

## EAST OF ENGLAND OFFICE

A12 Chelmsford to A120 Case work Team Our ref: PL00753271

By Email Only

A12chelmsfordA120@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Your ref: TR010060

22 March 2023

Dear A12 Chelmsford to A120 Case work Team

## Re: ExA 2nd written questions

Please find below Historic England's comments to the responses from the applicant relating to ExA 2nd written questions at Deadline 4.

Question Reference	Question	Historic England (HBMCE) response
Q2.11.3	The representation from HE [REP2-060] counters the assessment made by the Applicant on the significance of the scheduled monument at Appleford Farm, Rivenhall End. HE considers that the proposed construction works would result in a substantial change in the context of the monument. Can the Applicant re-appraise the impact on the monument as suggested by HE at their paragraph 5.3.8? Can further mitigation be provided in order to reduce the level of harm to the designated heritage asset?	We note the applicant's response to our Written Representation in REP3-0092 and the re-appraisal of the impact on the monument.  We disagree with the conclusion by the applicant, in terms of the impact on the scheduled monument. In our view the significance of effect with professional judgement would be moderate, rather than slight, adverse.  We do not believe additional on-site mitigation is possible at this location to reduce the level of harm to the designated heritage asset that we have identified.  At a meeting with the applicant on 16 March 2023, we suggested that off-site mitigation is investigated to offset the harm that we have identified. We would like to see a commitment to this from the applicant.







Q2.11.4	HE has also raised concerns as to the other scheduled monument along the proposed A12 route, being the Medieval moat at Marks Tey Hall. They have suggested an updated assessment taking into account their comments, but the Applicant has responded from page 190 of REP3-009. Can HE comment on this? Again, is it possible for the Applicant to provide additional mitigation which might ease the concerns of HE?	We note the applicant's response to our Written Representation in REP3-0092.  We disagree with the conclusion by the applicant, in terms of the impact on the scheduled monument. In our view the significance of effect with professional judgement would be moderate, rather than slight, adverse.  We do not believe additional on-site mitigation is possible at this location to reduce the level of harm to the designated heritage asset that we have identified.  At a meeting with the applicant on 16 March 2023, we suggested that off-site mitigation is investigated to offset the harm that we have identified. We would like to see a commitment to this from the applicant.
Q2.11.5	It is noted that a number of heritage assets (reference is made to 4 Grade I and 20 Grade II* listed buildings) might be affected by groundwater conditions. The Applicant proposes further assessment should be carried out as soon as possible and provided for the Examination. Can HE comment on the Applicant's response to its Written Representation [REP3-009] on this point?	We note the applicant's response to our Written Representation in REP3-0092.  We note that a detailed risk assessment, and where necessary a condition survey for any buildings identified at risk of differential settlement, will be carried out during the detailed design phase. Where risks of settlement were then found to be realistic, asset protection measures, as specified in the condition survey, would be carried out prior to relevant works commencing.  We are satisfied the proposed approach is appropriate.

If there are any further material changes to the proposals, or you would like further clarification in relation to our advice, please contact us.







Yours sincerely,

Jess Tipper

Dr Jess Tipper

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

E-mail: @historicengland.org.uk



