

**A12 CHELMSFORD TO A120 WIDENING SCHEME DCO  
PARKER STRATEGIC LAND AND HENRY SIGGERS  
COMMENTS ON FURTHER INFORMATION RECEIVED**

**1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This commentary is made on behalf of Henry Siggers (“Mr Siggers”) and Parker Strategic Land Limited (“Parker”). It relates to the proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme (the “Scheme”) being promoted by National Highways (“NH”) by way of an application for a Development Consent Order (the “Order”).
- 1.2 We refer to our Written Representations which outline our clients’ interests in the Order land and their serious concerns with the Scheme.
- 1.3 Counsel also attended Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (“CAH1”) on our clients’ behalf and made a number of oral submissions.
- 1.4 Since then, NH has submitted the following documents which aim, in part, to respond to our clients’ Written Representations and oral submissions at CAH1:
- 1.4.1 Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations [Document 9.24]
  - 1.4.2 Written Submission of Oral Case for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing [Document 9.29]
  - 1.4.3 Borrow Pits Cost Information [Document 9.39]
- 1.5 Our clients have the following comments on the documents listed at paragraph 1.4 above:

**2 COMMENTS**

- 2.1 The additional information provided by NH is generally lacking in detail and analysis. It does little to strengthen NH’s case for the acquisition of our clients’ site for use as a borrow pit.
- 2.2 We highlight the below points. However, we reserve our right to make further observations on the above documentation and any other documentation submitted by NH in the course of the examination.

**Importation of fill material from off-site**

- 2.3 The “Applicant’s Comments on Written Representations” and “Written Submission of Oral Case for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing” do not properly respond to our submission that an allowance is already being made to import 650,000m<sup>3</sup> of inert material from off-site in the event Colemans Quarry needs infilling.

- 2.4 NH simply suggest that the quarry is unlikely to need much infilling and that, if 650,000m<sup>3</sup> of inert material did need to be imported, “the environmental and traffic impacts...would be outweighed by using local scheme borrow pits”.
- 2.5 That is not a logical or complete response. The documents indicate that importing additional volumes of fill material from off-site in lieu of extracting it from borrow pit I is both possible and economically viable. No cogent argument or evidence has been presented to suggest otherwise.

**Extraction of greater volumes of fill material from other borrow pits**

- 2.6 NH have not fully responded to our submission that borrow pits E, F and J are suitable alternative sources of fill material instead of our clients’ site.
- 2.7 In respect of borrow pits E and F they simply state that extracting additional material from them would “drive up cost and time”. However, no analysis has been provided on the comparative cost and time of extracting additional material from those pits verses using borrow pit I.
- 2.8 NH have also ignored our point about borrow pit J entirely, despite noting its relative proximity and that it could supply an additional 300,000m<sup>3</sup> of fill material in the event Colemans Quarry needs infilling. NH suggest that the need to fill the quarry is unlikely to arise; in fact, in the “Written Submission of Oral Case for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing” it is noted that “350,000m<sup>3</sup> of suitable material is already available in the quarry limits to backfill the void”. This could free up the additional 300,000m<sup>3</sup> of material from borrow pit J and significantly reduce the need to take material from our clients’ site.
- 2.9 NH have not provided any analysis on the option to use borrow pit J more intensively, which presents an obvious and sensible alternative (in addition to importing more material from off-site) to acquiring our clients’ site.

**Inadequate costs information**

- 2.10 There is still a lack of information about costs and alternatives. NH have provided a new document titled ‘Borrow Pits Cost Information’. However, relevant costs information is either redacted or not included because it contains “commercially sensitive information for the Applicant”.
- 2.11 We struggle to see how no comparable costs information can be provided (for example, overall costs figures for off-site material and/or averaged costs across various unnamed suppliers). As it stands, the information is inadequate.

2.12 In the absence of clearer evidence on costs, NH cannot demonstrate that the use of greater quantities of off-site fill material is not appropriate or economically viable.

### **3 CONCLUSION**

3.1 Mr Siggers and Parker continue to strongly object to the proposed Order on the following basis:

3.1.1 There is no compelling case for the acquisition and sterilisation of the site.

3.1.2 There are reasonable alternatives to the use of borrow pit I and NH has failed to adequately explore those alternatives.

3.1.3 The application for the Order is flawed and the approach taken by NH is inadequate.