

Comments on “Applicant’s Responses to Open Floor Hearing 2, Appendix OFH2A- Junction 20A Southbound Merge Alternative Roundabout Proposal Analysis” Document Ref TR010060/EXAM/9.13.

1. My name is Charles Martin and I have previously made 2 submissions (refs 13557 and 13728) proposing a roundabout solution for the retention of Junction 20A Southbound. I am assuming I can respond, by Deadline 2, to the Applicant’s response to my submissions after the Open Floor Hearing.
2. I would make the following corrections to the text in the main body of the above document: Page 5, ref 6 - I have been a chartered civil engineer 35 years not 30 years and Page 7, ref 8 - The roundabout I propose is 28 metres ICD not 20 metres.
3. I make the following comments on the Applicant’s document referenced in the title above.

Applicant’s Paragraph	Charles Martin’s Comment
1.1.4	My design cannot be considered “similar” to the Applicant’s previous roundabout design outlined in their document “Applicant’s Responses to Relevant Representations” Jan 2023 Document ref. TR010060/EXAM/9.3
2.1.1	The Applicant still appears not to have carried out their own detailed technical design. They have simply modelled my design in AutoCAD. As previously stated, my design Options 1-3 are still to be considered sketches. Hence the Applicant’s comments can only be considered as subjective without technical back up.
2.1.4	The Applicant’s comments are noted. 10 mph is an acceptable speed for HGVs to negotiate a compact roundabout.
2.1.5	The Applicant feels that the southbound exit and northbound approach to the roundabout, as proposed in my earlier submissions, appear to cause HGVs some difficulties remaining in the correct lane. I would say large scale design will resolve this, as the overlap is very small. I am surprised that the Applicant has not carried out such a detailed design as I requested at the OFH 2, before dismissing my ideas.
Continued below	

Applicant's Paragraph	Charles Martin's Comment
2.2.2 and 2.2.3	My design could have some effect on the last section of Crix House curtilage wall. I previously stated in earlier submissions that the wall could be avoided by careful detailed design, if not completely avoided then any effect could be minimised. This design work has not been carried out by the Applicant such that I can be convinced that the wall is a critical restraint on any alignment. The roundabout approach/exit alignments appear to be critical in resolving any HGV conflict referred to above and in my view this conflict can be removed with detailed design.
2.2.4	The Applicant's design referred to assumes a design speed of 85kph (50mph). This does not need to be the case. Indeed the more logical design would be to continue the Hatfield Peverel village speed limit of 30 mph up to my proposed roundabout and further south by say 100 metres in both directions. There is a logic to this as drivers can understand a definite change in road layout and a lower design speed can minimise the B1137 curvature required. Local entry/exit curves can be accommodated more readily to resolve the HGV conflicts described by the Applicant.
2.2.5 and 2.2.6	My alternative scoring of the designs detailed in my second submission (ref 13728 dated 27 th January 2023) after the OPH 2, gives a score of +8 and I disagree with the Applicant's assessment of the negative effects of the items listed in 2.2.5
2.3.2	The Applicant agrees that further detailed design of my proposal may mitigate the geometric issues identified by "the swept path analysis". I therefore respectfully insist that the Applicant does indeed carry out further design to prove to the ExA that a roundabout should be installed.
Continued below	

Applicant's Paragraph	Charles Martin's Comment
2.3.3	<p>The Applicant states that A12 main line drivers may conflict with merging drivers from Junction 20A due to the vicinity of the upstream merge from their proposed Junction 21. The ExA will require proof of this subjective statement. My view is that the two junctions are far enough apart for this not to be an issue.</p> <p>The various user issues with roundabouts in general are well known and apply to any roundabout nationally. My proposal is no different.</p> <p>The surplus land being acquired for the attenuation pond can be used to accommodate my design and any insignificant increase in size of the pond will accommodate any extra run off.</p> <p>The Applicant's comment on carbon impact is very subjective and no proof to support this has been provided.</p> <p>I agree with the Applicant that minor mitigation works may be required to offset any minor loss to The River Ter flood plain. I do not see this as being a serious argument to ignore my proposal.</p>
3.1.1	The HGV issues are discussed above.
3.1.2	The Applicant's position is basically flawed as discussed above.
3.1.3	As discussed above the Applicant agrees a roundabout solution meets the design standards but the Applicant's position on the link back to the B1137 can be resolved with detailed design
3.1.4	The Applicant's comment only applies with the higher design speed of 50 mph, reduce this to 30 mph and redesign the south entry/exit.
3.1.5	My alternative design scores +8 in direct comparison to the Applicant's poor assessment of their completely different design.

4. Conclusion

4.1. The Applicant agrees that a roundabout proposal including associated slip-on and merge is a viable solution.

4.2. What needs to be done, is for the Applicant to submit a detailed design to the ExA that demonstrates this accurately. The Applicant thus far seems content to down-play a roundabout solution, relying on arguments without substantive proof to support their decisions.

4.3 The ExA, armed with a detailed roundabout solution can then make a reasoned decision on whether Junction 20A can remain open southbound.