While I accept that these modifications would all constitute improvements to the scheme, in the absence of consent from the owners to the additional land acquisition, I am unable to make any formal recommendation in their regard.

6.6.6 In addition to the modifications proposed by the HA, I take the view that further investigation is warranted of the Alternatives proposing an LAR between Scotch Corner and Barton [6.3.2.15 and 6.3.2.16] and that further consideration be given with regard to access to Mr Middleton's site, whether by way of OA4 or otherwise [6.3.6.4 and 6.3.6.5].

6.6.7 In the case of the modification to the access to the premises of Eastern Harvesters Limited [6.3.6.3], the written consent of the adjoining landowner has been supplied, and I propose to recommend that the scheme be modified accordingly.

6.7 Summary of Conclusions

6.7.1 In my view, clear transport and economic benefits would flow from implementation of the scheme, and, with appropriate mitigation in place and subject to the matters set out in the ensuing paragraph, there would be no subsisting major adverse environmental impacts. I have considered all objections to details of the scheme and all Objectors' Alternatives, both those made orally at the inquiry and those in written submissions.

6.7.2 I have set out in section 6.6, the respects in which I believe that the scheme requires modification, and the other scheme elements where I consider that further investigation is warranted. In all other respects I propose to recommend that the Orders be made as drafted.

6.8 Conclusions as to the individual Orders

6.8.1 The Appropriation Order: Subject to the issue of the Scotch Corner to Barton LAR and to the incorporation of the Leeming to Catterick LAR proposed in OA10, I conclude that the criterion set out in paragraph 6.1.3 is met, and that the Order should be made.

6.8.2 I have set out, also in paragraph 6.1.3, the criteria against which the Side Roads Order is to be considered. Subject to the matters set out in section 6.3.6, I conclude that the Order should be made.

6.8.3 The criteria against which the Compulsory Purchase Order is to be assessed are set out in paragraph 6.1.4. I have concluded in section 6.5 that these criteria are met.

6.8.4 As to the Detrunking Order, there is no objection from NYCC to the HA's proposals to detrunk sections of the A1 trunk road following the construction of the motorway. There is also no objection to the Section and Connecting Roads Scheme, and, given my conclusion as to the benefits of the scheme, I conclude that it is expedient that the Order and Scheme should be made.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 I recommend that

The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Appropriation) Order 20..

The draft A1 Trunk Road (Dishforth to Barton)(Detrunking) Order 20..

and

The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section and Connecting Roads) Scheme 20..

be made.

7.2 I further recommend that

The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Side Roads) Order 20..

and

The draft A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section) Compulsory Purchase Order (MP No.) 20..

be modified as set out in paragraphs 6.6.4 and 6.6.7 of this report, and, so modified, be made.

7.3 I make no formal recommendation with regard to the proposed modifications set out in paragraph 6.6.5 of this report. As indicated in paragraph 6.6.6, I consider that Objectors' Alternatives OA10, OA23 and OA24 warrant further investigation.

C J Tipping

Inspector

Annex A

APPEARANCES

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

represented by

Mr P Tucker of Counsel instructed by the Treasury Solicitor

He called

Mr A Duckworth Project Leader, Highways Agency

Mr A Ross Transport Engineering Sector, Faber Maunsell

Mr S Wallace Technical Director, Carl Bro Consultants

Mr P W Beswick Technical Director, RPS Group

Mr B Vyner Archaeological Consultant

Mr A Barker Regional Director, Faber Maunsell

Mr A E Charles Director of Acoustics
RPS Planning Transport & Environment

OBJECTORS

(Note: All objectors' addresses are in North Yorkshire save where otherwise indicated)

**North Yorkshire
County Council** County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8AD
represented by

Miss N Allen of Counsel instructed by the Solicitor
North Yorkshire County Council

She called

Mr B Mason Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager
North Yorkshire County Council

Mr M Roberts Head of Highway Operations
North Yorkshire County Council

Hambleton District Council Civic Centre, Northallerton DL6 2UU
represented by

Mr A McCormack Planning Policy and Design Officer

| | |
|--|---|
| Richmondshire District Council represented by | Swale House, Frenchgate, Richmond DL10 4JE |
| Mr P L Earle | Planning and Development Unit Manager |
| Councillor J Blackie | Council Leader |
| Councillor J McMullon | Council Chairman |
| Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council represented by | 56 Brompton Court, Brompton-on-Swale Richmond DL10 7SB |
| Mr A Guest | Council Chairman |
| Exelby, Leeming and Newton Parish Council represented by | 33 Roman Road, Leeming, Northallerton DL7 9SB |
| Mr J Kettlewell | Council Chairman |
| Mrs M Stead | Clerk to the Council |
| Melsonby Parish Council represented by | Farm Cottage, 24 East Road, Melsonby Richmond DL10 5NF |
| Councillor Mrs J Stansfield | |
| Middleton Tyas Parish Council represented by | 7 Cumberland Garden, Middleton Tyas Richmond DL10 6SE |
| Councillor P J Nimmins | Council Chairman |
| Councillor P A Croft | |
| Councillor J Wilkinson | |
| British Horse Society represented by | Stoneleigh Deer Park, Kenilworth Warwickshire CV8 2XZ |
| Mr M Weston He called | Director of Access, Safety and Welfare |
| Dr J Sugden | Transport Planning Consultant |
| Cyclists Touring Club represented by | |
| Mr R Healey | 6 Howard Drive, York YO30 5XB |

| | |
|--|---|
| Mr T Ratcliffe | 33 Malvern Drive, Stokesley, TS9 5NS |
| The Ramblers' Association (Northallerton Group) represented by | 17 North Side, Hutton Rudby TS15 0DA |
| Mr J D Marshall | Footpath Officer |
| Councillor T Pelton | Joiners Cottage, High Green, Catterick DL10 7LN |
| Eastern Harvesters Limited represented by | Saxham, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk IP28 6QZ |
| Mr J Haigh | Lister Haigh, Chartered Surveyors 106 High Street, Knaresborough HG5 0HN |
| Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Limited represented by | |
| Miss F Patterson QC | instructed by Field Fisher Waterhouse LLP 35 Vine Street, London EC3N 2AA |
| W G Baker Baker and Others represented by | |
| Mr W H T Salvin | The Estate Office, Egglestone Abbey Barnard Castle, County Durham DL12 9TN |
| Scurragh Lane Residents represented by | |
| Mr C Henderson | Oaklee, Scurragh Lane Skeeby, Richmond DL10 5EG |
| T M Jopling & Partners and Others represented by | |
| Mr P W Squire | CB Richard Ellis, St Martin's Court 10 Paternoster Row, London EC4M 7HP |
| Tunstall Road Action Committee represented by | |
| Ms J Branch | Beckside, Tunstall, Richmond DL10 7 QN |
| Mr P Biggs | Beckside (as above) |
| Mrs Y Brookes | Brewery House, 14 Richmond Road Brompton-on-Swale DL10 7HE |

Mr P and Mrs J Chapman
represented by

Mr A Black Savills, 13-15 Micklegate, York YO1 6JH

Mrs R Connolly Aldborough House, Aldborough St John
Richmond DL11 7TP

Mr and Mrs J E McIntyre Theakston Farm, Bedale, DL8 2HL

Mr J D Middleton Barrenthwaite Hall, North Stainmore
Kirkby Stephen, Cumbria CA17 4EU

Mr F and Mr J Pinkney Hall Farm, Moulton, Richmond DL10 6QH

Mr H Proom 40 High Street, Catterick, DL10 7LD

COUNTER-OBJECTOR

Mr C Hall Thorndale Trout Farm, Melsonby DL10 5NJ

Annex B

DOCUMENTS

A. DEPOSIT DOCUMENTS

Draft Orders

- DD1 The A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Appropriation) Order 20..
- DD2 The A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section and Connecting Roads) Scheme 20..
- DD3 The A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Side Roads) Order 20..
- DD4 The A1 Trunk Road (Dishforth to Barton) (Detrunking) Order 20..
- DD5 The A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton Section) Compulsory Purchase Order (MP No.) 20..
- DD6 The A1 Motorway (Dishforth to Barton) Public Consultation leaflet
- DD7 Draft Orders Publication leaflet, including Revision of Preferred Route, Explanatory Statement and Non Technical Summary of the Environmental Statement

Government Policy & Plans

- DD8 The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030 (2004)
- DD9 A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone. The Government's White Paper on the Future of Transport (1998)
- DD10 A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England (1998)
- DD11 A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England: Understanding the New Approach to Appraisal (1998)
- DD12 Transport 2010: The 10 Year Plan (2000)
- DD13 Transport Ten Year Plan 2000 Delivering Better Transport Progress Report
- DD14 The UK Biodiversity Action Plan.
- DD15 Highways Agency Biodiversity Action Plan (2002)

Legislation and Regulations

- DD16 Highways Act 1980
- DD17 Acquisition of Land Act 1981
- DD18 Land Compensation Act 1973

- DD19 Environmental Protection Act 1990
- DD20 Water Resources Act 1991
- DD21 Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984
- DD22 Noise and Statutory Nuisance Act 1993
- DD23 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
- DD24 The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- DD25 The Hedgerow Regulations 1997
- DD26 Wild Mammals Protection Act 1996
- DD27 Protection of Badgers Act 1992
- DD28 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended)
- DD29 Environment Act 1995
- DD30 Part IV of the Environment Act 1995, Local Air Quality Management,
Technical Guidance LAQM.TG (03)
- DD31 Land Drainage Act 1994
- DD32 Control of Pollution Act 1974
- DD33 Planning and Compensation Act 1991
- DD34 Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- DD35 The Countryside Act 1968
- DD36 The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975
- DD37 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949
- DD38 New Roads and Street Works Act 1991
- DD39 Water Industry Act 1991
- DD40 Electricity Act 1989
- DD41 Gas Act 1986
- DD42 Telecommunications Act 1984
- DD43 Pipelines Act 1962
- DD44 Traffic Signs Manual (Chapter 8) 2006 Regulations
- DD45 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1988

-
- DD46 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1994
- DD47 The Highways (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1999
- DD48 Noise Insulation Regulations 1975
- DD49 Noise Insulation (Amendment) Regulations 1988
- DD50 Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000
- DD51 Air Quality Limit Values Regulations 2001
- DD52 Air Quality Limit Values (Amendment) Regulations 2003)
- DD53 Surface Water (River Ecosystem) (classification) Regulations 1994
- DD54 The Groundwater Regulations 1998
- DD55 The Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc) Regulations 1994, as amended
- DD56 The Highways (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994
- DD57 The Compulsory Purchase by Ministers (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994
- DD58 Secretary of State's Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1990
- DD59 Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations (2000)
- DD60 The Highways Noise Payment and Movable Homes (England) Regulations 2000
- DD61 The Highways Noise Payment and Movable Homes (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2000
- DD62 Surface Water Quality Regulations 2000
- DD63 The Street Works (Sharing of Costs of Works) (England) Regulations 2000
- DD64 The Street Works (Recovery of Costs) (England) Regulations 2002
- European Union Directives**
- DD65 EC Directive on the Assessment of Certain Public and Private Projects on the Environment (85/337/EEC)
- DD66 Directive 97/11/EEC, which amends Directive 85/337/EEC
- DD67 EC Freshwater Fisheries Directive (78/659/EEC)
- DD68 EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (Birds Directive 1979) as amended (79/409/EEC)

DD69 The EC Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (92/43/EEC) also called the Habitats Directive

DD70 The Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC as amended by 91/692/EEC)

DD71 EC Dangerous Substances Directive 76/464/EEC.

DD72 Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC.

DD73 Berne Convention (1979). Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats.

Planning Policy and Guidance

DD74 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivery Sustainable Development (2005)

DD75 Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004)

DD76 Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation (2005)

DD77 Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004)

DD78 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 1: General guide to water pollution and prevention

DD79 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 2: Above ground oil storage tanks

DD80 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 3: Use and design of oil separators in surface water drainage systems

DD81 Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport

DD82 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 5: Works in, near or liable to affect watercourses

DD83 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 6: Working at construction and demolition sites

DD84 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 8: Safe storage and disposal of used oils

DD85 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 14: Development on Unstable Land

DD86 Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment

DD87 Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning

DD88 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 21: Pollution incidence response planning

DD89 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 22: Dealing with spillages on highways

DD90 Pollution Prevention Guidelines 23: Maintenance of structures over water

DD91 Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise (July 1994)

DD92 Planning Policy Guidance 25: Development and Flood Risk (2001)

Local Planning Policy and Guidance

DD93 Hambleton District Wide Local Plan, Adopted 1999

DD94 Hambleton District Council Biodiversity Action Plan 2002

DD95 Harrogate District Local Plan, Adopted 2001

DD96 Harrogate District Local Plan Selective Alterations 2004

DD97 Harrogate Biodiversity Action Plan, Harrogate Borough Council (undated)

DD98 North Yorkshire County Structure Plan, Adopted 1995

DD99 North Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006

DD100 Richmondshire Local Plan 1999-2006, Adopted 2001

DD101 Richmondshire Biodiversity Action Plan 2005

Design Standards, Advice And Guidance

DD102 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 1: Highway Structures:
Approval Procedures and General Design

DD103 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 2: Highway Structures:
Design (Substructures and Special Structures) Materials

DD104 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 3: Highway Structures:
Inspection and Maintenance

DD105 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 4: Geotechnics and Drainage

DD106 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 5: Assessment and
Preparation of Road Schemes

DD107 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6: Road Geometry

DD108 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 7: Pavement Design and
Maintenance

DD109 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 8: Traffic Signs and Lighting

DD110 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 9: Network – Traffic Control
and Communications

DD111 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 10: Environmental Design and
Management

DD112 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 11: Environmental
Assessment

-
- DD113 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 12: Traffic Appraisal of Roads Schemes
- DD114 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 13: Economic Assessment of Road Schemes (COBA Manual)
- DD115 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 14: Economic Assessment of Road Maintenance (QUADRO Manual)
- DD116 A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England: Guidance on the New Approach to Appraisal (1998)
- DD117 Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies (GOMMMS, Vol. 1) (2000)
- DD118 Guidance on the Methodology for Multi-Modal Studies (GOMMMS, Vol. 2) (2000)
- DD119 Applying the Multi-Modal Approach to Appraisal to Highway Schemes ('The Bridging Document') (2001)
- DD120 HM Treasury revised edition of its Green Book, Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government, (2003)
- DD121 Major Scheme Appraisal in Local Transport Plans: Part 1: Detailed Guidance on Public Transport and Highways Schemes (2002)
- DD122 ODPM Circular 02/03: Compulsory Purchase Orders
- DD123 GOMMMS Supplement - Transport Appraisal and the new Green Book (2003)
- DD124 Guidance for Safer Temporary Traffic Management, TRL Ltd, 2002
- DD125 Towards a balance with nature: Highways Agency Environmental Strategic Plan (1999)
- DD126 Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (1988)
- DD127 WebTAG guidance (available at website www.WebTAG.org.uk)
- DD128 Clements, D.K. & Tofts, R.J. (1992): Hedgerow Evaluation and Grading System (HEGS): A Methodology for the Ecological Survey, Evaluation and Grading of Hedgerows (Test Draft). Countryside Planning and Management.
- DD129 Cresswell, W. & Whitworth R. (2004): English Nature Research Report Number 576, An assessment of the efficiency of capture techniques and the value of different habitats for the great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*. English Nature, Peterborough.
- DD130 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): CLR7 Assessment of Risks to Human Health from Land Contamination: An Overview of the Development of Soil Guideline Values and Related Research

-
- DD131 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): CLR8 Priority Contaminants for the Assessment of Land
- DD132 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): CLR9 Contaminants in Soil: Collation of Toxicological Data and Intake Values for Humans
- DD133 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): CLR10 The Contaminated Land Exposure Assessment Model (CLEA): Technical Basis and Algorithms
- DD134 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 1 Soil Guideline Values for Arsenic Contamination, March 2002
- DD135 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 3 Soil Guideline Values for Cadmium Contamination, March 2002
- DD136 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 4 Soil Guideline Values for Chromium Contamination, March 2002
- DD137 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 5 Soil Guideline Values for Inorganic Mercury Contamination, March 2002
- DD138 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 7 Soil Guideline Values for Nickel Contamination, March 2002
- DD139 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2005): Science Report SGV 8 Soil Guideline Values for Phenol Contamination, October 2005
- DD140 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 9 Soil Guideline Values for Selenium Contamination, March 2002
- DD141 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2002): R&D Publication SGV 10 Soil Guideline Values for Lead Contamination, March 2002
- DD142 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2004): Science Report SGV 15 Soil Guideline Values for Toluene Contamination, December 2004
- DD143 DEFRA and Environment Agency (2005): Science Report SGV 16 Soil Guideline Values for Ethylbenzene Contamination, December 2004 updated April 2005
- DD144 Environment Agency website (2004): Dangerous substances, Table 1: Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) for List 1 dangerous substances, EC Dangerous Substances Directive (76/464/EC), 13th October 2004
- DD145 Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (IEEM) (2005): Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, Final Draft
- DD146 Nature Conservancy Council (1989): Guidelines for Selection of Biological SSSIs. Nature Conservancy Council
- DD147 North Yorkshire SINC Panel (2002): Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation in North Yorkshire, Guidelines for Site Selection. North Yorkshire County Council

-
- DD148 Richmondshire District Council Planning and Development Unit (2004): Letter dated 21 June 2004
- DD149 Soil Survey of England and Wales (1983): Sheet 1 - Northern England
- DD150 Soil Survey of England and Wales (1984): Bulletin No. 10, Soils and their Use in Northern England by R. A Jarvis and others
- DD151 F A Swartjes (1999): Risk-based Assessment of Soil and Groundwater Quality in the Netherlands: Standards and Remediation Urgency. Risk Analysis 19(6): 1235-1249
- DD152 Valuation Office Agency Mineral Valuer North (March 2003): Highways Agency. A1 Motorway Dishforth to Barton Section. Contaminated Land Preliminary Stage One (Desk Study) Report
- DD153 Valuation Office Agency Mineral Valuer North (2003): Highways Agency. A1 Motorway Dishforth to Barton Section. Contaminated Land Preliminary Stage One (Desk Study) Report, Appendix 2 – Envirocheck Report - Data
- DD154 Valuation Office Agency Mineral Valuer North (March 2003): Highways Agency. A1 Motorway Dishforth to Barton Section, Appendix 3 – Envirocheck Report – Plans
- DD155 CIRIA Report C532: "Control of water pollution from construction sites"
- DD156 The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003, which transposes the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC.
- DD157 The Surface Waters (Dangerous Substances) (Classification) Regulations 1998), which transposes the EC Dangerous Substances Directive 76/464/EEC and daughter directives.
- DD158 The Surface Waters (Fish life) (Classification) Regulations 1997 (as amended 2003), which transposes the EC Freshwater Fish Directive 78/659/EEC.
- DD159 Guidelines for Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (Second Edition 2002) - Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and The Landscape Institute
- DD160 Landscape Character Assessment (Guidance for England and Scotland 2002) - The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage
- DD161 Interim Advice Note (IAN) 54/04 (2004)
- DD162 CIRIA report No 142 Control of Pollution from Highway Drainage Discharges
- DD162 IRRRS Revision 1 (2004)
- DD163 Measures necessary where apparatus is affected by major works - A Code of Practice Approved by the Secretaries of State for Transport, Wales and

Scotland under sections 84 and 143 of the Act (i.e. NRSWA 1991)

DD164 A Grogan and others (2001): Nature Conservation and Roads: Advice in Relation to Otters. Wildlife Conservation Research Unit

DD165 Brough Beck Flood Risk Mapping Study: Catterick – Phase 2 Final Report, JBA for Environment Agency – North East Region, May 2003

Scheme Development Documents

DD166 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Local Model Validation Report, Ref. No. D2B/LD/DB/05/RE/006

DD167 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2004): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Traffic Forecasting Report, Ref. No. D2B/LD/DB/05/RE/007

DD168 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Economic Assessment Report, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/05/10/03/RE/010/ B

DD169 A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement Environmental Statement, Volumes 1 to 3

DD170 Not Used

DD171 Various Data Room Documents from earlier scheme

DD172 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2004): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Preliminary Sources Study, July 2004, Ref. No. D2B/DA/DB/07/04/RE/002/A, 02/08/05.

DD173 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement, Geotechnical Report Sections 1 to 7, Ref. No. D2B/DA/DB/07/06/RE/001/A.

DD174 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Route Options Assessment Report, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/09/12/RE/001/ D

DD175 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Report on Leeming Junction Options, Ref. No. D2B/LD/DB/09/12/RE/002/ D

DD176 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Report on Side Roads, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/09/12/RE/005/ E

DD177 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Public Consultation Response Report, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/09/12/RE/007/F

DD178 Not Used

DD179 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2004): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Structures Options Report, Draft, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/10/02/RE/001

DD180 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, High Load Route Options Report, Ref. No. D2B/DU/DB/09/12/RE/006/B

-
- DD181 McAlpine/AMEC JV (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements, Public Consultation Report, Ref. No. D2B/DA/DB/16/04/RE/001/C
- DD182 Archaeological Services at the University of Durham (2005): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement, North Yorkshire: Geophysical Surveys Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell –D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/004 – 3 Volumes
- DD183 Deegan, A: Air Photo Evaluation: A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvements Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2004 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/001
- DD184 Tees Valley Archaeology: A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement: Report on Archaeological Watching Brief on Geotechnical Investigation, 2004 Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/005
- DD185 University of Durham: A1 Dishforth to Barton: Palaeoecological Survey Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/002
- DD186 Wrathmell, S: A1D2B Cultural Heritage: Historic Buildings: A Review of Historic Buildings Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/003
- DD187 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Otter Survey Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/001/B
- DD188 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Bat Survey Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/002/B
- DD189 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Great Crested Newt Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/003/B
- DD190 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Wintering Bird Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/004/B
- DD191 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Badger Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/005/B
- DD192 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Deer Survey Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/006/B
- DD193 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Brown Hare Survey Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/007/B
- DD194 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Water Vole Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/008/B
- DD195 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement River Corridor Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/009/B
- DD196 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Pallet Hill SINC Bird Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/010/B
- DD197 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Breeding Bird Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/011/B

-
- DD198 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Phase 1 Habitat Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/012/B
- DD199 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Hedgerow Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/013/B
- DD200 Faber Maunsell: A1D2B Improvement Crayfish Survey 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/14/RE/014/B
- DD201 Not Used
- DD202 Faber Maunsell: A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement Hydraulic Modelling Report 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/16/RE/001
- DD203 Faber Maunsell: A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement Flood Risk Assessment Report 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/16/05/FRA/01
- DD204 Not Used
- DD205 Northern Archaeological Associates: Archaeological Monitoring of Geotechnical Investigations Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/012
- DD206 University of Durham: A1 Dishforth to Barton: Palaeoecological Assessment Site 3 Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2005 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/013
- DD207 Northern Archaeological Associates (2006) Archaeological Evaluation Trenching in Non-Scheduled Areas Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/014
- DD208 Northern Archaeological Associates: Archaeological Evaluation Trenching and Recording Post-Excavation Assessment, Catterick Bridge Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/015
- DD209 Northern Archaeological Associates: Archaeological Evaluation Trenching and Recording Post-Excavation Assessment, Healam Bridge Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/016
- DD210 Archaeological Services at the University of Durham: A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement, North Yorkshire: Geophysical Surveys Phase 2 Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/017
- DD211 Northern Archaeological Associates: Archaeological Evaluation Trenching and Recording Post-Excavation Assessment, Baines Farm Unpublished Report for Faber Maunsell 2006 – D2B/BR/DB/12/01/RE/018
- DD212 RPS: A1 D2B Improvement Landscape Character Assessment 2005 – D2B/HU/12/05/REP/025/B
- DD213 RPS 2004, A1 D2B Improvement, Environmental Scoping Report

DD214 RPS 2005, A1 D2B Improvement Landscape Report on Usage of Public Rights of Way Adjacent to and Crossing the A1 between Dishforth and Barton - D2B/HU/12/07/REP/014/ B - 2 Volumes

Other References

DD215 Institute of Field Archaeologists (1999): Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments

DD216 Institute of Field Archaeologists (1999): Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation

DD217 Institute of Field Archaeologists (1999): Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological Investigation and Recording of Standing Buildings or Structures

DD218 Institute of Field Archaeologists (2002): The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations Paper No. 6

DD219 English Heritage: Geophysical Survey in Archaeological Field Evaluation

DD220 Highways Agency: Notice of Intention Published 29 June 2006

DD221 Highways Agency: Statement of Case

DD222 Highways Agency: Public Notice 25 August 2006 – Objectors’ Alternatives and HA’s Minor Modifications

DD222A Highways Agency minor modification summary and plans

DD223 Detailed Plans of Objectors’ Alternatives

DD224 Addendum to Outline Statement of Case

DD225 See HA/P1

DD226 See HA/P2

DD227 See HA/P3

DD228 See HA/P4

DD229 See HA/P5

DD230 Not Used

DD231 See HA/P6

DD232 See HA/P7

DD233 “One future – different paths”; The UK’s shared framework for sustainable development

DD234 National Cycling Strategy (July 1996)

- DD235 North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy (July 1996)
- DD236 Not Used
- DD237 Not Used
- DD238 A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement - Exceptions Report following Stage 1 Safety Audit (March 2006)
- DD239 A1 Dishforth to Barton - Improvement NMU Audit
- DD240 RPG 12 Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber
- DD241 PPG 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- DD242 See HA/P5/A
- DD243 See HA/P4/A
- DD244 Harrogate District Local Plan Deposit Draft 1998, incorporating Proposed Pre-Inquiry & Additional Changes
- DD245 Yorkshire and the Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (Consultation Draft) 2005
- DD246 English Nature Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines 2001
- DD247 See HA/P8
- DD248 Faber Maunsell (2006): A1 Dishforth to Barton Improvement Orders Exhibition Report – D2B/DU/DB/16/06/RE/001
- DD250 See HA/P1/S
- DD251 See HA/P2/S
- DD252 See HA/P3/S
- DD253 See HA/P4/S
- DD254 See HA/P5/S
- DD255 See HA/P6/S
- DD256 See HA/P7/S
- DD257 See HA/P8S

B. HIGHWAYS AGENCY DOCUMENTS

Proofs of Evidence

HA/PErrata Errata to Proofs of Evidence (2/11/06)

- HA/P1 Proof of Evidence for Scheme Overview by Alan Duckworth
- HA/P1/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Scheme Overview by Alan Duckworth
- HA/P2 Proof of Evidence for Engineering by Alan Ross
- HA/P2/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Engineering by Alan Ross
- HA/P3 Proof of Evidence for Traffic & Economics by Steve Wallace
- HA/P3/Rev1 Revision of Figure A2
- HA/P3/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Traffic & Economics by Steve Wallace
- HA/P4 Proof of Evidence for Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision by Paul Beswick
- HA/P4/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision by Paul Beswick
- HA/P4/A Appendices & Figures to Proof of Evidence for Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision by Paul Beswick
- HA/P5 Proof of Evidence for Landscape & Townscape by Paul Beswick
- HA/P5/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Landscape & Townscape by Paul Beswick
- HA/P5/A Appendices & Figures to Proof of Evidence for Landscape & Townscape by Paul Beswick
- HA/P6 Proof of Evidence for Cultural Heritage by Blaise Vyner
- HA/P6/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Cultural Heritage by Blaise Vyner
- HA/P7 Proof of Evidence for Ecology by Andrew Barker
- HA/P7/S Summary Proof of Evidence for Ecology by Andrew Barker
- HA/P8 Proof of Evidence on Noise & Vibration by Anthony Charles
- HA/P8/S Summary Proof of Evidence on Noise & Vibration by Anthony Charles

Rebuttals to Objectors' Cases

- HA/R/OB01 Response to Mr P & Mr H Braithwaite of Floral Nurseries
- HA/R/OB04 Response to Mr A E Jones of Brook House and North End Farm
- HA/R/OB09 Response to Mr E and Mrs J Bedale of George F White
- HA/R/OB10 Response to Mr and Mrs K Thomas
- HA/R/OB11 Response to Mr P and Mrs J Chapman

HA/R/OB12 & 17 Response to Cyclists Touring Club
HA/R/OB13 Response to J M Greensit and Sons
HA/R/OB16 Response to Bedale and Villages Community Plan Forum
HA/R/OB23 Response to W G Baker Baker and others
HA/R/OB24 Response to Mr and Mrs J McIntyre
HA/R/OB29 Response to Exelby, Leeming & Newton Parish Council
HA/R/OB31 Response to Hackforth & Ainderby Miers with Holtby Parish Council
HA/R/OB33 Response to the Ramblers' Association
HA/R/OB35/1 Response to Mr M MacKenzie of North Yorkshire County Council
HA/R/OB35/1/Add1 Addendum to Response to Mr M MacKenzie
HA/R/OB35/2 Response to Mr M Roberts of North Yorkshire County Council
HA/R/OB35/2/A1 Amendment to Response to Mr M Roberts
HA/R/OB35/2/Add1 Addendum to Response to Mr M Roberts
HA/R/OB35/3 Response to Mr B Mason of North Yorkshire County Council
HA/R/OB35/3/Add1 Addendum to Response to Mr B Mason
HA/R/OB36 Response to the Ramblers' Association – Northallerton Group
HA/R/OB37 Response to Councillor C A Les and Mr Andrew Eyles
HA/R/OB39 Response to the British Horse Society
HA/R/OB40 Response to Councillor Tony Pelton
HA/R/OB44 Response to Chas. Long and Sons
HA/R/OB47 Response to Harris (UK) Limited
HA/R/OB48 Response to the Pallett Hill Sand and Gravel Company Limited
HA/R/OB49 Response to Mr P F Donaldson
HA/R/OB50 Response to Mr R Richardson
HA/R/OB51 Response to K N & J Wyrill and Sons
HA/R/OB52 Response to Mrs Yvonne Brookes
HA/R/OB57 Response to Cyclists Touring Club

HA/R/OB58 Response to Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council

HA/R/OB61 Response to Mr Robert Brooksbank

HA/R/OB62 Response to Middleton Tyas Parish Council

HA/R/OB65 Response to T M Jopling and Partners and others

HA/R/OB66 Response to Eastern Harvesters Limited

HA/R/OB68 Response to Travelodge Hotels Limited

HA/R/OB69 Response to the Trustees of NYT Pension Plans

HA/R/OB70 Response to North Yorkshire Timber Company Limited

HA/R/OB71 Response to Hambleton Steel Limited

HA/R/OB72 Response to Tunstall Road Action Committee

HA/R/OB73 Response to the Countryside Agency

HA/R/OB74 Response to Richmondshire District Council

HA/R/OB75 Response to Hambleton District Council

HA/R/OB78 Response to Mr and Mrs Colin Brown T/A Browns Motors Service and Repairs

HA/R/OB83 Response to North Yorkshire Local Access Forum

HA/R/OB86 Response to Mrs Rachel Connolly

HA/R/OB87 Response to J E Swiers Limited

HA/R/OB91 Response to Scurragh Lane Residents

HA/R/OB100 Response to the Ramblers' Association

HA/R/OB102 Response to Addisons, Chartered Surveyors, obo Mr R Marriner (deceased)

HA/R/OB108 Response to Melsonby Parish Council

HA/R/OB111 Response to Mr and Mrs A N Wilson of Aiskew Grange

HA/R/OB117 Response to Messrs J and F Pinkney

HA/R/OB128 Response to Mr Harry Proom

HA/R/OB135 Response to Mr J D Middleton

HA/R/OB136 Response to Mr F M Ward of Ward Farming

HA/R/OB139 Response to Mrs K Ellam

HA/R/OB140 Response to Mr J H Kirkham

HA/R/OB141 Response to Mr F A Webster

HA/R/OB147 Response to Mr T M and Mrs K P Chapman

HA/R/OB150 Response to Mr and Mrs G Liddell

HA/R/OB152 Response to the British Driving Society

Rebuttals to Objectors' Alternatives

HA/R/OA01 Dishforth to Baldersby Local Access Road

HA/R/OA02 Dishforth Pond

HA/R/OA03 Bridleway Overbridge: Mask Lane and Silicar Lane

HA/R/OA04 The provision of a new link road near Ainderby Quernhow,

HA/R/OA05 Pond location near Sinderby

HA/R/OA06 Sinderby Junction east pond

HA/R/OA07 Provision of a segregated right turn on the B6267

HA/R/OA08 NMU Overbridge at Cowfold

HA/R/OA09 Various side road junction alternatives at Leeming

HA/R/OA10 Local access road between Leeming and Catterick

HA/R/OA11 NMU crossing linking Low Street to Ghyll Lane

HA/R/OA12 Motorway alignment on the existing A1 in the Catterick area

HA/R/OA13 Local access road using existing southbound carriageway

HA/R/OA14 Realignment of Tunstall Road

HA/R/OA15 NMU overbridge crossing of the motorway at Manor House

HA/R/OA16 Pallet Hill link

HA/R/OA17 Provision of a new highway route to the west of Brompton-on-Swale

HA/R/OA18 Provision of an underpass on the line of the former Richmond railway branch line.

HA/R/OA19 Catterick North junction

HA/R/OA20 Scurragh Lane NMU overbridge crossing – Alternative 1

HA/R/OA21 Scurragh Lane NMU overbridge crossing – Alternative 2

HA/R/OA22 Scurragh Lane NMU underpass

HA/R/OA23 Barton to Scotch Corner – Alternative 1

HA/R/OA24 Barton to Scotch Corner – Alternative 2

HA/R/OA25 Segregated provision at the Kneeton Hall overbridge.

Highways Agency Inquiry Documents

HA/1 Opening Submissions on behalf of the Highways Agency – Mr Paul Tucker

HA/2 Guidance on Advice to Ministers: Benefit Cost Ratios & Value for Money

HA/3A Interim Advice Note 75/06

HA/3B Interim Advice Note 68/06

HA/3C Area Management Memo 71/06

HA/4 A1 Dishforth to Barton Compatibility

HA/5 Minutes of Traffic Management Strategy 30/11/05

HA/6 INCA Report Forward 18/10/06

HA/6A INCA Version 1.1

HA/7 A168 Survey 20/09/05 RSI Categories Analysis (Reason)

HA/8A Proposed works at Cataractonium Roman Forts & Town: Monument No 34733

HA/8B Proposed Works at Healam Bridge: Monument No 34736

HA/8C Proposed works at Cataractonium Roman Forts & Town: County Monument No 34733

HA/8D Proposed Works at Bainesse Roman Roadside Settlement: Monument No SM 34736

HA/9 Response to question raised during evidence of Mr Blaise Vyner

HA/10 A6136 Catterick Road ghost island junction with visibility information relevant to Picady

HA/11A Diagram: Access from Scurragh House Lane to Middleton Tyas – design widths

HA/11B Diagram: Access from Leeming Junction to Bowbridge Lane – design widths

-
- HA/12 Position Statement of the HA on Objectors' Alternative 10
 - HA/12/1 Response of North Yorkshire County Council to HA/12
 - HA/13 Photographs of former railway structure at Brompton-on-Swale
 - HA/14 Details of A1 Trunk Road Closures in the last five years (October 2006)
 - HA/15 E-mail from A-One Integrated Service in response to request for traffic information about A1 closures causing traffic diversion through Middleton Tyas
 - HA/16 Origins of traffic surveyed during road side interview between Middleton Tyas and Scotch Corner 15/06/2004
 - HA/17 Transport and the Economy – Government response to SACTRA report
 - HA/18 Section from "Breaking Point" – a report prepared by the Metropolitan Transport Research Unit for CTC, BHS RA & CA.
 - HA/19 Note of meeting between representatives of the HA, NYCC and North Yorkshire Police regarding dealing with incidents on the A1
 - HA/20 Meeting between HA & Middleton Tyas Parish Council to address questions raised during cross examination of HA by MYPC
 - HA/21 List of properties in Brompton-on-Swale subject to an increase in noise
 - HA/22 Copy of fax information sent by HA to Councillor Stead of Exelby, Leeming & Newton Parish Council about traffic restrictions on Cowfold Bridge
 - HA/22A HA website briefing note in respect to Cowfold bridge repairs
 - HA/23 Certificate from HA that all statutory procedures relating to draft orders have been complied with
 - HA/24 Linlathen development at Scotch Corner – traffic effects in Middleton Tyas
 - HA/25 A1 Dishforth to Barton - Details of Road Closures
 - HA/26 Memorandum of Understanding between HA & NYCC
 - HA/27 Email from Environment Agency regarding bridleway alongside Bedale Beck
 - HA/27A HA response to HA27
 - HA/28 Additional Traffic Information
 - HA/29 Scheme Brief

-
- HA/30 Letter from English Heritage dated 12/10/06 re Cataractonium Roman Fort
- HA/31 HA memorandum regarding width proposed access to Eastern Harvesters Limited
- HA/32 Letter confirming availability of funding signed 2/11/06
- HA/33 Note Regarding position of Statutory Consultees
- HA/34 Typical Council Construction Criteria
- HA/35 Statement regarding the positioning of the balancing pond on Harris UK Ltd Land
- HA/36 Highways Agency Closing Submission – Mr Paul Tucker

C. OBJECTORS' DOCUMENTS (by Objector Number)

- OB02/P Proof of Evidence of Mr D R Peat on behalf of The Estate of R Raw (deceased)
- OB09/P Proof of Evidence of Mr D R Peat on behalf of Messrs J E Beadle & Son
- OB11/P Proof of Evidence of Mr Andrew Black on behalf of Mr P and Mrs J Chapman
- OB12/P1 Proof of Evidence of Mr Ronald Healey on behalf of CTC North Yorkshire
- OB12/P1/Supp1 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Issues arising from HA Rebuttal
- OB12/P2 Proof of Evidence of Mr Terry Ratcliffe on behalf of CTC North Yorkshire
- OB12/P2/S Summary of Proof of Evidence of Mr Terry Ratcliffe on behalf of CTC North Yorkshire
- OB12/P2/Supp1 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Results of Cyclists survey
- OB12/P2/Supp2 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Updates Results of Cyclists survey
- OB12/P2/Supp3 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: A1 Motorway proposals September 1995
- OB12/P2/Supp4 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Five core principles in Para 3.15 Volume 5 of TA 91/05
- OB12/P2/Supp5 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Further updates of Cyclist survey
- OB12/CS Closing submission of CTC
- OB13/P Proof of Evidence of R H Fell on behalf of J M Greensit & Son Limited
- OB13/P/Supp1 Supplementary Proof of Evidence to the above: Expert Report
- OB23/P Proof of Evidence of Mr W H T Salvin on behalf of WG Baker Baker and others

| | |
|---------------|--|
| OB24/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs E McIntyre |
| OB29/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs M Stead on behalf of Exelby Leeming & Newton Parish Council |
| OB29/1 | Two letters of support for above proof |
| OB29/2 | Letter from Coxon Brothers about flooding plan at Bedale Beck. |
| OB29/CS | Closing submission of Exelby Leeming and Newton Parish Council |
| OB31/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs E Greensit on behalf of Hackforth & Ainderby Miers with Holtby Parish Council |
| OB35/P1 | Proof of Evidence of Mr M MacKenzie on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB35/P2 | Proof of Evidence of Mr M Roberts on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB35/P2/S | Summary Proof of Evidence of Mr M Roberts on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB35/P2/Supp1 | Supplementary proof: Mr M Roberts' comments in respect of the INCA document (ref: HA/6 & HA/6A) |
| OB35/P3 | Proof of Evidence of Mr B Mason on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB35/P3/A | Appendix to OB35/P3 |
| OB35/P3/S | Summary Proof of Evidence of Mr B Mason on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB35/CS | Closing submission on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council |
| OB36/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr J D Marshall on behalf of the Ramblers' Association (Northallerton Group) |
| OB36/P/Supp1 | Supplementary proof of Evidence on behalf of the Ramblers' Association (Richmondshire Group) |
| OB39/P | Proof of Evidence of Dr J Sugden on behalf of The British Horse Society |
| OB39/P/S | Summary Proof of Evidence of Dr J Sugden on behalf of The British Horse Society |
| OB39/CS | Closing submission on behalf of The British Horse Society |
| OB40/P | Proof of Evidence of Councillor T Pelton |
| OB40/P/Supp1 | Supplementary proof of Evidence of Councillor T Pelton |
| OB42/P | Proof of Evidence of Ms V Lamb on behalf of Mr P Donaldson |
| OB52/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs Y Brookes |
| OB52/CS | Closing submission of Mrs Y Brookes |
| OB58/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr R H Hall on behalf of Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council |
| OB59/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr M Snoddy on behalf of Ripon Loiters Cycling Club |
| OB61/P | Proof of evidence of Strutt & Parker on behalf of Mr J Brooksbank |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| OB62/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs C Jones on behalf of Middleton Tyas Parish Council |
| OB62/P/Rev | Revised presentation of Proof of Evidence of Middleton Tyas Parish Council |
| OB62/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Fracture of water main |
| OB62/P/Supp2 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: North Yorkshire Police |
| OB62/1 | Written observations on outline planning application for development at Scotch Corner |
| OB62/2 | Response to HA's rebuttal evidence (HA/R/OB62) |
| OB62/3 | Information of traffic diverted off A1 through Middleton Tyas |
| OB64/P | Proof of Evidence of Dr M A Harrison on behalf of Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd |
| OB64/P/S | Summary Proof of Evidence of Dr M A Harrison on behalf of Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd |
| OB64/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence |
| OB64/A | Appendices to OB64/P |
| OB65/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr P W Squire on behalf of T M Jopling & Partners and others |
| OB66/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr J E Haigh on behalf of Eastern Harvesters Ltd |
| OB66/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Photographs of existing side entrance |
| OB66/P/Supp2 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Agreed statement in respect of existing access to Eastern Harvesters Sinderby Station Depot |
| OB71/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr J E Haigh on behalf of Hambleton Steel Limited |
| OB71/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence |
| OB72/P | Proof of Evidence of Ms J Branch on behalf of Tunstall Road Action Committee |
| OB72/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Speed reports for traffic through Tunstall |
| OB72/P/Supp2 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Modification to OA14 |
| OB72/CS | Closing submission of Tunstall Road Action Committee |
| OB74/P/CS | Proof of Evidence of Richmondshire District Council |
| OB74/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence to the above |
| OB74/P/Supp1/S | Summary of Supplementary Proof of Evidence |
| OB74/CS | Closing submission of Richmondshire District Council |
| OB75/P | Proof of Evidence of Hambleton District Council |
| OB75/P | Closing Submission of Hambleton District Council |
| OB86/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs R Connolly |
| OB86/P/S | Summary Proof of Evidence of Mrs R Connolly |
| OB86/A | Appendix to OB/86/P |
| OB86/CS | Closing submission of Mrs R Connolly |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| OB88/P | Proof of Evidence of Mrs J Ratcliffe |
| OB91/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr C Henderson on behalf of Scurragh Lane Residents OB91/P/Supp1 Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Area Management Memo No 43 |
| OB91/P/Supp2 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: SACTRA Summary report |
| OB91/P/Supp3 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Review of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West – Background paper 3 |
| OB91/P/Supp4 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Guidance note for use of projection factors for background and roadside pollutant concentrations |
| OB91/P/Supp5 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: National traffic forecasting models in Europe and elsewhere |
| OB91/P/Supp6 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Transport-related Health effects with a Particular Focus on Children |
| OB91/P/Supp7 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Response to HA/R/OA20 |
| OB91/P/Supp8 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Graphics used in presentation of Proof of Evidence |
| OB91/P/Supp9 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Air Quality Questions |
| OB108/P | Proof of Evidence of Councillor Mrs J Stansfield on behalf of Melsonby Parish Council |
| OB108/CS | Closing submission of Councillor Mrs J Stansfield |
| OB117/P | Proof of Evidence of Messrs F & J Pinkney |
| OB128/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr H Proom |
| OB128/P/Supp1 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: Photographs |
| OB128/P/Supp2 | Supplementary Proof of Evidence: extra observations |
| OB135/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr J D Middleton |
| OB135/CS | Closing submission of Mr J D Middleton |
| OB139/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr P McGee on behalf of Mrs K Ellam |
| OB142/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr I Self on behalf of Motel Leeming Ltd |
| OB142/A | Appendices to OB142/P |
| OB147/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr T M Chapman & Mrs K P Chapman |
| OB149/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr M Every |
| OB151/P | Proof of Evidence of Mr C Hall |

D. GENERAL INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

PI/1 Pre-Inquiry Meeting Minutes

PI/2 Public Inquiry Attendance List

PI/3 Press Attendance List

PI/4 Original Objectors Letters & subsequent correspondence (10 volumes)

PI/5 Objectors' Alternatives

PI/6 Daily e-mails to interested parties about Inquiry proceedings & programme

PI/7 Site Visit Itineraries

PI/8 Correspondence Register, with annexed correspondence (10 ring binders)