

Appendix 2: Copy of Online Response Form

1. About you

Please share your views on the proposals by completing this response form.

Your feedback is essential as it will enable us to continue to improve the scheme.

We recommend that you read our Consultation Brochure and the other supporting consultation documents to help you complete this response form.

1a. Name

Essex County Council - Highways & Transportation

1b. Address

County Hall

Market Rd,

Chelmsford

Essex

CM1 1QH

1c . Email address and Postcode

Email address: gary.macdonnell@essex.gov.uk

Postcode: CM1 1QH

1d. Do you own land or hold any legal interests or rights, such as private rights of way or sporting rights, which may be affected by our proposals?

Yes

If you have ticked yes, have you received a letter to notify you of the consultation?

Yes

1e. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please include the name below.

Essex County Council: Highways & Transportation Service

Your role: Programme Manager

1f. By completing this response form, you have indicated that you have an interest in this proposed scheme. It would help us if you could identify the nature of your interest below (tick all that apply):

All apply:

Local resident (live within five miles of the A12)

Local business (business address within five miles of the A12)

Regular user of the A12 (in a private vehicle – eg commuter/leisure)

Regular user of the A12 (commercial vehicle – eg haulage)

Other (please state)

Highways authority for connecting local roads.

1g. How do you normally travel on the A12 (or on the adjacent footpaths and cycleways if applicable)?

All apply:

Car/Van - Commercial

Car/Van - Private

Heavy goods vehicle (HGV)

Bus

Motorcycle - Commercial

Motorcycle - Private

Walk

Cycle

Horse ride

Other (please state)

1h. How often do you use this route?

5 or more days a week

2a . Do you support or oppose the proposed scheme design at junction 19? Please refer to page 13 of the consultation brochure.

Oppose

2b. Please explain your response to 2a, including any changes you think we should consider making to the proposed junction 19 design.

On balance the County Council opposes the changes.

The reasons for concern are:

- Lack of detail on level of service information. By providing just one figure does not give us the clarity that individual arms of the junctions will function well. Greater clarity is needed
- The WCH facilities are not LTN 1/20 compliant in our view and if these were then the facilities would be more likely to be used and form a vast improvement on local connectivity for these modes. We feel that the design needs to show how the facilities cater for whole journeys via some form of wider route planning which the County Council is very happy to assist with
- To expand on this specific point the scheme that Highways England will be showing at Public Consultation does not accord with LTN1/20, as all the proposed cycle crossings at Jn 19 are

staggered (in contradiction with LTN1/20's core design principle of Directness – Table 10.1: 'Cycle crossings at junctions and across links should not be staggered')

- ECC has not been provided with any detailed traffic modelling results, so we do not know how severe the impact on traffic delay/queueing would be if LTN compliant crossings were provided. However, a much more appropriate approach to the design of the junction improvements would be for Highways England to include straight across cycle crossings as a requirement, then ascertain the level of improvement required for motorised vehicles with the crossings in place.
- The widening to three lanes stops east of J19 and the existing funnelling down to 2 lanes under Boreham bridge will continue to present a capacity bottleneck. We believe that capacity issues are worse on the Chelmsford Bypass then they are between J19 and J25. We accept that the widening must stop somewhere, but, in our view Boreham bridge needs to provide three lanes in each direction under it. As the structure is to be widened laterally in any event it seems short sighted not to do this under it
- Related to the point above the Chelmsford North East Bypass needs to tie in with Boreham interchange. Although a good start will be made via the HIF scheme a second stage providing direct slips between the bypass and the A12 has been designed. This would also necessitate widening of the A12 under the Boreham bridge. Whereas this second stage of the bypass is a County Council scheme it again seems short-sighted not to anticipate this in the A12 widening project by widening the A12 under the bridge.
- Finally, there is no clarity on the strategy for the Chelmsford Bypass or the A12 south of Chelmsford in the current RIS. Previously under RIS1 there were some studies carried out. We would expect the DCO Inquiry to receive clarity on this point so it would be useful for this aspect to be discussed in the next stages of the project. The danger is that without any clarity the benefits of the current widening will be lost if other parts of the A12 are not in the programme south of J19.

2c. Do you support or oppose the proposed design at junction 21? Please refer to page 14 of the consultation brochure.

Neutral

2d. Please explain your response to 2c, including any changes you think we should consider making to the proposed junction 21 design.

Whilst there are clearly some improvements at this junction as it is an improvement on existing connections at this point and because it is a purpose build interchange point build to modern standards there are concerns about connectivity with local roads which mean we cannot at this point fully support the proposals.

Locally too we have been made aware of many issues that residents and District and Parish Councils have already raised. These matters must be acted upon and they include:

- Inadequate connectivity with local roads such as the B1018 and B1019 which are essential feeder routes to the A12 from Maldon District. These roads are at best "country roads" which have evolved over many years and cannot provide the level of service required to channel traffic to the A12. We strongly advocate a new link road from the B1018 either to the new junction or a new intermediary junction that leads to it. Whereas this may be considered out of scope we need reassurance that such a link can be provided in the future

and that Highways England supports it and will not oppose it when it is subsequently planned and delivered. We are taking this point up with DfT separately.

- Secondly the junction arrangements at the Duke of Wellington pub are inadequate even in the short term and need addressing
- Thirdly we feel that the closure of junctions 20a and 20b will make matters worse at this junction which is in the middle of a village and which is already not able to provide a satisfactory level of service. The overall package of J20a, J20b and the new jJ21 makes local traffic conditions worse.

To help with the above concerns we need reassurances about the new link road and further modelling information about level of service on each arm of the Duke of Wellington roundabout. our concerns are exemplified by the following observations:

- there is a clear increase in traffic forecast on Main Road Boreham in AM Peak. We don't have select link analysis, but this appears to be coming via Hatfield Peverel, probably due to the closure of the southbound on-slip just south of Hatfield Peverel.
- traffic flow information for Church Road in Hatfield Peverel has not been provided, but there is a strong possibility that traffic from the B1019 Maldon Road could be using Church Road to access Main Road Boreham, rather than queue at the Duke of Wellington junction to access the new Junction 21. This would add to the case for the B1019 Link Road, which would enable drivers from Maldon to access Junction 21 without having to get stuck in long delays at the Duke of Wellington junction. There is a reduction in traffic predicted on The Street, in-between Maldon Road and Church Road. As commented above, this could be an indication of traffic diverting to Church Road, which would add to the case for the B1019 link road to Jn 21 this needs to be investigated further

Whilst we support the provision of a new bridge for local connectivity for cycling and walking, we would like plans drawn up showing how these complement our plans for whole routes. We would be happy to work with Highways England on this. Any such facilities must be LTN 1/20 compliant.

Two drainage ponds and woodland planting are in the way of B1019 Link Road Option 1. These need to be relocated, if passive provision for the Option 1 route is to be provided.

2e. Do you support or oppose the proposed design at junction 22? Please refer to page 15 of the consultation brochure.

Oppose

2f. Please explain your response to 2e, including any changes you think we should consider making to the proposed junction 22 design.

We currently cannot support this junction design. We have comments about local connectivity:

Locally there is some concern about Little Braxted Lane. We appreciate that local communities want continued access but there is concern about the mix of traffic likely to be attracted to the road such that it remains local in nature and character whilst retaining its national cycle network usage and in this respect the WCH bridge is a great idea, but again we want to take a holistic view of the NCN and local access road for which a complimentary package of traffic management measures may be required to manage HGV access, local traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Much more detail around all of this is required to include clarity on traffic usage as predicted by the modelling and select link analysis data for Little Braxted Lane.

Further specific comments:

- Colemans Junction – The cycle crossing is a staggered crossing. There is a need to reassess with straight-across (LTN1/20 compliant) crossing.
- Northern side of cycle bridge across A12 – Should be one long ramp, rather than a fold back one.
- Why is de-trunked section of A12 between Junction 22 and Braxted Road still a dual carriageway? 2-way flow of around 1300 per hour predicted in AM and PM peaks.
- Needs a section specific approach to the use of the old lanes on the existing A12. We don't want to see just painted out lanes - in some locations a rapid transit bus lane might be appropriate, in others a single carriageway with 2-way cycle lanes on other carriageway might be appropriate

2g. Do you support or oppose the proposed design at junction 24? Please refer to page 16 of the consultation brochure.

Oppose

2h. Please explain your response to 2g, including any changes you think we should consider making to the proposed junction 24 design.

We support the location and siting of the junction since it removes the anomalies of earlier south and north facing slip roads either side of Kelvedon and Feering whist affording access for Tiptree traffic. But there are many unknowns here and as at J21 the ability of local country roads to work efficiently with the new junction is questioned. Our concerns are:

Insufficient information on traffic flows and routings especially since the Crown Estates development proposals will add large amounts of traffic onto the road network and teasing out the routes that will be used to reach J24 from those used by existing traffic will be a complex matter. We do want to see the use of the High Street in Kelvedon as a means of accessing the A12 substantially reduced if not eliminated and this has not yet been demonstrated.

We are interested in the idea of a new link route to Tiptree to relieve the existing Inworth Road as long as there is also access from Kelvedon. We understand that this is outside of the scope of the project and are exploring this with DfT. Having said this, we cannot wholeheartedly say this is the preferred longer-term solution without much more traffic analysis and community discussion. Again, we would want the support of Highways England that the new link road could be accommodated in the A12 design as well as ideas for a local traffic management package if the Inworth Road did have to take what looks to be substantial increase in traffic and there are many imperfections and restrictions on the road at present.

We would also request a sensitivity test to explore how traffic routings would alter when the A120 option D is built. This may have implications for traffic using Kelvedon High Street for example.

2i. Do you support or oppose the proposed design at junction 25? Please refer to page 16 of the consultation brochure.

Oppose

2j. Please explain your response to 2i, including any changes you think we should consider making to the proposed junction 25 design.

Further information is required. Marks Tey J25 is a complex set of junctions and interfaces to get correctly defined. We support the additional lane for the A12 under the bridge and generally how access to and from the existing A12 will be provided and the provision of access to the local WCH routes and the service road. However, we would want to understand these linkages in far more detail through the traffic modelling available. For the WCH provision again we would want to derive network plans which show how the A12 improvements genuinely represent a step change in how local journeys will be facilitated. There are some serious local and strategic concerns we would like to flag. If these are not properly addressed in the next phase of work we will be opposed to the proposed design.

- The Parish Council has questioned the location of the off-slip roundabout access in terms of serving new development and we would want to work with all parties to satisfy ourselves that your proposals work as well as space and geometric constraints allow
- We feel that the junction with the A120 may be an over-provision as the A120 is likely to be diverted to follow the County Council's favoured route option D. The likely diversion of the A120 should be modelled as a sensitivity test as over-provision where the A120 currently joins will be a waste of resources and unnecessarily provide infrastructure which is not required in the medium term and which will not help the local community sense of Place if pursued simply due to uncertainty about the A120.
- Staggered cycle crossing are proposed across A120 arms and old A12 arm at new Station Road crossroads. These are not LTN1/20 compliant and considering the A120 Braintree to A12 scheme will significantly reduce flows at the junction, provision should be made for straight across crossings (either passively, or if A120 gets onto RIS 3, then actively)

2k. Please provide any comments you have on other parts of the design, such as the sections between the junctions on the proposed new road.

We would be keen to learn more about the following:

- signing strategy
- vehicle and driver information systems
- access to fuel and electric charging stations
- rest areas and laybys
- HGV and other large vehicle routing
- provision for cross overs and metre strips for use during future maintenance
- diversionary routes for periods of closure
- ideas for dealing with vehicle breakdowns to prevent whole lane closure
- speed monitoring systems
- vehicle restraint systems
- low noise surfacing
- noise attenuation measures

We are flagging these items up for the future, they are not an exhaustive list by any means.

We have some concerns about the Easthorpe access road proposals to enable local traffic movements between villages and the bypassed section of the A12. There is some evidence provided to suggest that increased through traffic will not feature but we would like to see further modelling undertaken to demonstrate this. The local community is concerned about the possibility of minor roads being used as "rat runs". If this possibility is confirmed there needs to be a consideration of

not having an all-vehicle bridge over the new A12 to reach the bypassed section but a WCH bridge instead.

We are grateful that the consultation highlights that junction 23 although removed from the design of the new A12 will be the subject of detailed consideration as part of the development going on in parallel of this RIS3 proposal. By the time of the DCO hearing being held we would expect that full clarity is available on the timing of the introduction of option D and full evaluation of its effects to have taken place. In the meantime, sufficient land safeguarding should be in place such that the addition of this scheme causes the minimum of disturbance during construction and minimises any abortive work.

4a. Do you support or oppose the proposed alterations to routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders?

Support

4b. Please provide us with any comments you may have on our proposed alterations to routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

We support the proposals and have detailed comments on many of these matters but at a strategic level we have the following observations and comments:

- pleased to see historic PROW reconnected
- positive provision via new bridges and widened bridges is welcome
- need to view the point treatments of PROW and cycleways as part of network planning rather than isolated facilities and to show how routes are formed rather than imagine how these would be used to complete medium length trips
- LTN 1/20 must be the starting point and erring on the side of truly segregated facilities and crossings rather than combined shared use ones

Whilst we support the alterations shown we would further comment that in general, it is considered that the scheme shows only token efforts to incorporate walking and cycling. For example, at Junction 24 this is given no consideration at all, only 9 miles of new (or improved) cycleways within a NSIP of this value is considered a significant failing.

5a. What are your views on the plans for the existing road and local roads? Please refer to pages 46 to 49 of the consultation brochure.

Neutral

5b. Please provide us with any comments you may have in relation to 5a.

We strongly support the bypassing of the sections of current A12 for the following reasons:

The Rivenhall section has long been recognised as substandard with local connections and many access points all of which lack good acceleration and deceleration lanes. Cycling and walking facilities have been rudimentary and unattractive; communities have been severed and the A12 and local roads combined in one highway. By separating out the strategic and local uses whilst ensuring good accessibility to local roads the A12 can perform as a much safer road and local traffic need not use it. This is a big improvement.

The Feering to Marks Tey section similarly acts as a combine local and trunk road and we are pleased to see this historic anomaly removed.

The above are thus beneficial points but there are some serious concerns that if not addressed will lead to ECC opposing this particular area of the scheme:

The re-purposing of the current A12 in these locations needs careful and joint collaborative work. It would seem incongruous to leave redundant dual carriageways in situ after these have been bypassed without substantial treatment to re-purpose carriageway space to sustainable modes or remove it all together. The County Council will want to consider this further and make detailed suggestions for inclusion in the final design.

Whilst the re-purposing represents an opportunity the bypassed sections will pass to The County Council to maintain and these are very old sections of road. Accurate asset records need to pass to the County Council and current defects remedied before the County Council will be happy to assume responsibility.

6a. Do you support or oppose the construction methodology for the proposed scheme? Please refer to pages 50 to 53 of the consultation brochure.

Neutral

6b. Please provide us with any comments you may have on the construction methodology.

ECC will continue to work with Highways England and will have comments on this matter once there is greater detail available.