

This submission at deadline 5 is made on behalf of The Bunting Family. It relates to the proposed A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme being promoted by National Highways by way of an application for a Development Consent Order.

Firstly, we will provide a brief update on the status of our objection and the progression of discussions with National Highways to overcome these objections. Draft Heads of Terms for a side agreement were drafted by us and sent to National Highways/Ardent at the beginning of April, to date we have not received a response to these. More positive engagement has been ongoing with the District Valuer, but these have stalled pending a response to the draft Heads of Terms for a side agreement. Our current position is we maintain our objection to the elements detailed in our original relevant representation for the reasons specified.

The second part of this submission provides a written submission of the points raised at Agenda item 6 of Issue Specific Hearing Session 4 with regards to Borrow Pits. This session was attended by our representative, Alex Dent (B.Sc. M.Sc. EurGeol C.Geol FGS) of WSP. The following points were raised by Alex and National Highways confirmed they would respond in writing following the session:

1. Why was the 445 000m<sup>3</sup> of Selected Fill omitted from the original Borrow Pits report?
2. Is the volume of Select Fill needed 445 000m<sup>3</sup> as per presentation verbally or 300 000m<sup>3</sup> as indicated in the slide presented?
3. What measures are being considered to reduce the volume of selected fill from Borrow Pit J (e.g. soil treatment of materials arising from the main works by use of additives such as lime/cement to form sub-base and capping and geogrids to minimise need for selected granular fill etc)?
4. Allied to 3 " the responses to queries to date indicate high sulphate concentrations - Has heave testing been done? Have alternative additives been considered to address this?
5. Can NH confirm that Burrow Pit J will only be used for selected fill not general fill?
6. One of NH's main arguments in favour of borrow pits is an economic one " can NH confirm that the costings include for dewatering and confirm what has been assumed here bearing in mind the shallow groundwater level, the permeable strata and the proximity of R. Blackwater.?
7. Can NH confirm that perishable materials such as stumps, logs, peaty materials etc will not be used to backfill Burrow Pit J?
8. Can NH confirm how the operator of Colemans Quarry is to be incentivised to prevent the being a programme issue requiring use of overburden from Burrow Pit J?
9. Can NH limit excavation at Borrow Pit J to above the water table?
10. If not, can NH backfill to above the water table to a mutually agreed and suitable specification?

We remain keen to continue to engage with National Highways to try to resolve the principles of our objection, but our current position is we strongly object to the proposed Order.