

# A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Project

Deadline 7 – Summary of Essex County  
Council's position

3 July 2023

# Contents

<b>1. Draft DCO - Articles .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Article 14 – Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Article 15 – Street Works .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Article 16 – Speed Limits &amp; Article 23 – Traffic Regulations .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Article 18 – Street works .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Draft DCO – Requirements.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Requirement 2 – Time limits .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Requirement 10 – Detailed Design .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>New Requirement – Walking Cycling and Horse-riding .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Requirement 14 – Boreham operation phase traffic mitigation measures.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Requirement 15 – Messing operation phase traffic mitigation measures.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Requirement 16 – Operation phase local traffic monitoring....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Requirement 18 – Junction 21.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Requirement 19 – De-trunking .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>New Requirement - Pre- and post-construction surveys .....</b>	<b>19</b>

<b>New Requirement - Power for ECC to inspect works that affect its local highway network during construction .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>New Requirement – Road Safety Audit .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>New Requirement – Details of consultation.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3. Land use.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4. Targeted Consultation – Junction 19 and Junction 25 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix A - WCHISM.....</b>	<b>26</b>

# 1. Draft DCO - Articles

This section sets out Essex County Council (the Council)'s Deadline 7 position on matters associated with the Articles within the draft DCO (dDCO). To assist the Examining Authority (ExA), each sub-section provides an overall summary of the Council's position on specific matters of interest to the Council and subsequently made proposed changes in areas where we disagree with the Applicant.

## Article 14 – Construction and maintenance of new, altered or diverted streets and other structures

The Council maintains its position as outlined in our Deadline 3 submission [REP3-035 Page 10] and Deadline 4 submission [REP5-033 Page 10], and reiterates that this liability would only be acceptable to the Council if (a) any de-trunking can only happen with the consent of the Secretary of State in consultation with the Council, and (b) there is a requirement for a de-trunking scheme that retains one carriageway for two-way traffic and converts the other carriageway for WCH purposes.

Unless National Highways is prepared to agree to implement a scheme for de-trunking that broadly accords with the Council's drafting Requirement for De-trunking as stipulated in Requirement 19, the Council does not believe it should be required to take on the financial liability for the continued maintenance of the de-trunked sections of the A12 and is not currently minded to accept such a substantial liability under Art.14.

It is the Council's position that our draft requirement wording for de-trunking, as explained and set out in [Section 2 Requirement 19- De-trunking](#), should be included in the DCO as made by the Secretary of State (SoS).

### Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO

Please see the Council's proposed drafting for [requirement 19](#) in the following section of this submission.

## Article 15 – Street Works

The Council welcomes the inclusion of Article 15(7) in the Applicant's Deadline 6 dDCO [REP6-037] following the ExA's commentary [PD-015].

## Article 16 – Speed Limits & Article 23 – Traffic Regulations

In Appendix A of the Council's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-098], we listed 18 locations where we considered changes would be required, to ensure that speed limits complied with the Council's Speed Management Strategy (SMS). Discussions between the Applicant and Council resulted in the Council agreeing the proposed speed limit at eleven of these locations, which requires no changes to the Applicant's dDCO. However, this left nine remaining locations where the speed limit was not agreed.

Subsequently, the Applicant has agreed to change the proposed speed limit at three of the nine locations. These changes need to be reflected in Schedule 3, Part 6 of the dDCO:

- i. Hatfield Peverel Link Road to J21 (change from 30mph to 40mph)
- ii. Realigned Kennel Access (change from 30mph to National Speed Limit)
- iii. B1024 Link Road (between Rivenhall End and Kelvedon)

At the other six locations, the Applicant and Council remain in disagreement:

- i. Junction 21 Roundabouts
- ii. Braxted Road (south of junction with Henry Dixon Road)
- iii. B1024 Link Road (between Rivenhall End and Kelvedon)
- iv. De-trunked A12 between Rivenhall East West Roundabout and Rivenhall End East Roundabout
- v. De-trunked A12 between Feering and Marks Tey
- vi. London Road Roundabout (de-trunked A12 arm)

The Council maintains that, at the locations above, either the speed limit should be increased, in line with DfT guidance (Circular 01/2013) and the Council's Speed Management Strategy (SMS), or the design should be amended to encourage natural adherence to the proposed speed limit. This is explained under 'Speed Limits' on pages 25 and 26 of REP6-098. However, the Applicant has not agreed to any changes at these locations:

- At Junction 21 they have stated that they can amend the speed limit, but have made no formal commitment to this.
- At Braxted Road and on the B1024 Link Road, they have stated that, in principle, they are happy to amend the cross section of the road to encourage natural adherence, but there is again no formal commitment to this.
- On the de-trunked A12 in Rivenhall End, between Feering and Kelvedon and on the approach to London Road Roundabout, the Applicant maintains that speed limits of 40mph, 50mph and 30mph, respectively, are appropriate for the 2-lane dual carriageway.

As the local highway authority, we maintain that, if no changes are made to the speed limits or highway design at these locations during detailed design, our views should be reported to, and considered by the Secretary of State. We therefore request that the six locations listed above should be specifically identified in Requirement 10, such that a report must be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State which includes details of the consultation undertaken with the Council, if no changes are made to the DCO design at these locations during detailed design.

### **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

The Council proposes 3 amendments as follows:

1. Amend the speed limit at the following two locations in Schedule 3, Part 6:

Traffic regulation measures speed limits plans – Sheet No. 6		
Hatfield Peverel CP	The New Hatfield Peverel link road (both sides) starting at point A.013, 156 metres north east of the centre point of the junction between The Street and Maldon Road to point A.014, 95 metres northwest of the centre point of the circulatory of the Junction 21 northern roundabout, a distance of 660 metres.	<del>30</del> 40 miles per hour
Hatfield Peverel CP	Realigned Kennel access (both sides) starting at point A.015, 62 metres southeast of the centre point of the circulatory of the Junction 21 southern roundabout to point A.016, 604 metres northeast of the same point, a distance of 542 metres.	<del>30 miles per hour</del> National Speed Limit

2. Insert the following item to Schedule 3, Part 6:

Traffic regulation measures speed limits plans – Sheet No. 12		
Kelvedon CP	The new Essex Fire and Rescue Access Road from Essex Fire and Rescue Service Access to Junction with B1024	National Speed Limit

Further amendments to Requirement 10 have been proposed by the Council as a result of our concerns with the Applicant’s speed limit proposals relating to Article 16 – Speed Limits and Article 23 Traffic Regulations. This can be found in [Section 2, Requirement 10 Detailed Design](#) of this submission.

## Article 18 – Street works

Following the ExA's commentary ref no. DCO-PC10 [PD-015] on Art. 18, the Council understand it is still the view of the Applicant [AS-103] that the drafting of Art. 18(3) should not be included, whereas the Council’s support the ExA’s commentary to support its inclusion. The Council maintains that for works proposed to highways (other than on trunk roads), the relevant street authority should have a power of prior approval. Precedent has been set in a similar provision in the Silvertown Tunnel DCO as per explained in REP3-035, Page 10 and REP5-033, Page 12.

### Council’s proposed changes to the Applicant’s DL6 dDCO

Insert new paragraph (3) under Article 18 – Street Works as follows:

*(3) The undertaker must not carry out works to any street under paragraph (1) for which it is not the street authority without the consent of the street authority, which may attach reasonable conditions to any consent.*

## 2. Draft DCO – Requirements

This section sets out the Council’s Deadline 7 position on matters associated with the Requirements within the draft DCO (dDCO). To assist the ExA, each sub-section provides an overall summary of the Council’s position on specific matters of interest to the Council and our proposed changes in areas where we are in disagreement with the Applicant.

### Requirement 2 – Time limits

The Council drew the ExA’s attention to the Applicant’s draft Requirement 2 wording during Issue Specific Hearing (ISH5) as concerns mentioned in our Deadline 3 submission [REP3-035, Page 10 – 13] remain unaddressed. The Council explained that the Council’s proposed wording would remove any residual doubt about the effect of sections 154 and 155 of the Planning Act 2008 and the time within which development must ‘commence’ (as defined) for the purpose of the pre-commencement requirements.

At ISH5 the Applicant confirmed that its proposed wording in Requirement 2 would mean that, once development had ‘begun’ by the carrying out of ‘pre-commencement works’, there would be no time limit within which the development may ‘commence’ and within which pre-commencement requirements (such as requirements 3, 5, and 7) may be discharged.

The Council considers that it would be unacceptable for the development to only ‘commence’ (say) 15 years after the coming into force of the DCO as the environmental and transport effects could then be quite different from those reported in the Environmental Statement and, in the meantime, there may be generalised blight for local residents.

### Council’s proposed changes to the Applicant’s DL6 dDCO

The Council is aware that the Applicant mentioned during ISH5 that they will be addressing this point in their next version of dDCO however should this amendment not address the Council’s original concerns, the Council request that Requirement 2 read as follows:

*2.–(1)The authorised development must not begin later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date on which this Order comes into force.  
(2) The authorised development must not commence later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date on which this Order comes into force.”*

### Requirement 10 – Detailed Design

The Council refers to its detailed design comments made at Deadline 3 [REP3-035, Page 10], Deadline 5 [REP5-033, Page 14] and Deadline 6 [REP6-098, Page 19]. The Council’s position remains that the ExA’s proposed change ref no. DCO-PC16 [PD-015, Page 7] should be inserted into Requirement 10 Detailed Design.



## Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO

The Council requests the insertion of new Requirement 10 (3) and Requirement 10(3), as per ExA's draft wording ref no. DCO-PC16, as follows:

*(3) - No part of the authorised development is to commence until, for that part, a report has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of State, following consultation with the relevant local highway authority, demonstrating that—*

*(a) the undertaker has engaged with the local highway authority, the local planning authority and other relevant stakeholders on refinements to detailed design for that part of the authorised development;*

*(b) the undertaker has had regard to the local highway authority, the local planning authority and other relevant stakeholders' comments; and*

*(c) any refinements to the detailed design for that part of the authorised development arising as a result of that engagement accord with the scheme design approach and design principles.*

*(4) - Furthermore, in relation to the following locations, the detailed design must take into account the views of the local highway authority:*

- Junction 19 roundabouts
- Junction 21 Roundabouts
- Braxted Road (south of junction with Henry Dixon Road)
- B1024 Link Road (between Rivenhall End and Kelvedon)
- De-trunked A12 between Rivenhall East West Roundabout and Rivenhall End East Roundabout
- De-trunked A12 between Feering and Marks Tey
- London Road Roundabout (de-trunked A12 arm)
- Junction 25 Old Rectory roundabout

## **New Requirement – Walking Cycling and Horse-riding**

Throughout the DCO process, the Council has consistently requested specific changes to the DCO design, to ensure that the walking, cycling and horse-riding (WCH) facilities accord with the DfT's LTN1/20 guidelines. The reasons for these changes are explained in the following sections of Council's Local Impact Report [REP2-055]:

- 8.2.10 to 8.2.19 – Over-arching WCH principles
- 8.3.8 to 8.3.15 – Junction 19
- 8.3.28 to 3.3.33 – Junction 21 to Junction 22
- 8.3.38 to 3.3.52 – Junction 23 to Junction 24
- 8.3.77 to 3.3.82 – Junction 24 to Junction 25
- 8.3.85 to 3.3.94 – Junction 25

At Deadline 6, the Applicant included a table in Appendix B of their Design Principles [REP6-058], setting out the principles it proposed to follow in the design of Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding (WCH) infrastructure. In ISH5, the Applicant confirmed that they will be reinserting a Requirement to ensure that this table has sufficient status within the DCO.

We agree that there should be a standalone WCH Requirement within the DCO and have provided our proposed wording for the Requirement below.

We also welcome the inclusion of a table in Appendix B of the Design Principles document [REP6-058]. However, we maintain that the proposals within the current table are not sufficient to ensure that the design of the WCH infrastructure will accord fully with LTN1/20. The table in Appendix B is based on a WCH infrastructure specification developed by the Council but omits a number of key design elements we consider are necessary. As a result, the Council is seeking the following changes/additions to the Applicant's proposed specification, as follows:

1. The Council should be the approving authority for changes made to the WCH infrastructure during detailed design, as the local highway authority, rather than the Secretary of State.
2. The two key WCH overbridges at Paynes Lane and Marks Tey should have segregated walking and cycling lanes and be 5.5 wide, between parapets (rather than 4m).
3. A separation of 0.5m (the LTN1/20 desirable minimum) should be provided between the proposed cycle tracks and the carriageway on the new junction 19 A12 Overbridge (Boreham Bridge) and Wellington Road Overbridge replacement (there is currently no separation proposed).
4. The existing shared use walking/cycling facilities between Witham and Kelvedon and Feering and Marks Tey should be installed or upgraded to a minimum width of 3m.
5. The cycle crossing of the de-trunked A12 within Rivenhall End should be designed to operate with a single stage, or with 4m minimum external radii turns if a single-stage cycle crossing cannot be reasonably accommodated.
6. A protected route for a footway/cycleway shall be provided, north-south from the southern extent of the red line boundary, passing through junction 24 under the A12, to the northern extent of the red line boundary.
7. All cycle tracks should be designed with at least the absolute minimum separation from carriageway recommended in LTN1/20 Table 6-1.

As we have no power to amend the content of the Applicant's Design Principles document, we have referred to our own WCH infrastructure specification matrix within our proposed wording for WCH.

A copy of the Council's proposed Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Infrastructure Specification Matrix is provided in [Appendix A](#) of this document.

## **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

1. Insert Schedule 2, Part 1 – Req (1) Interpretation, as follows:

*“Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Infrastructure Specification Matrix” means the document of that description listed in Schedule 12 (documents to be certified) and certified by the Secretary of State as the Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Infrastructure Specification Matrix for the purposes of this Order.*

2. Re-insert a WCH Requirement within the dDCO Schedule 2 Requirement XX, as follows:

### ***Walking, cycling and horse-riding***

*(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a scheme setting out written details of the provision for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders has been submitted to and approved in writing by the highway authority.*

*(2) The written details under sub-paragraph (1) must:*

*i. include the provision for WCH users at new and existing overbridges of the A12;*

*ii. include the provision for WCH users at new and existing at-grade highway crossings and routes that are affected by the scheme; and*

*iii. unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local highway authority, accord with the Walking Cycling and Horse-Riding Infrastructure Specification Matrix.*

*(3) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented by the undertaker.*

## **Requirement 14 – Boreham operation phase traffic mitigation measures**

The Council set out its views on the measures required to mitigate the impact of the DCO on the B1137 in its Local Impact Report [REP2-05], paras 8.3.17- 8.3.20 (pages 39-39). The measures proposed were justified in the Council’s B1137 Main Road, Boreham Technical Note [REP3-034].

We are pleased to see many of the Council’s recommended mitigation measures included in the Applicant’s proposed text for Requirement 15. However, the Applicant still does not agree to include minor road narrowing at three key locations on Main Road.

The Council maintains that the provision of average speed cameras should be in combination with other measures, to visually reinforce the need to travel at lower speeds. The proposed road narrowings are a key part of an overall package of measures and should be included within the requirement, hence we consider the Council’s proposed wording for Requirement 15, below, to be appropriate.

### **Council’s proposed changes to the Applicant’s DL6 dDCO**

Requirement 14 wording to be as follows:

#### ***Boreham operation phase traffic mitigation measures***

*(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence use until a scheme for managing traffic on the B1137 between junction 19 and junction 21 of the A12 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The B1137 traffic management scheme must be agreed by the local highway authority and unless otherwise agreed include the following measures:*

- i. an average speed camera system covering the stretch of the B1137 between the southern entry to Boreham Village and Hatfield Peverel;*
- ii. a new signalised pedestrian crossing and associated road narrowing opposite the Co-op food store;*
- iii. minor road narrowing (similar to the existing provision at the southern entry to Boreham village) at three new locations:*
  - a. the northern entry to Boreham village*
  - b. between the northern entry to Boreham village and Waltham Road*
  - c. In the vicinity of the pedestrian entrance to the recreation ground*
- iv. place-making / safety signs at an additional three locations within Boreham village to increase awareness of the speed limit changes*

*(3) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented and delivered by the undertaker.*

## **Requirement 15 – Messing operation phase traffic mitigation measures**

The Council set out its views on the measures required to mitigate the impact of the DCO on Messing, Inworth and Oak Road, Tiptree in its Local Impact Report [REP2-05], paras 8.3.62-8.3.74 (pages 46-49). The measures proposed were justified in the Council's Inworth, Messing & Tiptree Mitigation Options Technical Note [REP3-033].

The Applicant has only proposed to provide two of the measures the Council has identified, and these measures alone will be insufficient for adequately mitigating the impacts of the new junction on the local road network in the vicinity of the new junction. It is the Council's firm view that these mitigations should be in combination with each other to effectively reduce the impact of traffic flow changes in the vicinity of Messing, Inworth and Tiptree.

In addition, to give surety that the mitigation measures are implemented before the opening of the A12 scheme, the Council maintains that the wording for this requirement should state that '...no part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented'.

We consider the Council's proposed wording for Requirement 16, below, to be appropriate for inclusion in the DCO.

### **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Requirement 15 wording to be as follows:

#### ***Messing operation phase traffic mitigation measures***

*(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until a scheme for managing traffic on the approaches to junction 24 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The scheme must include an assessment of improvements to the B1023 or another suitable corridor for walking, cycling and horse riding users, to help off-set the impacts of increased traffic on this route.*

*(3) The scheme in sub-paragraph (1) must include the following measures:*

- i. an average speed camera system covering the B1023 between Inworth Road roundabout and the existing 30mph terminal on the northern approach to Tiptree, and a fixed speed camera covering the southbound carriageway north of the Inworth Road roundabout;*
- ii. widening of pinch points between Perrywood Garden Centre and the B1022 to a minimum carriageway width of 6.1m in line with the approach to other pinch point widening proposals;*
- iii. widening of Hinds Bridge to provide a minimum carriageway width of 7.3m, with provision for pedestrians and cyclists;*

- iv. *measures to improve provision for walking, cycling and horse riding users, as identified in the assessment under sub-paragraph (2);*
- v. *village entry treatments at the entrance to Messing village;*
- vi. *'Unsuitable for HGVs' signage on Kelvedon Road and Harborough Hall Road;*
- vii. *narrowing of the entries to Oak Road (both the eastern and western ends), through tightening of entry radii and appropriate landscaping.*
- viii. *priority narrowing measures on Oak Road; and*
- ix. *improved signage at either end of Oak Road to guide through traffic to the B1022/B1023 junction.*

*(4) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until the approved scheme has been implemented by the undertaker.*

## **Requirement 16 – Operation phase local traffic monitoring**

The principle of traffic monitoring, with both pre-opening baseline and post opening surveys, together with a number of control sites to monitor background growth, has been accepted by the Applicant on other DCO schemes, as has the provision of reasonable and appropriate mitigation, should monitoring show that there is a significant adverse impact due to the scheme.

In the Council's Monitoring and Mitigation Plan Technical Note **[REP6-100]** we have clearly set out the monitoring we believe is required to identify the impact of the A12 scheme on the local highway network. We have provided the reason for each proposed monitoring site in Table 2.2 and explained how this data, combined with control data from ECC's own traffic monitoring programme could be used to specifically identify whether unanticipated post-opening changes in traffic flow, speed, and/or delay have been caused by the A12 scheme or other factors (Section 3 of REP6-100, pages 14-17).

As explained at ISH5, while the Applicant has agreed to traffic monitoring at the seven monitoring locations identified in the Council's Local Impact Report **[REP2-055]**, since the LIR was submitted the Council's has formed the view that additional monitoring is necessary to properly and robustly monitor and assess the impact of the A12 widening on the local highway network, see Section 2.2 of **REP6-100** where this is set out and our justification is provided.

The Applicant has explained that in their view it will not be possible to determine the extent to which the scheme is causing a particular change, given other contributory factors, and it is therefore not appropriate that they be required to mitigate any adverse effects observed through monitoring via a suitable mechanism included within Requirement 17. The Council believes strongly however that this approach is unreasonable, being akin to an argument that unless it can be 100% proven the scheme is causing an adverse effect the Applicant is not required to address it. The Council suggests this is not reasonable as, if the scheme can reasonably be concluded to be having a significant material adverse impact on the basis of the monitoring data collected (taking account of control data as necessary), it is reasonable to expect the Applicant to address this. The Council has put forward how a suitable mechanism for agreeing post-opening mitigation could work in **REP6-100**, as an example,

and there are precedents where agreement of such a mechanism has been required by other highway DCO schemes.

We consider the Council’s proposed wording for Requirement 17, below, to be appropriate for inclusion in the DCO.

**Council’s proposed changes to the Applicant’s DL6 dDCO**

Requirement 16 wording to be as follows:

***Operation phase local traffic monitoring and mitigation***

*(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until written details of an impact monitoring and mitigation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The impact monitoring and mitigation scheme must include:*

- i. a before and after survey to assess the changes in traffic;*
- ii. the locations to be monitored and the methodology to be used to collect the required data;*
- iii. the periods over which traffic is to be monitored;*
- iv. the method of assessment of traffic data;*
- v. control sites to monitor background growth;*
- vi. the implementation of monitoring no less than 3 months before the implementation of traffic management on the existing A12;*
- vii. agreement of baseline traffic levels;*
- viii. the submission of survey data and interpretative report to the highway authority; and*
- ix. a mechanism for the future agreement of mitigation measures.*

*(3) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must be implemented by the undertaker.*

*(4) The monitoring regime will include, but not be limited to, to the surveys listed in the following table:*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Approximate LAT/LNG</b>	<b>Types of Survey Required at Location &amp; Frequency</b> (All surveys to be in neutral month, unless continuous, and record data in each direction separately)
B1137 Main Road, Boreham	51.761435, 0.539143	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classified Traffic Count (VivaCity sensor) – Continuous</li> <li>• Traffic Speed (1-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>

The Street / Maldon Road Junction, Hatfield Peverel	51.777269, 0.599273	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Junction Turning Movement (3-day Video Survey) - 2 times a year</li> <li>Classified Traffic Count on Maldon Road (VivaCity sensor) – Continuous</li> <li>Queue/Delay on approaches to junction (GPS-based data) – Continuous</li> </ul>
Braxted Road / Braxted Park Road	51.800088, 0.698817	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Traffic Count (Loop) – Continuous</li> </ul>
B1023 Inworth Road, (south of proposed Inworth Rd roundabout)	51.833191, 0.725859	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Traffic Count (Loop) – Continuous</li> <li>Traffic Speed (1-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>
Gore Pit (Blue Anchor) Junction, Kelvedon	51.843925, 0.715645	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Junction Turning Movement (3-day Video Survey) - 2 times a year</li> <li>Classified Traffic Count on Inworth Road (2-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> <li>Queue/Delay on approaches to junction (GPS-based data) – Continuous</li> </ul>
Little Braxted Road, Little Braxted	51.805828, 0.657102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Traffic Count (2-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> <li>Classified Traffic Count (3-day weekday video survey) – 2 times a year</li> <li>Traffic Speed (1-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>
Kelvedon Road, Messing	51.835483, 0.746054	
Oak Road, Tiptree	51.821652, 0.743548	
New Road, Hatfield Peverel	51.774098, 0.599067	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Traffic Count (2-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> <li>Traffic Speed (1-week Automatic Traffic Counter Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>
Church Road, Hatfield Peverel	51.771398, 0.595781	
Mowden Hall Lane, Hatfield Peverel	51.762219, 0.571398	
Church Road, Boreham	51.754012, 0.548618	
London Road (De-trunked A12), Rivenhall End	51.817132, 0.667038	
London Road (De-trunked A12), Feering	51.856056, 0.738770	
B1023 Inworth Road, (north of proposed Inworth Rd roundabout)	51.835994, 0.724352	
B1022 Maypole Road, Tiptree	51.819514, 0.746529	
B1023 Church Road, Tiptree	51.814823, 0.747088	
B1024 Coggeshall Road, Kelvedon	51.847543, 0.697726	
Coggeshall Road, Feering	51.851835, 0.713637	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classified Traffic Count (2-week ATC Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>



Easthorpe Road, Easthorpe	51.857889, 0.763189	
Station Road/North Lane, Marks Tey	51.886801, 0.782880	
B1408 London Road, Copford	51.880591, 0.800446	
School Road, Copford	51.875022, 0.798691	
B1137, between A12 Junction 19 & Boreham	51.758660, 0.530889	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic Speed (1-week Automatic Traffic Counter Survey) – 2 times a year</li> </ul>
B1137, between Damases Lane & Mowden Hall Ln	51.770489, 0.567735	
New Hatfield Peveler to A12 Junction 21 Link Road	51.779021, 0.601203	
Braxted Road, south of new Braxted Road Overbridge	51.814199, 0.669073	
New B1024 Link Road	51.823090, 0.679364	
De-trunked A12, west of London Road Roundabout	51.875411, 0.776258	

## Requirement 18 – Junction 21

The Council received the requested drawing HE551497-JAC-HGN-5\_S1\_J21-SK-C-0011\_P01.pdf from the Applicant on 27 June 2023 showing the updated general arrangements at junction 21. Initial review indicates the drawing satisfies the Council's request and as stated at ISH5, the Council wishes that the drawing is referenced in requirement 18 to provide the clarity required.

### Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO

Requirement 18 wording to be as follows:

#### ***Junction 21 design***

*X. –(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until an updated version of general arrangement drawing HE551497-JAC-HGN-5\_S1\_J21-SK-C-0011\_P01.pdf showing the revised design of junction 21 has been submitted and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The updated drawing and revised design must include a two-lane exit from both the junction 21 northern roundabout to the A12 northbound slip road and from the junction 21 southern roundabout to the A12 southern slip road.*

*(3) The new junction must be constructed in accordance with the revised drawing referred to in sub-paragraph (1) from the point the authorised development is open for public use.*

## Requirement 19 – De-trunking

Throughout the consultation and examination process, the Council has consistently and repeatedly made representations to raise its concerns with the Applicant's de-trunking proposals and has set out in detail why these proposals are not deemed appropriate nor acceptable. This is a major area of concern to the Council and to that end the Council has sought to proactively support the Applicant in delivering a more appropriate scheme for the de-trunked sections of the A12.

The Council has funded its own study to identify an alternative proposal for the de-trunked sections of A12, as set out in its Alternative De-Trunking Proposals Technical Note [REP3-083]. The preferred alternative is clearly illustrated in **Appendix B of REP3-83** and includes:

- The conversion of one half the dual carriageway into an active travel corridor, which is not accessible to motorised traffic other than for access to local properties (where relevant) and maintenance purposes
- In conjunction with the above re-greening of part of this carriageway through breaking up sections and covering with earth/topsoil with provision of suitable planting to increase and enhance biodiversity
- Conversion of the remaining carriageway into a single carriageway road with one lane in each direction; and
- Measures in addition to the above to encourage compliance with the speed limit on the single carriageway

The Council maintains that its de-trunking proposals are more appropriate than the Applicant's as they address the issues of non-compliance with existing policies, over provision of carriageway, excessive maintenance costs, inappropriate speed limits, anti-social driver behaviour and poor alignment with the County Councils place making agenda. In addition, they would see a step change in WCH provision and green infrastructure.

The Applicant has raised three main issues, when rejecting the Council's alternative de-trunking proposals, stating that:

- (i) they have not been included in the DCO, and to do so would delay the process significantly;
- (ii) they will add significant cost to the project; and
- (iii) they will lead to environmental effects that have not been assessed.

However, the Council maintains that these issues should not be used as a reason to reject the Council's proposals.

To address the delay aspect there is a clause within the proposed requirement 19 wording which allows the applicant to implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme at its own expense within eighteen months of the first opening of the authorised development for public use or, with the written agreement of the local highway authority, shall provide sufficient funds for the local highway authority to implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme. The Council is not seeking that the details are agreed now or even before commencement of the scheme. This would therefore allow sufficient time to approve and implement the de-trunking outside of the main scheme implementation.

With respect to cost, the Applicant undertook an initial estimation of the costs for the Councils de-trunking alternative (£5 million). It is felt by the Council that this represents a small and justified increase in costs (circa 0.5%) when compared against the overall scheme cost for the A12 widening and the long-term and ongoing maintenance burden the Applicant's current proposals would place on the Council. Given the potential benefits and enhancements to the scheme objectives this is felt to be proportionate to the concerns held.

Lastly with respect to the environmental impacts and the potential impacts not being considered within the environmental assessment undertaken to date, the Council suggests that the Applicant has provided no meaningful evidence to show this is the case. The Council is strongly of the view that the alternative proposals set out in [REP3-083] (including re-greening, improved provision for active modes and breaking up (rather than removal of) existing material are minor in nature relative to the main works and will quite clearly represent a significant overall environmental enhancement compared to the Applicant's proposals. In addition, the Council's proposal will help to realise more fully the traffic flows and speed limits as set in the Applicants appraisal of the de-trunked proposals presented in the DCO.

As a result of these factors, the Council strongly urges that the wording it has proposed for Requirement 19 be imposed by the Secretary of State.

## **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Requirement 19 wording to be as follows:

### ***De-trunking***

*19. - (1) No part of the authorised development is to open for public use until a written scheme for the de-trunking of the A12 between Witham and Rivenhall End (east) and also between Feering and Marks Tey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The scheme approved under sub-paragraph (1) must include:*

- a. the conversion of one carriageway into an active travel corridor, not accessible to motorised traffic other than for access to local properties and maintenance;*
- b. re-greening of part of this carriageway through breaking up of sections and covering them with earth/top soil, and provision of suitable planting to increase biodiversity;*
- c. conversion of the other carriageway into a single carriageway road, with one lane in each direction; and*
- d. measures to encourage compliance with the speed limit on the single carriageway road.*

*(3) The undertaker shall implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme at its own expense within 18 months of the first opening of the authorised development for public use or, with the written agreement of the local highway authority, shall provide sufficient funds for the local highway authority to implement and deliver the approved de-trunking scheme.*

In a scenario where the Council's proposed drafting of Requirement 19 is not included in the DCO, the Council does not consider it should be mandated to maintain the de-trunked sections of the A12 and that the maintenance responsibility for these sections of road should be retained by National Highways. Notwithstanding this, if contrary to the Council's position the ExA be minded to recommend to the SoS that the Applicant's drafting of Requirement 19 on de-trunking be adopted, then the Council strongly urges that the Applicant's draft Requirement 19 wording relating to the de-trunking be amended as follows:

### ***De-trunking***

*19. (1) The consent of the Secretary of State pursuant to Article 15(7) must not be sought until written details of the proposals for the roads to be de-trunked as identified in Part 14 of Schedule 3 has been submitted and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant highway authority and relevant planning authority, such scheme to include:*

- (a) drawings and plans showing the proposals;*
- (b) details of how the proposals maintain a safe and reliable highway network;*
- (c) details of the provision made for non-car transport modes;*
- (d) details of how existing accesses will retain access to the de-trunked road;*
- (e) details of how existing utilities will be safeguarded;*
- (f) the agreement of the local highway authority that any highway assets to be transferred to it are in a condition that meets its reasonable satisfaction;*
- (g) details of proposed landscaping and planting;*
- (h) details of drainage provision; and*
- (i) a timetable for implementation of the proposals.*

These amendments improve the drafting and the insertion of new sub-paragraph (f) would give the Council some comfort that some financial liabilities that might otherwise occur can potentially be mitigated. It should be emphasised, however, that these amendments do not meet the Council's objection, and the Council's strong preference is for its version of the Requirement to be included at the DCO.

### **New Requirement - Pre- and post-construction surveys**

The Applicant has agreed to carry out pre and post condition surveys of the local highway roads as detailed in their Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [REP6-055 Section 4.4] and SoCG [REF6-069 Item 2.66] however any remedial works will be limited to damages caused by vehicles associated with their works. The Council welcomes the Applicant's commitment to carry surveys however does not agree with their limited liability for remediating damages to the local highways caused by the Applicant's construction works.

The Applicant has a responsibility for mitigating against 'rat running' thereby is responsible for developing solutions (e.g. temporary signage) that mitigates the risk of inappropriate vehicles unintentionally diverting on unsuitable roads such as Little Braxted Lane and between Hatfield Grove and Bury Farm Estates. Similar issues has been made in other interested parties representation such the SoCG with Maldon District Council [REP6-068 item 2.6]

The exact details of their mitigation cannot be determined until the proposed Traffic Management Working Group has fully matured. Should the Applicant's measures be unsuccessful, the Council will be responsible for pursuing individuals for damages caused to our highway assets (green claim) and this has not always been successful due to the level of evidence required. Without this requirement, the Council's potential financial liabilities for these works will be much greater and a requirement would put the onerous on the Applicant's to mitigate this issue.

The Council understand the Applicant's concerns that they should not be responsible for the general wear and tear of the local highway authority hence we believe it is only reasonable that a schedule of condition before the construction works, and a specification of the conditions to which it should be returned is agreed prior to the construction works commencing.

### **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Insert new requirement in Schedule 2 requirements, Part 1 as follows:

#### ***Pre and post construction surveys***

*X.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part a pre-condition schedule of the affected local highways and a post-condition specification in which the affected local highway will be returned to , has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local highway authority.*

*(2) The local highway must be returned in accordance with the approved post-condition specification.*

### **New Requirement - Power for ECC to inspect works that affect its local highway network during construction**

Referring to the points raised in the Council's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-098 Page 26], in order for the Council to meet its duties under the Highways Act 1980 for works on the local highway roads, we need to carry out inspections at various stages, review test results, or test the materials themselves to confirm that the highway works have been satisfactorily completed.

During ISH5, the Council and the Applicant are in general agreement with the principle of this request, and the Council is aware that the Applicant is identifying a suitable mechanism to secure this agreement as mentioned during ISH5 however, as of July 3, 2023, the Council has not seen this commitment. Therefore, in the absence of an alternative mechanism, the Council's position remains and will be proposing these changes to the Applicant's dDCO.

### **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Insert new requirement in Schedule 2 requirements, Part 1 as follows:

#### ***Inspection of works affecting the local highway network***

*(1) Any officer of the local highway authority duly appointed for the purpose may at all reasonable times, subject to any necessary and reasonable health and safety restrictions imposed by the undertaker, enter upon and inspect any part of the authorised development which—*

*(a) is in, over, under or adjacent to any local highway, or*

*(b) may affect any local highway or any property of the local highway authority, during the carrying out of the Works, and the undertaker must give to such officer all reasonable facilities for such inspection.*

*(2) The testing of materials used in any Works affecting local highways must be carried out at the expense of the undertaker in accordance with the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works Appendix 1/5 (Specification for Highway Works). The local highway authority must receive copies of all test certificates and results which have been requested by it in writing as soon as reasonably practicable. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the local highway authority has full power to test all or any materials used or proposed to be used in any work to the local highway at its own expense and the undertaker must provide such information and materials as is reasonably necessary to facilitate such testing.*

*(3) The undertaker must not alter, disturb or in any way interfere with any property of the local highway authority on or under any local highway, or the access thereto (except to the extent authorised under the powers conferred by this Order), without the prior written consent of the local highway authority.*

## **New Requirement – Road Safety Audit**

The Council maintains its position as outlined in our Deadline 6 submission [REP6-098 Page 29] and can report that discussion with the Applicant has been positive since ISH5. Our position is similar and welcomes the Applicant's acceptance of the Council participating in the Road Safety Audit process, as defined by GG119, in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

The Council is aware that the Applicant is identifying a suitable mechanism to secure this agreement as mentioned during ISH5 however, as of July 3, 2023, the Council has not seen this commitment. Therefore, in the absence of an alternative mechanism, the Council's position remains and will be proposing these changes to the Applicant's dDCO.

### **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Insert new requirement in Schedule 2 requirements, Part 1 as follows:

#### **Road Safety Audit**

*(1) The undertaker must procure that an appropriately qualified safety auditor undertakes road safety audit stages 3 and 4 on the Works including any Works to local highways in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges ("DMRB") Volume 5 Section 2 Part*

2 (GG 119) or any replacement or modification of that standard and must provide copies of the reports of such audits to the local highway authority.

(2) The local highway authority must be invited to participate in the stage 2, 3 and 4 road safety audits conducted under sub-paragraph (1).

(3) Where the report of the stage 3 road safety audit identifies any recommended works to the local highway, the undertaker must use reasonable endeavours to agree with the local highway authority which works or alternative proposals require to be implemented, provided that no works may be implemented which would give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those identified in the Environmental Statement.

(4) Where the report of the stage 4 road safety audit identifies any recommended works to the local highway, the undertaker must use reasonable endeavours to agree with the local highway authority which works or alternative proposals require to be implemented.

(5) Any works which the undertaker considers are required to be carried out to the local highway in accordance with the report of the stage 3 or stage 4 road safety audit, which works may not give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those identified in the Environmental Statement, must be undertaken by and at the expense of the undertaker to the reasonable satisfaction of the local highway authority.

(6) The undertaker must use reasonable endeavours to agree with the local highway authority a programme for any works to be carried out under sub-paragraph (5), which programme must include timing of any closures of any part of the highway, traffic management arrangements, signage and diversion routes where required.

(7) The carrying out of works under sub-paragraph (5) are to be taken to be works carried under this Order.

(8) Where, agreement cannot be reached under this paragraph, the terms of the Detailed Local Operating Agreement will be resolved by arbitration under article 62 (arbitration).

## **New Requirement – Details of consultation**

Throughout the examination, the Council has maintained its position that the local highway authority should be the approving body for requirements that directly impact the local highway network. This position is explained in detail in our Deadline 3 submission [REP3-035, Pages 8 and 12], as well as our Deadline 5 submissions [REP5-033, Page 14 and REP5-034, Page 12] because essentially, the Council will bear the ultimate responsibility for the local roads.

The Council acknowledges the concerns raised by the Applicant in their response [REP6-092, Pages 107-109] to our Deadline 5 submission. However, their comments fail to address the fundamental reasons behind the Council's request for a change in the requirements. The Applicant insists that the current wording of the requirements already necessitates consultation with the local highway authority or relevant planning authority before seeking

approval from the SoS. Nonetheless, this process lacks transparency and detail, as it does not impose a requirement on the Applicant to conduct a comprehensive consultation and provide a fair report to the SoS. This becomes problematic, especially in cases where the Applicant rejects specific requests for amendments from the relevant planning authority. The current wording does not oblige the Applicant to inform the relevant planning authority of the reasons for rejecting their request. Consequently, the relevant planning authority will remain unaware of whether their concerns have been fully evaluated by the SoS. This issue was examined in the A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Development Consent Order (DCO) examination, and the ExA's considerations can be found in the A303 DCO's Final Recommendation Report, specifically in Paragraphs 16.6.14 to 16.6.22.

## **Council's proposed changes to the Applicant's DL6 dDCO**

Should the ExA be minded not to make the Council the approver for requirements which have a direct impact on the local highway network. The Council requests that suggested wording taken from A303 Sparkford to Ilchester Dualling Development DCO Schedule 2 (Requirements) Part 1, Requirement 2 Details of Consultation is inserted into the DCO.

### ***Details of consultation***

*(1) With respect to any requirement which requires details to be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval under this Schedule after consultation by the undertaker with another party, the details submitted must be accompanied by—*

- a) a report setting out the consultation undertaken by the undertaker to inform the details submitted and the undertaker's response to that consultation; and*
- b) copies of all consultation responses received.*

*(2) At the time of submission to the Secretary of State for approval, the undertaker must provide a copy of the report referred to under sub-paragraph (1) to the relevant consultees referred to in the requirement in relation to which approval is being sought from the Secretary of State.*

*(3) The undertaker must ensure that any consultation responses which request alterations to the details proposed by the undertaker are addressed in the details submitted to the Secretary of State for approval under this Schedule, however the undertaker must amend the details proposed in response to consultation only where it is appropriate, reasonable and feasible to do so, taking into account considerations including, but not limited to, cost and engineering practicality.*

*(4) Where the requests made in consultation responses are not incorporated in the details submitted to the Secretary of State for approval, the undertaker must state in the report referred to under sub-paragraph (1) the reasons why any requests made in consultation responses have not been included in the submitted details. At the same time as sending that report to the Secretary of State for approval the undertaker must send a copy of that report by electronic transmission to any consultee who made representations on that matter.*



### 3. Land use

The Council accepts the Applicant's proposed amendments to the footpath arrangements around Coleman's fisheries to create a new path running along the south side of the A12 on the access track, linking footpaths Witham 101 and Witham 103.

The Council maintains its position as outlined in REP5-033 on the location of the Gershwin Boulevard bridge, however there should be access provided to both the southern section of footpath 95 Witham on foot and Howbridge Hall Lane by bicycle.

## 4. Targeted Consultation – Junction 19 and Junction 25

The Council has examined the proposed changes to the designs of Junctions 19 and 25 which were put forward by Applicant in their targeted consultation exercise. In our Deadline 6 submission [REP6-098, pages 24 and 25], we identified particular concerns with regard to the positioning of internal stoplines and the potential impact of queued vehicles within the junctions and requested further modelling to enable us to examine these impacts in more detail

The information requested at Deadline 6 was provided by the Applicant on Monday 26 June, with the clarification that the signal timings were modelled in VISSIM using Fixed Time control, whereas, in reality, the junctions are likely to use more advanced signal techniques such as MOVA which uses real-time flow data via loops to optimise timings. We have therefore examined the supplied information, taking into account the clarification given.

Based on the information provided for the part-signalised Marks Tey Roundabout (Junction 25), the maximum average queue lengths at some of the internal stoplines suggest that some disruption to the operation of the junction could occur in the peak hours. However, it is not possible to estimate how frequent such disruption would be. Similarly the information provided for Junction 19 shows average maximum queues in the AM and PM peaks which could potentially block back to adjacent arms of the roundabouts and/or over-run transition points within the roundabouts, which would prevent drivers from switching into the correct lanes for certain movements.

It is accepted that MOVA should be able to detect queues in locations where storage is inadequate and make some adjustments. However, the ability of MOVA to do so without causing issues elsewhere in the junction cannot be demonstrated at present. As a result, it is not possible for the Council to be content that these further optimisations would not lead to significant effects on the connecting local highway networks, particularly if the optimisation at detailed design stage indicates a need to take action to manage slip road queues in respect of potential collision risks on the SRN mainline.

The Council proposes, therefore, that the Junction 19 dumbbell roundabouts and the part-signalised Marks Tey Roundabout at Junction 25 should be added to the list of specific locations requiring further consultation within Requirement 10. This would ensure that the Council is involved with the detailed design work and testing which will be required to confirm that the “real world” impacts from queuing and internal delays within the proposed junction design does not lead to unacceptable consequences for the local highway network.

### **Council’s proposed changes to the Applicant’s DL6 dDCO**

Please see the Council’s proposed drafting for [requirement 10](#) in the following section of this submission.

# Appendix A - WCHISM

## Walking Cycling and Horse-riding Infrastructure Specification Matrix

WCH element	Locations	Design Specification
Overbridges (including bridge decks and approach ramps)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paynes Lane</li> <li>Marks Tey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum internal radii of 4 metres for any change in direction on its northern and southern ramps, including entry and exit to ramps</li> <li>no more than one switchback on its southern and northern ramps</li> <li>a maximum longitudinal gradient of 5% (with max length of 5% gradient being 30m) for each ramp</li> <li>Segregation between the walking and cycling facilities</li> <li>5.5m minimum width between parapets</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little Braxted Lane</li> <li>Snivellers Lane</li> <li>Potts Green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4m minimum width between parapets</li> <li>the lowest number of switchbacks possible, subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints</li> <li>5m minimum external radii at turns (including entry and exit to ramps), providing a 4m actual turning radii in one direction</li> <li>a maximum longitudinal gradient of 5% (with max length of 5% gradient being 30m) for each ramp</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gershwin Boulevard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4m minimum width between parapets</li> <li>the lowest number of switchbacks possible, subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints</li> <li>a maximum longitudinal gradient of 5% (with max length of 5% gradient being 30m) for each ramp</li> <li>5m minimum external radii at turns (including entry and exit to ramps), subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints</li> </ul>
At grade crossings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastways/Colchester Road</li> <li>Henry Dixon Road/ Braxted Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The signalised cycle crossing shall operate as a single-stage non-staggered toucan crossing (as per LTN1/20 para. 10.4.15 or 10.4.20), subject to traffic modelling provided by National Highways (NH) and approved by Essex County Council (ECC) confirming that a</li> </ul>

WCH element	Locations	Design Specification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A120 Coggeshall Road (on approach to Old Rectory Junction)</li> <li>• New London Road (on approach to Old Rectory Junction)</li> <li>• A120 Dumbbell Link (A12 Jn 25)</li> </ul>	<p>single-stage cycle crossing would not be overly detrimental to the traffic capacity of the junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If traffic modelling and design optioneering plans provided by NH and approved by ECC demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a single-stage non-staggered cycle crossing (as per LTN1/20 para. 10.4.15 or 10.4.20) would be overly detrimental to the traffic capacity of the junction, and/or</li> <li>b. there are safety, operational or environmental reasons why a single stage cycle crossing cannot be accommodated within the parameters of the consent</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>a two-stage cycle crossing shall be provided in accordance with LTN1/20 paras 10.4.20 and 10.4.22. This two-stage cycle crossing will include a straight or angled alignment at the refuge for cyclists, even if the associated pedestrian crossing is staggered and 4m minimum external radii turns for cyclists on any refuge</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Junction 19 (Generals Lane splitter island)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The splitter island will provide at least 4m external radii turns for cyclists</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wellington Bridge parallel crossing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing on the new Hatfield Peverel Link Road will be provided between the replacement Wellington Bridge and the Duke of Wellington Roundabout (grid reference 579439, 211988);</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rivenhall End cycle crossing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cycle crossing of the de-trunked A12 within Rivenhall End will be designed to operate with a single stage, as per LTN1/20 para. 10.4.22, subject to reasonable visual and physical constraints. If design optioneering plans confirm that a single-stage cycle crossing cannot be reasonably accommodated, 4m minimum external radii turns will be provided for cyclists on any refuge.</li> </ul>
WCH Routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between Witham and Kelvedon</li> <li>• Between Feering and Marks Tey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed and existing shared use walking/cycling facilities in the locations listed will be installed or upgraded to a minimum width of 3m</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New A12 Junction 24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of a route for a footway/cycleway shall be provided, north-south from the southern extent of the red line boundary, passing through junction 24 under the A12, to the northern extent of the red line boundary.</li> </ul>

This information is issued by:  
Essex County Council

Contact us:

 @essex.gov.uk

Essex County Council  
County Hall, Chelmsford  
Essex, CM1 1QH

 Essex\_CC





The information contained in this document  
can be translated, and/or made available in  
alternative formats, on request.

Published July 2023