

North Yorkshire County Council

Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

26 June 2019

A66 Dualling – Consultation on Options

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose Of Report

- 1.1 To advise members of public consultation on the options for dualling the remaining single carriageway sections of the A66 from Scotch Corner to Penrith, and to confirm the County Council's response.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The A66 is a trans-Pennine trunk road that is a key route between north-eastern England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. It's a hugely important route for freight traffic and it's also important for tourism, giving access to the Lake District and the North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 2.2 The A66 is maintained by Highways England who recognise that it isn't up to modern standards. Drivers face congestion, delays at key junctions and substandard access to jobs and leisure locations. Therefore they are investigating ways to enhance the A66 through a comprehensive programme of improvements that would raise the whole route to dual carriageway standard with the aim of delivering a consistent quality of journey for the 50 miles between Penrith on the M6 and Scotch Corner on the A1(M).
- 2.3 Highways England are currently undertaking a non-statutory consultation with partners and stakeholders along the A66 corridor on the design for the new sections of dual carriageway. North Yorkshire County Council highways department is represented on the scheme stakeholder working group however the consultation exercise provides an opportunity to seek views from wider service areas
- 2.4 Whilst this is a non-statutory stage of consultation, it provides a formal opportunity to respond to the design and proposed mitigation measures. The consultation has being supported by a programme of local events, including at West Gilling and Richmond which are close to the A66.

3.0 Consultation on Options

- 3.1 The consultation material is extensive and includes a lengthy brochure with design plans of each of the options for the sections of route to be upgraded to dual carriageway.

- 3.2 The objectives of the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine project are as follows:
- Safety – to achieve a consistent standard of dual carriageway. The ‘old’ A66 will become part of the local road network to provide better, safer routes for cyclists and pedestrians.
 - Connectivity – Improving connectivity, reducing congestion and improving the journey reliability for local people as well as between the key employment areas of Cumbria, Tees Valley and Tyne and Wear.
 - Environmental – Minimising noise impacts as well as seeking to minimise any potential negative impacts on the natural environment and landscapes of the North Pennines and Lake District.
 - Economic – Improving strategic regional and national connectivity, particularly for freight which accounts for a quarter of all traffic.
 - Tourism – Improving access to key tourist destinations such as the North Pennines and Lake District.
 - Community – Re-connecting communities and providing better links between settlements along the route.
 - Capacity – Reducing delays and queues during busy periods and improving the performance of key junctions such as the A66/A6 and the M6 junction 40.
- 3.3 The County Council strongly supports infrastructure enhancements that will strengthen east-west connectivity and the A66 has been recognised within the Strategic Transport Plan published by Transport for the North. The route is a key component of its ‘Connecting the Energy Coasts’ Strategic Development Corridor as a scheme that will ‘Enhance East-West strategic connections across the North to support UK competitiveness’. The dualling scheme is included in its Investment Programme. The scheme is also strongly supported by both Durham and Cumbria who are the other two local authorities within its route.
- 3.4 Whilst considerable material has been made available on the proposed scheme, it is important to note that the design and environmental impact analysis are still works in progress, and at this stage full and final details are not available. Officers will continue to engage with Highways England as work progresses, and will provide advice in respect of the County Council’s interests outside the formal consultation stages through the scheme stakeholder group.
- 3.5 Nonetheless there are a range of potential effects that are of interest to the County Council so as part of this consultation response comments have been sought from wider service areas and these are summarised below.
- 3.6 Strategic Policy & Economic Growth:
North Yorkshire County Council has developed a plan to deliver economic growth. It identifies seven enablers including delivering a modern integrated transport network and creating the right conditions for business growth and investment.
- 3.6.1 The emerging York, North Yorkshire and East Riding (YNYER) Spatial Framework is a collaborative approach to strategic planning within the sub region and Transport is identified as a growth enabler and the framework includes the following strategic investment priorities for transport:
- T1 Strengthen the East – West road, rail and water connections.
- 3.6.2 Within the Spatial Framework the A66 corridor spans two Sub Areas, the A1 Corridor and Yorkshire’s National Parks. The priorities for these sub areas include supporting towns as hubs and links to adjoining areas.

3.7 Highways & Transport:

In general terms interested in reassurances on:

- How each of the current junctions will be accommodated/amended in the final proposal
- Will the old lengths of road become a Local Access Road (LAR)
- How the junctions between what may become the LAR and the new A66 alignment are set up
- What will be happening with the drainage from the current and proposed line of the A66
- The future of the old line of road and what will happen to it going forward, reduced width etc

3.8 Public Rights of Way:

The road scheme must respect existing public rights of way and avoid significant changes to the historic network and advice on the existing alignment of public rights of way should be sought from NYCC's Countryside Access Service prior to the commencement of detailed design work.

- 3.8.1 Small scale diversions of individual rights of way may be considered where this provides a safer but not significantly less convenient route, however the creation of cul-de-sac public rights of way must be avoided, and CAS should be consulted on any proposed public rights of way diversions before public consultation on a side roads order is undertaken.
- 3.8.2 Consent will need to be given by CAS prior to any structure being installed on a public right of way either for the purpose of public safety or control of livestock. New structures on public rights of way must comply with BS 5709-2018.
- 3.8.3 Where practicable all public rights of way should be accessible to wheelchair users and meet the minimum criteria for new public footpaths and public bridleways and the use of the A66 verge to link public rights of way and minor roads should be avoided.
- ### 3.9 Heritage Services – Ecology:
- Would expect to see a through Ecological impact Assessment (EclA) undertaken on all designated sites, habitats of principal importance (whether designated or not), protected and priority species.
- 3.9.1 We would expect the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) mitigation hierarchy to be used to mitigate or avoid impacts and also provide enhancement measures to ensure that overall biodiversity net gain is achieved. Sufficient land and financial resources are required in order to ensure that any mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures can be achieved and maintained in the long term.
- 3.9.2 There are some quite large wet grassland areas with breeding wader birds in very close proximity to the current A66. There are also a lot of high quality streams fed by limestone springs in the area, some of which have supported native crayfish (protected species) in the recent past.
- 3.9.3 The Parishes along the A66 have never been properly surveyed and the little information that exists is very dated, consequently, it is hoped that Highways England will undertake thorough baseline surveys and not assume that existing ecological data is sufficient to inform their assessment and design process.
- 3.9.4 The need to consider the impact of earthworks and landscaping on surrounding habitats and learn lessons from previous upgrades when a valuable wetland at Rokeby Close was damaged by construction of earth mounds and tree planting.

- 3.10 Heritage Services – Landscape:
Would expect the final planning application to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment together with assessment of landscape and visual impacts (LVIA) which should involve NYCC.
- 3.10.1 The options outlined in the A66 Public Consultation document suggest the potential for significant Landscape and Visual effects and therefore the LVIA will be expected to consider each of the options to guide and determine the final design.
- 3.11 Heritage Services – Archaeology
The importance of Cultural Heritage has been identified in the consultation document which is welcome. The main issue within North Yorkshire is the site of the Carkin Moor Roman Fort and native settlement which is a Scheduled Monument. Option M has been designed to avoid impact to the Scheduled area and this would be the preferred route from purely an archaeological point of view based on current knowledge.
- 3.11.1 However it is important to note that currently unidentified archaeological remains of equivalent significance to the scheduled monument could be present. Recent archaeological work at Scotch Corner has demonstrated that Roman activity in this area is much earlier and more significant than originally thought and therefore whichever option is chosen that archaeological issues will be a major factor in the design and build of the scheme.
- 3.11.2 It is expected the standard industry approach supplemented by field evaluation of each option to identify any previously unrecorded archaeological features will be undertaken. This would allow a proper assessment to be made of the impact of the options on the significance of the archaeological resource.
- 3.11.3 We would also expect that Historic England will take the lead role regarding the impact on the Scheduled Monument.
- 3.12 Public Health:
An overarching aim to create High Quality Safe Places, including enhanced connectivity with safe and efficient infrastructure to enable residents to share in the benefits of growth and also developing local opportunities to promote walking and cycling and local stopping points.
- 3.13 Children & Young Peoples Service:
Can see the high value of improving this important connection and would expect the improvement works to the A66 will allow access to schools via alternative routes during phased construction.
- 3.14 More detailed technical comments expanding on the points identified above have been provided by the service area teams. These are set out in Annex 1, and can form part of the overall response to the consultation.

4.0 Equalities

- 4.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any adverse equalities impacts arising from the recommendations of this report. It is the view of officers that the recommendations included in this report do not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010 attached as Annex 2.
- 4.1.1 Notwithstanding the above Highways England are required as part of progressing the scheme to produce an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA). This considers the potential effects of the scheme on people protected by the Equalities Act 2010.

- 4.2 An EQIA considers whether the scheme will have a bigger, or different, effect on groups of people because of their age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, or sexual orientation, and describes Highway England's current understanding of any potential equality effects that may arise. It would also explain how Highway England propose to avoid or reduce any adverse equality effects that may occur because of the scheme.
- 4.3 Whilst we would not expect to identify any disproportionate concentrations of groups with protected characteristics within the scheme corridor within North Yorkshire responses from officers have not identified any specific local issues.

5.0 Finance

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implication for the County Council associated with this current consultation exercise.
- 5.2 Where appropriate mitigation measures in relation to effects on NYCC infrastructure will be identified. It is anticipated that Highway England will bear the costs of any necessary mitigation.

6.0 Legal

- 6.1 The current consultation is a non-statutory process that will contribute to the preparation of preferred route option designs for the scheme. A further consultation will be undertaken at that later stage.

7.0 Recommendation

- 7.1 The Corporate Director of Business and Environmental Services shall make a submission to Highways England on behalf of North Yorkshire County Council, setting out the response to the consultation on the options for the A66 dualling scheme as identified in sections 3.3 to 3.14 and Annex 1 to this report.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director
Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: David Hern

Background Documents:

Highways England scheme page

<https://highwaysengland.co.uk/projects/a66-northern-trans-pennine/>

Highways England scheme consultation page

<https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/cip/a66-northern-trans-pennine/>

Highways England scheme consultation document

https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/cip/a66-northern-trans-pennine/supporting_documents/Web%20%20A66%20NTP%20Consultation%20Brochure.pdf

Comments received

Strategic Policy & Economic Growth

North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) has developed [a plan to deliver economic growth](#). The vision aspires to North Yorkshire being a modern economy characterised by high quality, efficient transport and communications, higher levels of entrepreneurialism and opportunities for younger people to access good quality employment and affordable housing opportunities. It identifies seven enablers: Create high quality places and increased housing provision and green infrastructure; Deliver a modern integrated transport network; Increase skills levels and ensure that the workforce meets the needs of the county; keeping the workforce healthy and happy; Creating the right conditions for business growth and investment; Enhancing the environment and developing tourism and the green economy; Deliver a modern communications network.

The emerging York, North Yorkshire and East Riding (YNYER) Spatial Framework is a collaborative approach to non-statutory strategic planning within the sub region. The purpose is to support effective cross boundary planning by looking ahead, beyond current Local Plan periods, with a broad time horizon of 2035 to 2050. It provides a consistent framework to shape and coordinate the preparation of Local Plans, industrial and economic strategies, transport and other infrastructure plans across the area. Transport is identified as a growth enabler and the framework establishes the following strategic investment priorities for transport:

- T1 Strengthen the East – West road, rail and water connections.
- T2 Improve 'eastern' north – south links.
- T3 Support multi modal solutions to provide choice and integration.
- T4 Reinforce future rail service enhancements and the role of rail stations and hubs.
- T5 Support bus networks, including Park & Ride for cities and towns and inter urban services
- T6 connect communities with opportunities and promote active travel modes.

The A66 corridor spans two Sub Areas – C) A1 Corridor, and E) Yorkshire's National Parks. The priorities for these sub areas are as follows:

- A1 Corridor: towns as economic hubs; networks of settlements and centres – Northallerton, Thirsk, Catterick Garrison, as a new town with military driven growth; link to Darlington and HS2; A1 upgrade; ECML upgrade; access to rail; strategic sites; defence estate review; and Tees Valley regeneration emphasis.
- Yorkshire's National Parks (Moors & Dales, 2 linked parts): natural capital; regional place makers/assets; links to adjoining areas (Tees Valley, south east Cumbria, north east Lancashire) health and recreation resource; sustainable tourism; upland/natural flood management; York Potash; local needs; long term sustainability of communities and special qualities of the parks; and, A171 improvement where compatible with National Park purpose.

A number of Strategic Development Zones (SDZ) are identified. These are broad locations, which offer opportunities to realise and link up strategic opportunities in providing a focus for meeting future growth and development needs and including key employment sites over the period to 2050. They provide a focus for cross boundary development solutions and the shared prioritisation of infrastructure improvement and investment. There are none within the A66 corridor, but others may benefit from improved regional transport infrastructure and connectivity.

Highways and Transport - Area Improvement Managers

Only 1 part of the proposals is within our area but our comments are as follows:

There are concerns about the Warrener Lane junction and how this adjoins any future proposals. There is also a busy farm on Warrener Lane which we expect will need to turn in both directions on the A66, this may be against what they are looking to achieve but any impact will be seen on the local highway network which is narrow in certain locations and any impact from the upgrade would need to be accounted for on the adjacent network

We would like to see that Collier Lane would not have a junction on to A66

There is a culvert at the top of Waitlands Lane which would need to be investigated and replaced/repositioned accordingly

There is concern about water that comes from the top side of the A66 opposite the Fox Hall Inn.

In general terms we are interested in:

- How each of the current junctions will be accommodated/amended in the final proposal
- Will the old lengths of road become a Local Access Road (LAR)
- How the junctions between what may become the LAR and the new A66 alignment are set up
- What will be happening with the drainage from the current and proposed line of the A66
- The future of the old line of road and what will happen to it going forward, reduced width etc

As part of the upgrade are they looking at the traffic levels and what they will look to do as there are concerns about other junctions which have an accident record and these may attract a greater use and as a consequence may require some amendment.

Countryside Access Service - Public Rights of Way

1.0 Carkin Moor to Stephen Bank Proposal

- 1.1 Highways England's proposals for this section consist of three options for new dual carriageway, all off line from the existing road. Option N diverts the road to the north, Option M diverts it to the south and Option O diverts to the north of Mainsgill Farm then swings to the South of Fox Hall Inn.
- 1.2 North Yorkshire County Council's Countryside Access Service (CAS) recommend option N. Both Mainsgill Farm and Foxhall Inn are served from the south by useful and attractive public rights of way. The bridleway from Mainsgill Farm Shop links to their outdoor play area and follows an easy to use field edge track to the village of Ravensworth just over a mile away. The footpath south from Foxhall Inn also forms a useful and appealing route through fields to the village. Option N would preserve these links and moving the road further north will improve the amenity provided by direct access the countryside for both establishments.
- 1.3 While public rights of way to the north of the A66 could be improved they are all effectively severed from Foxhall, Mainsgill and Ravensworth by the existing road. It is hoped the northern option N route would improve this situation but even if it does not this would not be worse than the current situation whereas a southerly route would have a detrimental effect on existing public rights of way.

2.0 Carkin Moor to Stephen Bank affected public rights of way

- 2.1 West Layton public footpath 20.72/1/1. This short link from the hamlet appears little used. If it is intended to link Collier Lane to the existing A66 via a bridge over or under the new road as part of option N it is recommended that this footpath be diverted to Join Collier Lane to better link to 20.55/1/1
- 2.2 Ravensworth public footpath 20.55/1/1 would be much improved were it to link into the existing A66 downgraded to a local access road as part of option N.
- 2.3 West Layton public footpath 20.23/8/1 would be improved and much more useful if a safer crossing were provided of the A66 as part of option N preferably with an overbridge of the new road. If this cannot be justified on cost grounds it could be combined with an accommodation bridge for Fox Grove Farm via a short diversion if required.
- 2.4 Ravensworth public footpath 20.55/2/1 at Fox Hall Inn would be much improved were it to link into the existing A66 downgraded to local access road as part of option N.
- 2.5 Ravensworth public bridleway 20.55/6/1 would be much improved were it to link into the existing A66 downgrade to local access road as part of option N. However given the popularity of Mainsgill Farm Shop it is likely that both the junction of the bridleway and existing A66 which is shared with the farm shop vehicular access and the proposed all movement junction for Option N on Moor Lane will be very busy and hazardous for non-motorised users. CAS recommend that a separate grade separated crossing of the new road be provided for bridleway users in this vicinity to connect to 20.55/6/1, Moor Lane and East Layton Bridleway 20.23/5/1 and that bridleway 20.55/2/1 be diverted away from the shared vehicular access to a separate access onto the existing A66.
- 2.6 East Layton bridleway 20.23/5/1. The junction with the A66 is currently very hazardous for all users with very narrow verges in both directions which are obstructed by highway signs. It is recommended that a grade separated bridleway crossing of the new A66 be provided in conjunction with 20.55/6/1
- 2.7 Warrener Lane, Forcett and Carkin public bridleway 20.30/5/1. This crossing is particular hazardous for horse riders. Although technically single carriage way, this section was widened as part of the dual carriageway section to Scotch Corner. Traffic here often bunches as drivers focus on the transition from single to dual carriageway and is unaware of the bridleway crossing. Crossing for walkers, cyclists and horse riders is further complicated by vehicle traffic turning into and out of Warrener Lane south. No corrals are provided on this crossing creating additional risk for horse riders. It is recommended that a grade separated crossing for bridleway users be provided at this location.

3.0 Suggested safety improvements on the existing dual carriageways sections.

- 3.1 The improvements to the A66 proposed by the current scheme will make the route a more appealing option for east to west traffic in the North of England and consequently increase its use. As stated above existing at grade public rights of way crossings are at best difficult to use for some users and dangerous for others. It is recommended that to safeguard these routes for the future where possible all public rights of way crossings on the A66 be provided with access to grade separated crossings.

3.2 Priorities for grade separated crossings should be given to Melsonby Crossroads, Jagger Lane bridleway crossing, Winston Crossroads and Newsham Grange bridleway crossing.

4.0 General requirements

- 4.1 The road scheme must respect existing public rights of way and avoid significant changes to the historic network.
- 4.2 Advice on the existing alignment of public rights of way should be sought from NYCC's Countryside Access Service prior to the commencement of detailed design work.
- 4.3 Small scale diversions of individual rights of way may be considered where this provides a safer but not significantly less convenient route.
- 4.4 Creation of cul-de-sac public rights of way must be avoided.
- 4.5 It is recommended that CAS be consulted on proposed public rights of way diversions before public consultation on a side roads order is undertaken.
- 4.6 Consent must be given by CAS prior to any structure being installed on a public right of way either for the purpose of public safety or control of livestock. New structures on public rights of way must comply with BS 5709-2018.
- 4.7 Use of the A66 verge to link public rights of way and minor roads should be avoided.
- 4.8 Where practicable all public rights of way should be accessible to wheelchair users with a firm, stable non slip surface and maximum gradient of 20%.
- 4.9 The minimum width for new public footpaths is 2.0 metres and public bridleways 4.0 metres.
- 4.10 Public bridleway construction should comply with British Horse Society guidelines: <https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/safety-advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice>.

Heritage Services – Ecology

With regards to ecological considerations there is quite a formal process to go through for major development projects seeking planning approval. I would expect to see a thorough Ecological impact Assessment (EclA) undertaken in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). This should deal with designated sites, habitats of principal importance (whether designated or not), protected and priority species.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advocates use of the mitigation hierarchy which seeks to avoid impacts, mitigate where avoidance is not possible, compensate as a last resort and also provide enhancement measures to ensure that overall biodiversity net gain is achieved. Sufficient land and financial resources are required in order to ensure that any mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures can be achieved and maintained in the long term.

From local knowledge there are some quite large wet grassland areas with breeding wader birds in very close proximity to the current A66. There are also a lot of high quality streams fed by limestone springs in the area, some of which have supported native crayfish (protected species) in the recent past.

Something we'd like to highlight from an ecology point of view is the poor quality of ecological data for Richmondshire district. The Parishes along the A66 have never been properly surveyed and the little information that exists is very dated. For example, there are very few County Wildlife Sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) in that area, but this more a reflection of poor survey coverage than lack of interest. Consequently, we would hope that Highways England would undertake thorough baseline surveys and not assume that existing ecological data is sufficient to inform their assessment and design process.

We would also stress the need to consider the impact of earthworks and landscaping on surrounding habitats. This is of concern because during the previous upgrade, a valuable wetland at Rokeby Close was damaged by construction of earth mounds and tree planting.

Heritage Services – Landscape

The two upgrade sections I would be interested in are Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor and Scotch Corner Junction.

I would expect the DCO application to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment together with assessment of landscape and visual impacts (LVIA). The LVIA should be in accordance with 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment - Third Edition, Landscape Institute and IEMA'. We would be interested to comment the study area and viewpoints for the LVIA.

The options outlined in the A66 Public Consultation document suggest the potential for significant Landscape and Visual effects. I would expect the LVIA to consider each of the options to then guide and determine the final design.

Landscape mitigation should be sensitive to local character and setting and also consider wider Green Infrastructure and long term maintenance and management.

Heritage Services – Archaeology

I am pleased to see that Cultural Heritage has been picked up in the Highways England Public Consultation document including the Chief Executive's Foreword.

The only part of the proposal within North Yorkshire is the Stephen Bank to Carkin Moor option. This includes the site of the Carkin Moor Roman Fort and native settlement which is a Scheduled Monument. Option M has obviously been designed to avoid impact to the Scheduled area and would also mean that the monument was no longer bisected by the existing carriageway. This would of course be the preferred route based on current knowledge.

However it may be that currently unidentified archaeological remains of equivalent significance to the scheduled monument are present elsewhere and potentially on the proposed route of Option M. Recent archaeological work at Scotch Corner has demonstrated that Roman activity in this area is much earlier and more significant than originally thought and I would expect that whichever option is chosen that archaeological issues will be a major factor in the design and build of the scheme.

In assessing the options for the proposal I would expect to see the standard industry approach in the form of a thorough desk-based study including assessment of aerial photographs and LIDAR data. This should be supplemented by field evaluation of each option to identify any previously unrecorded archaeological features. The field evaluation should include geophysical survey and trial trenching. This would allow a proper assessment to be made of the impact of the options on the significance of the archaeological resource.

I am presuming that Historic England will take the lead role regarding the impact on the Scheduled Monument.

Public Health

Our overarching aims aspire to create High Quality Safe Places (*where healthy behaviours are the norm*) e.g.

- Enhance connectivity with safe and efficient infrastructure, enabling residents to share in the benefits of growth.
- Enhance neighbourhood walkability, promoting living environments for the needs of all ages.
- Improve the use of existing tools (e.g. Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Health Impact Assessments) to achieve this.
- Enhance Road Safety e.g. Invest in better walking and cycling infrastructure to improve active travel across the social gradient.
- For example would it be possible to improve the cycling infrastructure which would support healthy lifestyles increases in cycling, and much lower numbers of cyclists killed or seriously injured. Lower speed limits also decrease the risk of death and serious injuries.
- Design any local stopping points (e.g. Roadside Cafes / Farm shops etc) so that they are easy and safe to access / walk around (and for dog users!) consequently increase activity levels – enhance local growth and connectedness
- Supporting sociable places that provide opportunities for people to meet others, socialise and organise together.

Does the route selection decision making criteria includes population and human health issues?

The table below from Public Health England lists the wider determinants that expect to be considered at scoping.

Note that although mental health is not specifically mentioned this should receive parity of esteem with physical health and is implicit in many of the wider determinants mentioned.

Health and wellbeing themes			
Access	Traffic and Transport	Socioeconomic	Land Use
Wider determinants of health and wellbeing			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to local public and key services and facilities - Access to good-quality affordable housing - Access to healthy affordable food - Access to the natural environment - Access to the natural environment within the urban environment - Access to leisure, recreation and physical activity opportunities within the urban and natural environments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accessibility - Access to/by public transport - Opportunities for/access by cycling and walking - Links between communities - Community severance - Connections to jobs - Connections to services, facilities and leisure opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment opportunities including training opportunities - Local business activity - Regeneration - Tourism and leisure industries - Community/social cohesion and access to social networks - Community engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land use in urban and/or rural settings - Quality of urban and natural environments

Children & Young Peoples Service

We can see the high value of improving this important connection and presumably improvement works to the A66 will allow access to schools via alternative routes during phased construction. Arkengarthdale is probably closing and so will not require access off the A66 – and can be accessed via Richmond or Reeth; Melsonby has alternative routes in; as does Eppleby Forcett. Middleton Tyas does not necessarily need access from Scotch Corner while that is upgraded. We presume that access routes during works to improve the A66 and Scotch Corner connection will be subject to consultation and thought through more thoroughly in the scheme's detailed planning.

Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.			
Directorate	Business and Environmental Services		
Service area	Highways and Transportation		
Proposal being screened	Highways England consultation on options to improve the A66		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	David Hern		
What are you proposing to do?	Respond to the Highways England consultation on options to improve the A66 strategic road		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	To seek to ensure that the views of the County Council are considered by Highways England in their decision making process		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No		
Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics			
As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? 			
If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.			
Protected characteristic	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	No	Yes	
Age	✓		
Disability	✓		
Sex	✓		
Race	✓		
Sexual orientation	✓		
Gender reassignment	✓		
Religion or belief	✓		
Pregnancy or maternity	✓		
Marriage or civil partnership	✓		
NYCC additional characteristics			
People in rural areas	✓		
People on a low income	✓		
Carer (unpaid family or friend)	✓		

Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No			
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	No			
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continue to full EIA:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for decision	The recommendation relates only to a consultation response. Highways England will be required to undertake a detailed Equalities assessment of their final decision with regards to their proposals			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	<i>Barrie Mason</i>			
Date	17/06/19			