

A12 Widening Chelmsford to A120

Additional Response to Planning Inspectorate Re. Retaining Junction 20A

1. My name is Charles Martin and I refer to National Highways Document “TR010060 9.3 Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations” Dated January 2023.
2. After my presentation at the Open Floor Hearing 12th January 2023, I was made aware by the Applicant’s staff of National Highways analysis of the scenario to retain Junction 20a Southbound within the above vast document of several hundred pages (page 539 to be specific). As outlined in my OFH submission I find this level of NH engagement very poor.
3. Referring to NH’s analysis as stated in TRO10060 Appendix B (A12 Junction 20A Southbound Merge Assessment of Alternatives) I would make the following observations, some in support but the majority in rebuttal.
4. **Executive Summary Page 4:** NH analysis finds that a roundabout solution for the retention of Jn20A southbound would score poorly on the grounds of; impacts on road users and worker safety , natural and built environment, walking cycling and horse-riding connectivity, cost and carbon increases, construction and drainage challenges and increased land.
5. The only item I agree with is increased land, the rest is very subjective and open to many arguments to discount them.
6. **Section 4 Page 10:** NH say that Terling Hall Bridge will be a restraint on the location of the on-slip (agreed) or the bridge will have to be modified to incorporate the extra width of the on-slip and merge (disagree). My design complies with standards and will fit without bridge alterations.
7. NH say it is possible to fit in a roundabout west of the River Ter but their design would have a significant effect on Crix House. They say that there will be significant adverse effects and RTCs resulting from HGV traffic on B1137.
8. All the arguments in para 7above are subjective but I do agree that extra land take will be required with NH’s design to cater for all movements. Their roundabout and approaches design, in my view, is far in excess of what is required and is based on trunk road standards which are not necessary here as Main Road is a B class side road.
9. **Section 5 – Scoring Table 5.2:** Rescoring the Roundabout alternative using my smaller scale design I find a positive score of +8 over NH’s junction closure design.

Revised Table 5.2:

RIS Objectives	Charles Martin RBT. Design Jn 20A as compared to NH RBT Design DS-01	Comments
1.Supports Growth in Local Plans etc.	0	Neutral on congestion and A12 capacity
1.Specific traffic flow	+1	Less traffic in Boreham. Possibly more in Hatfield Peverel (At worst Neutral)
2.Road user safety	0	NH arguments against rbt. are subjective. Neutral
2.Road worker safety	0	NH argument re Traffic management is flawed as TM will be required along the whole A12 route. No difference here
3.Improved network resilience	+1	Agree with NH score
3.Recognises impacts on other schemes	0	Agree with NH score
4.Improved environmental Impact within communities	+2	Agree with NH score with proviso that Jn 20A remains open S/Bound
4.Impact of infrastructure on environment	-1	My design has some effect but not as great as NH's rbt. alternative
5. Scheme provides safe WCH route etc.	+2	Keep WCH route on north side as at present only one crossing as at present. No hazard.
5.Safety and Public transport	0	Agree with NH score neutral
6.Improve customer satisfaction	+3	NH argument is subjective. NH Proposed Jn21 design is not favourable to southbound traffic from Maldon
6.Improve scheme profile	+1	Agree with NH score
7.Econmoic benefits	0	Agree with NH score neutral
7.Cost	-1	Marginal difference in overall cost of scheme

RIS Objectives	Charles Martin RBT. Design Jn 20A as compared to NH RBT Design DS-01	Comments
8. Carbon		Significant works to do in NH closure scheme. Neutral overall
8. Highway Geometry	0	Agree with NH score
8. Construction Challenge	0	No extra challenge
8. Drainage Challenge	0	Neutral, very little overall change in sealed surface. Proposed attenuation pond adjacent will cope with any marginal increase
8. Structures challenge	0	No challenge
8. Planning and Land Challenge	0	Extra land required but not significant. Neutral. (At worst -1)
TOTAL	+8	

10. National Highways scoring for their design for a roundabout (-15) is subjective in many places and scoring arguments along the lines above have equal weight, resulting in a positive score over NH's default proposed closure of Jn 20A.
11. NH are overdesigning their roundabout solution, thus producing a favourable score for their default closure design in comparison with the design proposed in my submission.
12. I conclude therefore that a Junction 20A design based on a much-reduced scale is a viable alternative.

Charles Martin