

# **A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme**

**TR010060**

## **5.2 Consultation Report**

### **Annex S: Essex County Council Requirements Letter and Response**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed  
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 5

August 2022

## Infrastructure Planning

### Planning Act 2008

# A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme Development Consent Order 202[ ]

---

## 5.2 CONSULTATION REPORT

### ANNEX S: ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL REQUIREMENTS LETTER AND RESPONSE

---

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Regulation Reference</b>                   | Regulation 5(2)(q)                  |
| <b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference</b> | TR010060                            |
| <b>Application Document Reference</b>         | TR010060/APP/5.1                    |
| <b>Author</b>                                 | A12 Project Team, National Highways |

| <b>Version</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Status of Version</b> |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Rev 1          | August 2022 | DCO Application          |

## **CONTENTS**

|           |   |           |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>Requirements letter from Essex County Council.....</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Response to requirements letter .....</b>              | <b>10</b> |

| Junction / Section        | Key issues identified   | Specific Essex County Council requirements   | Rationale for requirements   |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Scheme-wide</b></p> | <p>In general, whilst the plans and other information that have been made available on the proposed scheme is helpful, in many cases currently insufficient detail has been supplied. The County Council requires more detailed drawings in order to allow decisions to be made on a more informed basis and to better understand what is proposed, for example on issues such as Green Infrastructure as this is a key priority for Essex in moving towards net zero.</p> <p>The provision of active travel measures (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding facilities (WCH)) is – based on the information available – currently insufficient. All active travel facilities should be LTN 1/20 compliant and evidenced as such. Further detail is provided under individual junctions and links</p> <p>With regard to the sections of A12 which will be de-trunked, in these locations there needs to be continued careful and joint collaborative work. The County Council as Highways Authority believes it is entirely inappropriate to leave redundant dual carriageways in situ after these have been bypassed without substantial modifications. This is currently a major concern for the County Council and joint work is required to develop an approach which is acceptable to both parties. Without prejudice to any future decisions, we need further information on the condition of all assets for which National Highways are proposing the Highways Authority (ECC) will be liable.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More detailed drawings that show the current proposed arrangement in sufficient detail are required scheme wide. These should ideally be at 1:1250 scale (rather than 1:2500), as was produced in support of similar schemes such as the A47 Wansford to Sutton dualling DCO submission. General Arrangement (GA) plans should also be provided for the proposed new and amended structures, as was done for the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet scheme.</li> <li>2. A definitive list and plans for the structures, drainage and all other assets for which it is proposed the Highways Authority will be liable is required. This should include all necessary information on asset condition such as as-built drawings, materials specifications and inspection reports (if available). A detailed list of information required for each asset category has been provided.</li> <li>3. Amendments to scheme-wide drainage and Green Infrastructure (GI) proposals are required to ensure that all impacts on County Council assets are mitigated to the stringent standards required by the County Council. This includes ensuring that pollution control mitigation is in place for all outfalls from the drainage network, increased detail in terms of drainage design or reassurance that processes are in place to provide this for further review before a formal decision can be made on scheme design and the inclusion of information about how and where biodiversity net gain will be delivered.</li> <li>4. Key sections of the proposed de-trunked A12 should be redesigned, to ensure that they are appropriate for expected future traffic flows, encourage mode shift to more sustainable forms of transport and better accord with the environmental objectives of the scheme.</li> <li>5. Full LTN 1/20 compliance needs to be demonstrated throughout the scheme; in particular at junctions and proposed pedestrian and cyclist crossing structures. If full compliance is not achievable the reasoning should be provided, and these departures should be agreed on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>6. Existing and proposed walking and cycle routes should be made more attractive through good design, lighting and the creation of GI planting alongside routes where appropriate. This can deliver multiple benefits in terms of air quality and flood management, and to create attractive routes to encourage usage.</li> <li>7. Provision of space should be made for renewable energy generation and electric vehicle charging points.</li> <li>8. The location of proposed bus stops with solar canopies and other bus infrastructure affected or required in connection with the scheme needs to be discussed and agreed with the County Council's Integrated Passenger Transport Unit (IPTU) infrastructure team.</li> <li>9. The means by which biodiversity net gain will be achieved on the project should be clearly demonstrated. This could include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Wildlife crossings and green corridors could be better utilised in order to prevent habitat fragmentation.</li> <li>b. Additional opportunities for street tree planting in line with recent updates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</li> <li>c. More crossing points to link up green spaces allowing them to be multifunctional and accessible to different use groups.</li> <li>d. Preservation and protection of existing woodland with a suitable buffer to prevent any ecological impact. If it is proposed the benefits outweigh the</li> </ol> </li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plans currently available are insufficiently detailed to enable the County Council and other stakeholders to fully understand the proposed arrangement. The provision of more detailed plans and GA plans for new and amended structures will ensure the County Council can fully review the proposals (for example, the width of proposed structures and how much space is available for WCH users).</li> <li>2. The County Council needs to be clear on the assets, including their condition and design life / residual life, for which NH are proposing the Highways Authority will become liable. This will enable Essex to take an informed position on this. As a general rule the County Council would wish to minimise future maintenance liabilities as far as possible.</li> <li>3. The current proposals do not include pollution mitigation on all outfalls. This should be included to make sure that this significant piece of infrastructure is held up to the same stringent requirements highlighted within the Essex SuDS Guide, that are placed on smaller scale developments. Although the current design meets national design standards, which allow increases in the level of pollutants in the environment, it still constitutes a worsening of current environmental pollution levels and does not take any steps towards enhancing the natural and local environment, which is a key principle of national and local guidance. The submission of further details on biodiversity impact mitigation is needed to bring the scheme in line with the Essex GI Strategy, 2020, Essex Climate Action Commission recommendations and emerging Essex GI Standards (building on the National GI Framework, which is a commitment from the 25 Year Environment Plan- <a href="https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Home.aspx">https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Home.aspx</a>). It is important that the scheme works with and reflects high-quality multifunctional GI features present both on and off site wherever possible in terms of habitat type, land use, boundary features, scale and location and minimise the introduce of GI features that have single benefit or of no local relevance.</li> <li>4. The County Council considers that retention of the de-trunked sections in their current form is not appropriate. These sections would be over-purposed for their intended functions, would create significant unnecessary future maintenance liabilities for the Council and be detrimental to future development and mode shift objectives.</li> <li>5. LTN 1/20 sets out Government best practice for the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and is strongly supported by Essex as a means of encouraging active travel. Non-compliance with LTN 1/20 detracts from this aim and should be minimised as far as possible.</li> <li>6. The provision of well-designed and easily-maintained walking and cycling routes can encourage more sustainable travel, improve health and wellbeing, reduce congestion and reduce air pollution. Hedges (planted 3m back from the edge of routes to allow for growth) can be effective in providing screening from traffic using the A12.</li> <li>7. Essex needs significant investment in electric vehicle infrastructure and renewable energy generation in support of the climate action agenda and energy security in line with Government policy. The transition to electric vehicles and the need for more renewable energy to be generated, stored and used locally demands that more renewables are generated locally.</li> </ol> |

|                                       |   |  |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                       |   | ecological disturbance, then any losses should be compensated so with a suitable scheme. Include hedgerow/verge improvements.  | <p>8. The scheme provides an opportunity to enhance provision for buses along the corridor including the de-trunked sections and at junctions. This is an important part of the scheme and should be considered at an early stage, prior to detailed design, to ensure it is not an afterthought.</p> <p>9. Under the Environment Bill 2021, NSIP developments are required to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. The County Council wishes to understand how this will be achieved and to work with NH on the measures that will be implemented as part of the scheme to achieve this requirement.</p> <p>Generally, from a policy perspective, the scheme provides a significant opportunity to deliver the wider aims identified within <b>Everyone's Essex</b>, our plan for levelling up Essex. While the scheme as proposed is aligned with the Essex Local Transport Plan (LTP) connectivity outcome there are significant opportunities to better align proposals with the LTP outcome to <i>Provide sustainable access and travel choice for Essex residents to help create sustainable communities</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling Essex residents to access further education employment and vital services (including healthcare, hospitals and retail)</li> <li>• Maintaining the vitality of our rural communities</li> <li>• Encouraging and enabling healthier travel and leisure activities</li> <li>• Creating strong and sustainable communities</li> </ul> |
| <b>Junction 19 (Boreham)</b>          | <p>At a high level the key issue related to Junction 19 is regarding the level of provision for active modes in particular walking and cycling measures which need to be LTN 1/20 compliant, but it is also noted that equestrian facilities are to be provided. More detail is needed in this regard.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the current DCO proposals for Junction 19 do not provide for future upgrading i.e. the proposed dualling of the Chelmsford North East Bypass and would involve abortive works under the current design, albeit it is acknowledged that this is not yet a committed scheme.</p>           | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Updated drawings, to demonstrate that the cycling facilities at Junction 19 fully accord with LTN 1/20 (including redesign of all staggered cycle crossings to provide straight across crossings). Traffic modelling outputs are required based on these drawings, to confirm and that junction still has enough traffic capacity to operate safely with these facilities in place.</li> <li>2. A redesigned WCH bridge to the north of Junction 19, to provide a more direct route for users, with fewer zig-zag foldbacks, if possible, and 5m radius (minimum) turns where ramp sections change direction - in accordance with LTN 1/20. Confirmation that the width of the bridge is sufficient to provide appropriate segregation of pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists</li> <li>3. A continuous off-carriageway WCH route from Boreham village to Beaulieu via the A12 WCH overbridge giving access to the new station. This should be provided as part of the scheme and not as a designated funds measure.</li> <li>4. Details are required of the proposed speed limit changes on Boreham Main Road, including confirmation that any proposed speed limit changes have been included in the traffic modelling as a core scenario. The County Council does not believe that a change to speed limit signage alone will be sufficient and other measures should be provided in consultation with Essex (such as speed cameras and/or traffic calming measures) to support the speed limit changes.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LTN 1/20 sets out Government best practice for the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and it is strongly supported by Essex as a means of encouraging active travel. Non-compliance with LTN 1/20 detracts from this aim and should be minimised as far as possible.</li> <li>2. As above re LTN 1/20 compliance.</li> <li>3. The overbridge provides a high value link from Boreham village and surrounding villages both over to the new station and into new open access areas which have onward WCH routes. Off-road provision linking the new station to Boreham village via the new bridge will reduce severance caused by the A12 and represent a far more appealing route to many vulnerable road users than the proposed new provision alongside the carriageway and across Junction 19.</li> <li>4. Experience in Essex has shown that it is important to consider the views of the local community when progressing with speed limit changes, and that the other speed management measures are typically required to ensure speed limit reductions are effective in reducing vehicle speeds. Full details on the proposed changes are required, together with an agreed package of speed management measures. Evidence should also be provided of consultation with bus operators regarding speed limit changes, as this is an important bus corridor.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Junction 21 (Hatfield Peverel)</b> | <p>The key issue related to the junction proposals at Junction 21 are predominantly around the B1019 Maldon Road / The Street junction which from traffic modelling shows an increase in traffic flows on the Maldon Road Northbound resulting in a queue length of 185 metres in the AM Peak Period in 2042.</p> <p>As has been documented previously the County Council advocates a new link (including highway and walking/cycling/horse riding provision) from the B1019 to the new Junction 21 to provide appropriate connectivity to Maldon district and mitigate the impacts of the A12 scheme on Hatfield Peverel. This</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provision should be included within the scheme for a new link road, connecting the new southern Junction 21 dumbbell roundabout to the B1019 at an appropriate point. This should be built to DMRB and Essex highway standards as appropriate and include a two-lane approach to the roundabout (of which one lane could be converted into a bus lane in the future).</li> <li>2. Detailed drawings are required to demonstrate how the proposed WCH facilities on the replacement Wellington Road Bridge will connect with existing WCH facilities on the southern side of the A12 - including safe crossing facilities.</li> <li>3. It is important that a continuous and segregated walking and cycling route of adequate width is maintained between Witham and Hatfield Peverel is required</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient space is available at the Maldon Road/The Street junction to mitigate the impact of the traffic flow and provide appropriate walking and cycling facilities, without having a detrimental impact on local properties, streetscape and vulnerable road users. The A12 scheme should therefore include a local bypass of Maldon Road in the vicinity of the southern dumbbell roundabout in order to mitigate these impacts. A new pedestrian crossing is planned to be implemented close to the junction on Maldon Road (funded from a secured developer contribution), to improve pedestrian connectivity and safety at this junction. This crossing is likely to exacerbate delay at the junction if the A12 scheme is progressed in its current form.</li> <li>2. The plans currently available are insufficiently detailed to enable the County Council and others to fully understand the proposed arrangement, and particularly</li> </ol>  |

Essex County Council's position on the A12 junction 19-25 widening project – March 2022 – Final

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>link road is not included in the A12 scheme and Essex do have not funding to deliver this.</p> <p>Whilst we accept that this junction is already operating overcapacity the A12 scheme will make it materially worse. We appreciate the work that NH have done to consider improvements to the junction, but as NH note no acceptable solution has been found. It is considered that a link road to Maldon should be provided as part of the scheme.</p> | <p>(together with confirmation of the maintenance/reinstatement of PROWs). The new provision should be lit to improve accessibility during the hours of darkness.</p> <p>4. A new walking and cycling route should be included (within the proposed red line boundary) to north of Junction 21, to connect new developments in Witham to Hatfield Peverel station.</p>   | <p>the interface with the existing layout in the vicinity of the Duke of Wellington PH. The provision of more detailed plans and GA plans for new and amended structures will ensure Essex can fully review the proposals.</p> <p>3. This section of the A12 is currently a well-used link by walkers and cyclists and should be maintained through the new junction arrangement to allow the continued use for walkers and cyclists between the two.</p> <p>4. A link through this land would provide the residents of the new development with a safe and car free route to the train station, encouraging sustainable travel and avoiding the busy main road and junctions through Hatfield Peverel.</p>  |
| <p><b>Junction 22 (Witham)</b></p>               | <p>In terms of key issues these are again related to the level and standard of active mode provision and the need for this to be in line with LTN 1/20 standards, for example where possible having straight ramps rather than switch back ramp sections at Colemans Junction.</p>  | <p>1. Redesigned segregated walking &amp; cycling bridges to the west of Junction 22 (in Gershwin Boulevard Bridge and Little Braxted Lane Bridge), to provide a more direct route for users, with fewer zig-zag foldbacks, if possible, and 5m radius (minimum) turns where ramp sections change direction – in accordance with LTN 1/20. Confirmation that the bridge has been designed to provide appropriate segregation of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>2. Provision of straight across cycle crossings at Colemans Junction, in accordance with LTN 1/20. Confirmation that the junction has sufficient traffic capacity with straight across cycle crossings in place (with separate staggered pedestrian facilities, if required).</p>   | <p>1. The cycling infrastructure proposed as part of the A12 scheme should be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20. The current proposals appear to fall short of the recommendations in LTN 1/20, both in terms of its core principle of directness and in terms of physical layout (turning radii, lane widths, etc.).</p> <p>2. As above.</p>   |
| <p><b>Junction 22 to 23 (De-trunked A12)</b></p> | <p>The current proposals show a retention of the dual carriageway section which will be de-trunked through Rivenhall End. There are a number of significant issues with this from an Essex perspective and the current proposals are therefore a major concern.</p>   | <p>1. A redesigned de-trunked A12 from Junction 22 to Rivenhall End (junction with the realigned Braxted Road), to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of existing dual carriageway in its entirety including base course, sub-base (where appropriate) and vehicle restraint systems (VRS).</li> <li>• Replacement of removed dual carriageway with a 7.3m single asphalt carriageway to modern standards and segregated provision for active modes.</li> <li>• Widening on the approach to Junction 22 for the provision of a westbound bus lane.</li> <li>• Backfill of remaining highway corridor to former carriageway level with appropriate material and tree planting .</li> <li>• Setting aside of land for an electric vehicle (EV) rapid charging station and provision for ground mounted solar PV generation and on shore wind to feed renewable energy to charging station.</li> <li>• New tree planting within the existing and new verges, where possible.</li> </ul> <p>2. A redesigned de-trunked A12 through Rivenhall End (from realigned Braxted Road to proposed single carriageway east of Rivenhall End), to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of existing dual carriageway in its entirety including base course, sub-base (where appropriate) and vehicle restraint systems (VRS).</li> <li>• Replacement of removed dual carriageway with 7.3m single asphalt carriageway to modern standards with bus stop bays with solar canopies (where appropriate) and segregated provision for active modes.</li> <li>• Backfill of remaining highway corridor to former carriageway level with appropriate material and tree planting.</li> <li>• Removal of proposed roundabout east of Rivenhall End.</li> <li>• Segregated walking and cycling facilities on either side of the road.</li> <li>• Straight across parallel cycle/pedestrian crossing of de-trunked A12.</li> <li>• New tree planting within the existing and new verges, where possible.</li> </ul> | <p>1. It would be entirely inappropriate for NH to pass on a dual carriageway to the County Council as Highways Authority, when the traffic flows do not justify a dual carriageway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maintenance liability would be huge, and this is a significant concern for Essex, particularly given the extent and current condition of assets that NH are proposing would be transferred.</li> <li>• A significant opportunity for landscape and carbon mitigation would be lost. Retention of a dual carriageway would detract from the local environment, increase the risk of the road being used inappropriately and fetter future development options along the corridor.</li> <li>• The A12 scheme will be a large generator of carbon and NH need to make the most of every opportunity to offset carbon the impact of the scheme.</li> <li>• Recycling of base course and sub-base should help to reduce the carbon impact construction</li> </ul> <p>2. As above, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature of the de-trunked A12 will change beyond recognition. The low traffic flows forecast for the road demonstrate that it will become a local access road only. The A12 scheme needs to ensure that the design of road matches its intended purpose, rather than leave it as an inter-urban highway with potential road safety issues around speeding traffic.</li> </ul> <p>3. The current cycling infrastructure proposals on Braxted Road fall sort of the DfT's LTN 1/20 guidelines, in particular at the Henry Dixon Road crossing (note this crossing would not be required if the level of Henry Dixon Road is raised to create an at-grade junction with the de-trunked section).</p> |

Essex County Council's position on the A12 junction 19-25 widening project – March 2022 – Final

|                                     |   |   |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                     |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of an at-grade roundabout at Henry Dixon Road where it crosses the de-trunked section of the A12, through raising of carriageway corridor levels and removal of existing overbridge. The existing overbridge would represent a significant maintenance burden to County Council for seemingly no gain. Raising the carriageway levels and creating an at-grade roundabout is more appropriate given the future nature of the roads and has the benefit that the proposed signalised junction on the realigned Braxted Road can be removed from the scheme.</li> <li>Provision of bus (&amp; active mode) only access to Oak Road to/from the de-trunked A12.</li> </ul> <p>3. Amendments to realigned Braxted Road to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Segregated walking and cycling facilities along whole length of new road, from southern extent of scheme to de-trunked A12.</li> </ul>   |   |
| <b>Junction 23 (Kelvedon South)</b> | <p>Of key importance at this junction location is that the A12 scheme takes appropriate account of the evolving proposals for the A120 Braintree to A12 scheme.</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence to confirm that the A12 scheme has taken appropriate account of the evolving proposals for the A120 Braintree to A12 scheme, to ensure that the future delivery of the optimal A120 scheme will not be jeopardised.</li> <li>Evidence is required that the impacts of the planned Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) have been taken into account.</li> <li>Redesigned walking and cycling bridge near Essex County Fire and Rescue Service headquarters, to provide a more direct route for users, with fewer zig-zag foldbacks, if possible, and 5m radius (minimum) turns where ramp sections change direction – in accordance with LTN 1/20. Confirmation that the bridge has been designed to provide appropriate segregation of pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the DfT's Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020–2025 announcement, it stated that the A12 scheme 'will need to take into account evolving proposals for the A120 Braintree to A12'. Appropriate assurance is required to demonstrate that design changes made to the A12 scheme have not added significant unnecessary cost increases to the A120 project or negatively affected its environmental impact</li> <li>The IWMF will be a significant generator of traffic in the future. The County Council requires evidence to demonstrate that this has been considered adequately in the design of the A12 scheme</li> <li>The current walking and cycling bridge proposals fall short of the DfT's LTN 1/20 guidelines, in particular with regard to directness and physical dimensions/layout</li> </ol>  |
| <b>Junction 24 (Kelvedon North)</b> | <p>Local community connectivity needs enhancing to assist in mitigating the impacts of traffic flow changes which are forecast to increase as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>As has been documented previously the County Council does not support the proposed Junction 24 in its current form. There are concerns about the impact of additional traffic on local roads as a result of the junction location and current proposed arrangement. Whilst it is noted that iterations of the traffic modelling have indicated reduced traffic flows on Inworth Road, the reasons for these changes are not currently sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Whilst it is appreciated the consideration that NH have given to the proposed community bypass to date, it is not believed that this been adequately assessed or that sufficient evidence has been provided as to why it is not considered a proportionate intervention (noting the concerns about the traffic forecasts for Inworth Road mentioned above). Essex do not have funding to deliver the bypass and given the outstanding concerns about the impacts of the scheme on local roads we believe that the bypass should be included within the scope of the A12 scheme.</p> <p>There also appears to be very limited consideration given to the impact of the scheme on County Council drainage assets.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence is required to confirm that the proposed A12 scheme will not have a significant adverse effect on key local junctions in Kelvedon, Feering and Tiptree.</li> <li>Confirmation is required that proposed footway provision under the A12 will accord with Essex design standards.</li> <li>The inclusion of a drainage system on Inworth Road should be included as part of the scheme.</li> <li>A community bypass should be delivered as part of the scheme, linking the proposed new southern Junction 24 dumbbell roundabout to the B1023 south of All Saints Church. This should be built to DMRB and Essex highway standards as appropriate. Fundamentally, further assessment is needed of a new additional east-west link which connects the new junction with the B1023 close to the A12 to reduce the need for traffic between the new junction and Feering/Kelvedon to travel through Inworth to access the bypass. An alternative arrangement which should be considered, in consultation with the County Council, is a new link between the B1023 and the southern dumbbell south of the A12 which has the effect of segregating Inworth Road at the point it connects to the link road. This would have the effect of making the stretch of Inworth Road between the A12 and the bypass a no through route and for local traffic only meaning that traffic between Feering/Kelvedon and Tiptree would be required to use the bypass.</li> <li>Notwithstanding the above, the implementation of package of measures on Inworth Road to minimise the impacts of the additional traffic and help to address safety concerns is welcomed. This should include localised widening to reduce pinch points, footway improvements and details of the proposed speed limit changes. An assessment should also be undertaken on the introduction of priority working on Hinds Bridge. Currently the plans provided do not show sufficient detail of the measures proposed or the remaining pinch points – where pinch</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed traffic modelling has not yet been provided to confirm that the impact of traffic resulting from the A12 scheme will be acceptable in Kelvedon, Feering and Tiptree.</li> <li>As a new asset the footway provision should meet current standards. Confirmation of this is requested; as this is not currently discernible from the plans provided.</li> <li>The existing drainage system is already struggling to cope with current levels of rainfall, which affects traffic flows in this area during severe weather. If traffic flows increase as a result of the scheme upgrading the drainage network is required to ensure that future rainfall events do not cause worsening traffic issues in the area. The supplementary consultation states that a detailed assessment of flood risk will be undertaken; this is welcomed but it is not clear when this will take place or how drainage improvements will be secured.</li> <li>The current Junction 24 layout and arrangement would have a significant material impact on local roads, in particular the B1023 Inworth Road. Insufficient information has been provided on the assessment of a bypass and the reasons for the changes in traffic forecasts as a result of the scheme. The A12 scheme should therefore include a local bypass of Inworth in order to minimise and where possible avoid these impacts.</li> <li>The proposed location and current arrangement of Junction 24 will lead to a material increase in traffic on Inworth Road. Measures are required to mitigate the impacts of this increase as far as possible and ensure the scheme does not have a material adverse impact on road safety and amenity along this link.</li> <li>The proposed location of Junction 24 is expected to lead to an increase in traffic forecast through the village. Measures to mitigate this impact, taking account of the nature of the road network in this area, should be identified.</li> </ol> |

Essex County Council's position on the A12 junction 19-25 widening project – March 2022 – Final

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | <p>points remain the road width and reason for not being able to increase it should be provided.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Consideration, in consultation with the County Council, should be given to the implementation of a HGV restriction (local access only) on the approaches to Messing.</li> <li>7. Protection of a route for a footway/cycleway through the A12 scheme area, north-south from the southern extent of the red line boundary, passing through Junction 24 under the A12, to the northern extent of the red line boundary. Allowance within the design of Junction 24 for this route, in order to facilitate a future direct cycle route from Tiptree to Kelvedon. It is not clear currently what space provision will be made for this. Clarification of whether a new more direct north-south route through this junction can be provided is requested.</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. There is significant concern within the local community about the impacts of the currently proposed junction arrangement on Inworth Road and Messing. Assurance is required that the proposed alternative in the form of the community bypass has been adequately assessed.</li> <li>8. The Inworth road is an important cycle route from Tiptree into the rail station at Kelvedon for commuters. The junction should not preclude the provision of a future north-south route through the junction to enhance the route between Tiptree and Kelvedon for pedestrians and cyclists. The scheme presents an excellent opportunity to improve north-south connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, which is currently impeded by the A12, and the feasibility of a more direct connection via this new junction should be examined.</li> </ol>   |
| <p><b>Junction 24 to 25 (De-trunked A12)</b></p> | <p>The current proposals show a retention of the dual carriageway section which will be de-trunked between Junction 24-25. As with the de-trunked section through Rivenhall End, there are a number of significant issues with this from an Essex perspective and the current proposals are therefore a major concern.</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A redesigned de-trunked A12 from Feering (New Lane) to Marks Tey, to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement of dual carriageway with 7.3m single asphalt carriageway to modern standards with bus stop bays with solar canopies (where appropriate) and segregated provision for active modes.</li> <li>• 'De-straightening' of highway alignment to encourage speed limit adherence.</li> <li>• Removal of existing dual carriageway in its entirety including base course, sub-base (where appropriate) and vehicle restraint systems (VRS).</li> <li>• Provision of an electronically monitored and enforced bus gate at appropriate point on route to ensure it is used for local access and buses only.</li> <li>• Backfill of remaining highway corridor to former carriageway level with appropriate material and tree planting along length of corridor or conversion to linear park / greenway with provision for linear solar farm.</li> <li>• Widening and resurfacing of segregated WCH route along length of linear park and provision of linear solar farm.</li> <li>• Simple T-junctions at New Lane, Wishing Well Farm and Easthorpe Road junctions, rather than roundabouts.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | <p>Same reasoning as for points 1 and 2 of Junction 22-23 (de-trunked A12):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would be entirely inappropriate for NH to pass on a dual carriageway to the County Council as Highways Authority, when the traffic flows do not justify a dual carriageway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maintenance liability would be huge, and this is a significant concern for Essex, particularly given the extent and current condition of assets that NH are proposing would be transferred.</li> <li>• A significant opportunity for landscape and carbon mitigation would be lost. Retention of a dual carriageway would detract from the local environment, increase the risk of the road being used inappropriately and fetter future development options along the corridor.</li> <li>• The A12 scheme will be a large generator of carbon and NH need to make the most of every opportunity to offset carbon the impact of the scheme.</li> <li>• Recycling of base course and sub-base should help to reduce the carbon impact construction</li> <li>• The nature of the de-trunked A12 will change beyond recognition. The low traffic flows forecast for the road demonstrate that it will become a local access road only. The A12 scheme needs to ensure that the design of road matches its intended purpose, rather than leave it as an inter-urban highway with potential road safety issues around speeding traffic.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Junction 25 (Marks Tey)</b></p>            | <p>The key issue here is that the proposed junction with the A120 may over-provide in terms of capacity, given the A120 is planned to be diverted as part of the A120 Braintree to A12 RIS3 Pipeline Scheme. To reduce capacity at this location will provide the opportunity to reduce severance between communities north and south of the A12.</p> <p>Much like other junctions the provision for active modes should be improved for example straight-across crossings in line with LTN 1/20 particularly if a new A120 came on line, significantly reducing the flows at Marks Tey.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provision of straight across cycle crossing at the new Station Road crossroads, in accordance with LTN 1/20, with staggered pedestrian crossings, if necessary, to ensure adequate capacity for motorised traffic.</li> <li>2. Retention and upgrading of all Marks Tey bus stops – in particular on the dual carriageway section of the A120 between the proposed Marks Tey station junction and the A12 overbridge.</li> <li>3. The existing footbridge over the A12 is narrow and unpleasant to use, and its replacement is welcomed. Further detail is required on the design to ensure it is fit for purpose for both pedestrians and cyclists. The plans provided suggest the bridge will also be accessible to horse riders – confirmation is requested that this will be the case.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The current cycling infrastructure proposals fall short of the DfT's LTN 1/20 guidelines, in particular with regard to crossing design.</li> <li>2. The provision of bus stops meeting current guidance is required to ensure bus access and good provision for passengers is maintained in Marks Tey, at the locations that will be impacted by the scheme. Currently it is not clear how passenger transport service provision will be impacted in the area.</li> <li>3. The current design does not appear to be LTN 1/20 compliant. This bridge, if well designed and sufficiently wide, provides an excellent opportunity to reduce the severance effect of the A12 in this area and improve connectivity across Marks Tey.</li> </ol>   |



National Highways  
Woodlands  
Manton Lane  
Bedford MK41 7LW

4 July 2022

Dear Billy

## **A12 CHELMSFORD TO A120 WIDENING SCHEME - ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL'S POSITION ON THE A12 JUNCTION 19-25 WIDENING PROJECT**

I am writing further to my letter of 26 May which acknowledged receipt of the council's "requirements" document received by the project on 1 April 2022 and the creation of the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) working group.

The project continues to consider the "requirements" document in detail and the engagement approach we have set up will allow for the topics within it to be discussed in more detail. This letter is National Highways' response to several of the requirements outlined in the document.

In the sections below the project has extracted and, in some instances, summarised the requirements document. Beneath that position, I have provided the position of the project. This is not exhaustive but does capture the main items.

### **Additional detail to be provided - general**

The requirements document made a request for the following:

- 1:1250 scale drawings
- A definitive list and plans for the structures, drainage and all other assets for which it is proposed the Highways Authority will be liable is required. This should include all necessary information on asset condition such as as-built drawings, materials specifications and inspection reports (if available). A detailed list of information required for each asset category has been provided.
- Updated drawings, to demonstrate that the cycling facilities at Junction 19 fully accord with LTN 1/20 (including redesign of all staggered cycle crossings to provide straight across crossings).
- Detailed drawings are required to demonstrate how the proposed WCH facilities on the replacement Wellington Road Bridge will connect with existing WCH facilities on the southern side of the A12 - including safe crossing facilities.

In addition to the above there have been various general discussions about further traffic information, including junction 19. However, more recently these requests have not been specific.

### Project response

At the time of writing this letter the following draft application documents have been shared:

- Streets and Rights of Way Plans
- General Arrangement Plans
- Engineering Sections Plan and Profiles
- Structures Engineering Drawings
- Interrelationship Document
- Drainage Drawings
- Land Plans
- REAC/1<sup>st</sup> EMP
- OCTMP
- Environmental Statement (ES) Chapters 1-5
- Parts of ES Chapter 16 Cumulative Assessment
- Design and Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Borrow pits Report
- Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report
- Classification of Roads Plans
- De-trunking and Stopping-up Plans

In addition, access to our Projectmapper system was first provided to the council in 2021 to assist with Statutory Consultation information sharing with the council. Additional access has now been provided and the design has been updated to reflect that being submitted for Development Consent. As discussed at the meeting on 1 June 2022, if further layers are required do let the project team know and we will consider further requests.

Regarding the drawing's ratio, the Rules applying to the applications for development consent allow for 1:2500 scale plans and drawings. Given the size of the scheme it is our view this is both an acceptable and appropriate scale for application drawings. It is also worth noting the drawings produced by the scheme contain the design models, any drawing at a larger scale would contain the same information, which is appropriate for the preliminary design stage for a project of this size, and therefore a larger scale drawing would not contain any more detail.

Asset information for the de-trunked sections of the project is covered in page 7 of this letter. Regarding proposed local road assets outside of the de-trunking, proposed road ownership plans were sent to the council in August 2021. We were seeking feedback on these plans for many months.

The draft Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans, Classification of Roads Plans and De-trunking and Stopping-up Plans have been issued to you in draft. These plans show what will form part of the local roads network to be handed over to the council for your future ownership and maintenance. The detailed asset information requested for these will be developed throughout detailed design and construction stages of the project, and we will work closely with you as this information is developed.

In respect of traffic information, following the statutory consultation a traffic working group was established with the council. The purpose of this group was to provide the additional information requested in consultation responses, as well as the “A12 DCO traffic modelling requests” note we received from the council on 16 November 2021. The workshops took place and a complete slide deck with some 195 slides of information was provided on the shared Teams page.

On 10 June the draft Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report and Transport Assessment were issued to the shared Teams page. Access to the shared teams page has also been given to your consultants Systra and as of the date of this letter. The project does not believe any further information needs to be provided.

### **Walking cycling, and horse-riding**

The requirements document made various requests in relation to walking, cycling and horse-riding. These mostly related to LTN 1/20 and the extent to which the scheme complies with it, including switchbacks and straight across crossings. The requirements document also focused on junction 19 facilities.

#### A12 project's response

The proposed scheme will provide a considerable improvement to WCH provision. The scheme submitted for development consent will include:

- A total of 30km of new and/or improved WCH facilities
- 6 road bridges with walking and cycling provision, 5 of which will be new or upgraded provision
- 5 road bridges with walking provision
- 5 new WCH bridges (walking, cycling and horse riding), 1 improved walking and cycling bridge

Overall, there will be 20km of additional WCH provision. The project is also bringing over 3.5km of the council's existing facilities up to LTN 1/20 compliance. At the recent WCH workshop with your PRow team represented, the proposals were very well received.

The project has responded to the council's requests to do the following:

- Change in the design to Payne's Lane Bridge

- Straightening of the ramp on the north side of the Little Braxted Lane bridge
- Commitment during stage 5 (detailed design) to be captured within the SOCG to implement up to 5m radius on WCH bridge ramps at all locations along the length of the scheme within land constraints. The early detailed design will be shared with you prior to examination.
- Commitment to share the traffic modelling effects of providing straight across crossings for cyclists at the following locations:
  - Henry Dixon/Braxted Road
  - Colchester Road at Eastways Junction
  - A120 Marks Tey Interchange

Subject to that information being provided, if agreed, a commitment to provide early detailed design plans of the crossing prior to examination.

Regarding junction 19 facilities, we are providing a grade separated bridge at Paynes Lane, in accordance with LTN 1/20, which will provide the main link WCH from Boreham, to the Beaulieu Park development and proposed station. The remaining connectivity connections at J19 are designed in accordance with LTN 1/20. We also note that our proposed provision is an upgrade of the current developer's consented works, carried out by agreement with the Council under the Highways Act 1980, which contains uncontrolled crossings.

On 20 June we held a workshop to confirm the above and alongside the draft DCO documents issued, including Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement.

### **Maldon link road**

The requirements document states:

*“Provision should be included within the scheme for a new link road, connecting the new southern Junction 21 dumbbell roundabout to the B1019 at an appropriate point. This should be built to DMRB and Essex highway standards as appropriate and include a two-lane approach to the roundabout (of which one lane could be converted into a bus lane in the future).”*

### A12 project's response

The project has considered the Maldon Road/The Street junction in considerable detail and has engaged with the council throughout scheme evolution. This culminated in the letter sent to the council on 23 December 2021 which dealt with the position expressed by the council to the project at the workshop 29 September 2021.

Since then, the project has undertaken further analysis of the operability of the Maldon Road and The Street junction. The modelling of the junction was updated as part of the development of the scheme's Transport Assessment, with the results being shared with council officers on 25 February 2022. This assessment showed that although queues on Maldon Road would become slightly longer due to the proposed A12 scheme, when averaged across all arms the delays at the junction would not become significantly

worse due to the proposed scheme. In fact, in the PM peak the overall delays would improve.

In your requirements letter the council's position changed to that previously expressed in letters to the Department for Transport and consultation responses. As such further work has been undertaken to assess the link road suggestion. This was presented to the council on 12 May 2022. In addition, a specific Technical Report note has been prepared (which will be shared with the council) to provide a detailed overview of various assessments and the project's conclusion. The Technical Report will also be appended to the Environmental Statement.

The project's position is that extensive work has concluded the link road is not justified as part of the proposed scheme.

Nevertheless, considering the council's historical work on developing bypass proposals, and the council's previous suggestions on the project, we have developed a further technical note confirming the capacity of the proposed junction 21 and its ability to handle a future link in case the council wishes to promote on in the future. I attach a copy of that note for your information.

### **Inworth Road bypass**

The requirements document states:

*"A community bypass should be delivered as part of the scheme, linking the proposed new southern Junction 24 dumbbell roundabout to the B1023 south of All Saints Church. This should be built to DMRB and Essex highway standards as appropriate. Fundamentally, further assessment is needed of a new additional east-west link which connects the new junction with the B1023 close to the A12 to reduce the need for traffic between the new junction and Feering/Kelvedon to travel through Inworth to access the bypass. An alternative arrangement which should be considered, in consultation with the County Council, is a new link between the B1023 and the southern dumbbell south of the A12 which has the effect of segregating Inworth Road at the point it connects to the link road. This would have the effect of making the stretch of Inworth Road between the A12 and the bypass a no through route and for local traffic only meaning that traffic between Feering/Kelvedon and Tiptree would be required to use the bypass."*

### A12 project's response

The project has undertaken considerable work to consider the traffic increase on Inworth Road, and more recently the projected increase, for the worst peak of the day, of two vehicles per minute in the community of Messing. In response to community concerns about the existing drainage issues, and pinch points on Inworth Road, we have proposed several interventions that were presented in our supplementary consultation. They will mitigate most of the existing community concerns and improve the safety case on Inworth Road, which already operates as a feeder route to the SRN, via existing J23 and J24 – both to be superseded by our proposed J24.

We have also considered the merits of a bypass. We considered:

1. No interventions on Inworth Road
2. Our localised interventions on Inworth Road
3. A single link road to the south of junction 24 bypassing Inworth
4. Two link roads connecting with the southern dumbbell of junction 24, one bypassing Inworth
5. Two link roads, one connecting to the northern dumbbell on junction 24, and one connecting to the southern dumbbell bypassing Inworth.

We presented the findings of the introduction of a bypass at the workshop on 12 May using 5 above as the main comparison. However, the note we have created, which we will share with the council, will present analysis of each of the bypass options. This note will be included within our Environmental Statement.

Recently conversations about more “subtle” interventions to minimise traffic through Messing have taken place, including at our meeting on 13 June. The project's view is the projected flows of two vehicles per minute at peak time through Messing can be accommodated by the existing roads.

We have considered your feedback on the slides we presented on 12 May. At our workshop on 1 June, we confirmed which aspects of the feedback we would incorporate into the slides. Once the council has confirmed it is satisfied with the traffic figures, we will share the updated slides which will be presented to Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council.

### **De-trunking - junctions 22-23**

The requirements document made considerable requests for works to take place to the de-trunked section of the current A12 carriageway. The requests included removing existing dual carriageway, to be replaced with a single carriageway road with active travel segregation, the removal of the proposed Rivenhall roundabout and the creation of a new at-grade roundabout facilitated by raising the height of Henry Dixon Road. In addition, there were various requests for tree planting, solar and onshore wind generation with the setting aside of land for electric vehicle rapid charging points, as well as additional bus service provision.

### **De-trunking - junctions 24-25**

The requirements document made considerable requests for works to take place to the de-trunked section of the carriageway. The requests included removing existing dual carriageway to be replaced with a single carriageway road with active travel segregation and de-straightening work. In addition, there were requests for the provision of electronically monitored and enforced bus gate, additional planting and the creation of a linear park and solar farm.



## A12 project's response

The council's requirements go considerably beyond the scope and budget of the A12 project.

National Highways' Operational Team has developed the following principles for de-trunking standards that National Highways will seek to agree with the council:

1. The de-trunked assets will meet the standard of safe and serviceable operation, as set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.
2. The condition of the de-trunked roads will be similar to other comparable roads on the Strategic Road Network as measured by the Pavement Condition Key Performance Indicator in Roads Investment Strategy 2: 2020 – 2025 (or any relevant replacement from time to time in force).
3. Prior to de-trunking, maintenance will have been undertaken in accordance with an intelligence-led system designed to achieve optimum intervention for each individual asset by improving asset quality and customer satisfaction whilst offering greater value for money.
4. Maintenance schemes for de-trunked assets which have previously been identified for delivery through funding in Road Investment Strategy 3: 2025 to 2030 will be completed or funded by National Highways.

In terms of next steps, we wish to work with the council to formulate a handover plan. The proposed next steps to handover are to:

1. Provide asset inventories such as lights, drainage pavement, signs etc. We expect to be able to provide this in the next two months;
2. Provide a condition report with a forward look of planned works. We expect to be able to provide this by the end of the year;
3. Forward funding considerations, such as minor capital works, designated funds and RIS 3. We expect that discussions on this will be ongoing from 2023.

The aim of the handover process is to assure ECC that the roads will be handed over in a safe and serviceable condition. All additional works that would have been delivered in 2025-2030 period will either be delivered by NH, or a lump sum could be handed to ECC.

In addition to the above, as discussed at several meetings, it is important to note that outside of the scope of the A12 project, National Highways does have access to Designated Funds. Designated funds are separate to our core work of operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network. They provide ring-fenced funding that we use to invest in and support initiatives that deliver lasting benefits for road users, the environment and communities across England.

We are progressing two applications in relation to the de-trunking and believe a further session on Designated Funds either within the SOCG working group structure or outside would be beneficial. We can discuss this further at the next SOCG working group meeting.

## **Biodiversity net gain**

### A12 project's response

DEFRA metric 3.0 is being applied to the proposed scheme, with the aim of maximising biodiversity value. The proposed scheme is exceeding 10% net gain. Further details of the methodology and the biodiversity net gain scores will be found when our application is submitted within Appendix 9.14: Biodiversity Net Gain report.

I believe the above covers the main items raised in the requirements letter.

I look forward to continuing our ongoing discussions.

Yours sincerely

Philip Davie  
Project Director, A12 Chelmsford to A120