

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>A120 Environment Forum – second meeting</b>		
<b>Project</b>	A120 Braintree to A12 Feasibility Study	<b>Date/Time</b>	6 June 2016, 4-6pm
<b>Location</b>	Committee Room 2, Chelmsford County Hall, Essex CM1 1LX	<b>Prepared by</b>	Stephen Pennock (Jacobs)
<b>Attendees</b>	See Attachment 1		

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <p>All attendees went around the room and introduced themselves to the forum and the organisation they represented.</p>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Project update</b></p> <p>Chris Stevenson (CS) of Essex County Council (ECC) provided background to the A120 feasibility study and an updated on its current status.</p> <p>Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essex County Council is the sponsor for the A120.</li> <li>• The scheme is at the feasibility stage where there are currently a large number of possible routes.</li> <li>• The selection will be reduced to 4-5 options in January for the public consultation.</li> <li>• Environmental surveys currently being carried out.</li> </ul>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Feedback from Forum Members</b></p> <p><b>Ramblers Association</b> – Asked if the A120 feasibility study was coordinating with the A12 project due to the proximity between the projects. Worries about duplicating work and confusing the public. Also raised a concern that people who feel they are outside the boundaries are receiving letters for a road project 2 miles away.</p> <p><b>CS</b> – There is support between the two projects. Jacobs is working on both projects for consistency. Anything where data can be shared, such as traffic environment will be shared. Attempting to try not to confuse the public with duplication of process. There will be a focus on engagement with the public on both projects to make the intentions of each clear.</p>	<b>N/A</b>



Agenda Item	Notes	Actions
	<p><b>Philippa Garden (PG)</b> – Jacobs will share as much data and survey findings as possible - however letters might have to be duplicated, because one will come from HE one from ECC.</p> <p><b>Ramblers Association</b> - What is the timeframe on the A12? Request in relation to how its progressing in context with the A120.</p> <p><b>CS</b> – The A12 is a Highways England scheme that will be progressing between Now – 2020 it will be designed and then work will start towards the end of the first period, it will go to the second period. Possibly 2025. Discussion about the Road Investment Strategy and how it differs from the ECC schemes.</p> <p><b>Essex Bridleways Association</b> – Some of the forum members have attended a non-motorised road users workshop. One of the ideas raised from a NMU point of view was - what happens to the old road, how NMU friendly that can become?</p> <p><b>CS + PG</b> – It is within scope of the scheme to help NMU's. When routes are more solid it can be discussed. Acknowledged as a possible opportunity to present to the public.</p>	
4	<p><b>How options are developed for highways projects</b></p> <p><b>PG</b> – Provides a presentation on how options are developed for highways projects.</p> <p><b>Essex Bridleways Representatives</b> – Discussions about connectivity between towns – making sure this continues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing for multi users (for example bridges) Cyclists, Horse riders, Pedestrians.</li> <li>• Encompass all NMU's into plans rather than as an afterthought.</li> <li>• Making sure parapets are high enough. Including access alongside the road.</li> </ul> <p>A call to think about how this works ahead of time rather than retrospectively thinking about NMU's after the road has been completed.</p> <p><b>CS</b> - Difficult to see how cycleways and footpaths are going to be used before we carry out the design. Once the options are narrowed down it can be more involved, and then when at the detailed design stage it can be more specific with individual paths and rights of way.</p> <p><b>Ramblers Association</b> – Rights of way improvement plan – trying to make accessibility better. Discussions on Public rights of way, maintenance, and accessibility. Recognising the context change of walks and public rights of way from a way to get from A to B, to a</p>	N/A



Agenda Item	Notes	Actions
	<p>place to walk a dog or go for a leisure walk.</p> <p><b>CS</b> – When considering NMU’s in the plans it would be about recognising priorities, Which parts are most likely to get used, and which parts provide the connectivity between communities. This will be easier once we know where the road will go to take a look at improving the network of NMU’s.</p> <p><b>How are NMU issues looked at as part of the DCO process?</b></p> <p>Horse riders felt left out compared to cyclists – Cyclists can use bridleways but horse riders cannot use cycle paths. This is understood but it was asked that Horse riders are kept in mind not just cyclist and pedestrians when looking at NMU’s and connectivity.</p> <p><b>CAUSE</b> – Air quality/pollution, flooding and water run-off. How will these things affect the present area and present environment? Is the plan to separate through traffic from local traffic.</p> <p><b>CS</b> - Yes, main points of priority – the road minimises journey time, maximises safety, and connectivity. The roads purpose will be to get from A-B in this way it will be separate from local traffic. Expect to find more HGV’s and long distance journeys using the road and therefore not using local roads. These will all be considerations when looking at the options.</p> <p>Point made about the amount of existing entrances along the A120 being too many and thus holding up the traffic. - Options that come to consultation will have obvious differences in junctions. Different ways of achieving the same goals.</p> <p>Point made of the Impact of proposed local Rivenhall incinerator plant – This has been taken into account with the A120. Added to the list of things considered, including in traffic modelling.</p> <p>Will the website feature the environmental information?</p> <p>Majority of this information goes onto the GIS Mapping software. The website will be updated as much as possible. Commitment to sharing as much environmental information as possible with the public.</p> <p><b>Presentation by PG on the process.</b></p> <p>Some of the members queried whether Highways England are kept up to date about whether the process is followed properly?</p>	



Agenda Item	Notes	Actions
	<p><b>CS</b> - Highways England are part of the project board given presentations of the work intermittently to make sure we are keeping to the Highways England processes. They sign off the approach. At each stage there is a document which shows how the project progresses, this needs to be inspected by HE to make sure criteria has be fulfilled. It is in no-ones interest to get to a stage and be told that something has been missed.</p> <p>The forum discussed the involvement of developers allowed or encouraged to put money into these projects? – Discussions around how funding it worked out and how this affects plans and routes.</p> <p><b>CS</b> - At this point developments or uncommitted developments locations are not considered part of this study. ECC are working closely with Braintree and Colchester on their local plans making sure they align.</p> <p><b>CS</b> - Explained what a RIS scheme involves.</p> <p>Forum members asked if it is preferable to go under or over a rail line.</p> <p><b>CS</b> - Engineers will look at all options during the design stage and it might be different in terms of feasibility.</p> <p>Forum members asked how definitions of significant environmental effects are measured. The differing levels are shown within Philippa’s presentation, and it is explained what is meant by significant affects, potential and slight.</p> <p>Adrian Dawes and PG led a discussion regarding how they take environmental issues into account. The feasibility study would look to limit the environmental affects to a minimum. Explanation of the process firstly discarding any option that would have any major impacts immediately. Then working down to find the options with the least amount of disruption that still fulfils the other criteria.</p>	
5	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>No other business.</p>	N/A
6	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>Possible mid to late September date. To be confirmed.</p> <p>Agenda item for next meeting – asked forum members for any issues that have arisen since the last forum.</p>	N/A

### Attachment 1: Attendees and apologies

#### Attendees

Name	Position	Body
Amanda French	Representative	Bridleways Association
Sue Dobson (Chair)	Representative	Bridleways Association
Alan Lindsay	Transport Strategy & Engagement Manager	Essex County Council
Chris Stevenson	Head of Commissioning, Connected Essex, Integrated Transport	Essex County Council
Katherine Evans	Essex Area Footpath Secretary	Ramblers Association
Shaun Taylor	Tree and Landscape Officer and Team Supervisor	Braintree District Council
Noel Mead	Member	CAUSE
Paul Edmunds	Member	Ramblers Association
Philip Jellard	Member	CAUSE
Adrian Dawes	A120 Environment Lead	Jacobs
Philippa Garden	A120 Engagement Lead	Jacobs
Stephen Pennock	Stakeholder Engagement	Jacobs

#### Apologies

Name	Position	Body
Emma Goodings	Planning Policy Manager	Braintree District Council
Liz Lucas	Volunteer Operations Manager	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Essex
Karen Syrett	Place Strategy Manager	Colchester Borough Council
Beverly McLean	Planning Manager	Colchester Borough Council
Martin Barrell	Environment Team Manager	Environment Agency
Emma Simonds	Ecological Consultant	Essex County Council
Luke Bristow	Ecologist, Place Services	Essex County Council
Jonathan Douglas-Hughes	Chair	Essex Heritage Trust
Ray Booty	Chair	Essex Local Access Forum



Essex County Council

[www.a120essex.co.uk](http://www.a120essex.co.uk)  
[a120study@jacobs.com](mailto:a120study@jacobs.com)

Name	Position	Body
Andrew Impey	Chief Executive	Essex Wildlife Trust
Andy Jobling	Asset Manager	Highways England Environment Lead