

Simpson House
 6 Cherry Orchard Road
 Croydon CR9 6BE
 United Kingdom
 T +44 (0)20 8686 8212
 F +44 (0)20 8681 2499
 www.jacobs.com

Subject	A120 Colchester Community Forum		
Project	A120 Braintree to A12 Feasibility Study	Project No.	B3553T41
Prepared by	Ragi Yogeswaran	Phone No.	+44 (0) 2073782897
Location	Acorn Room, Feering Community Centre, Coggeshall Road, Feering, CO5 9QB	Date/Time	6 th December 2016
Participants	Apologies Jayne Richardson (JR) Cllr Katherine Evans (KE) Robert Mitchell (RM) Gerald Wells (GW) Ron Marks (RMA) Philip Jellard (PJ) Jill Hinds (JH) Linda Gossett (LG) Cllr Peter Chillingworth (PC) Mark Leslie (ML) Philippa Garden (PG) Virginia Vandermeer (VV) Ragi Yogeswaran (RY) Chris Stevenson (CS) Alan Lindsay (AL)		
Copies to	David Orr-Ewing	File	A120 Colchester Community Forum Meeting Notes

Notes	Action
1 Welcome KE welcomed the group and introduced the project team members.	
2 Traffic modelling PG ran through the importance of traffic modelling and outlined the current traffic study. She also summarised the current traffic issues identified along the A120. PG explained how the traffic model is build and the inputs that were used to build the model. KE asked explanation on the type of developments that are taken into account while building the traffic model. AL stated that the model will include committed	

Notes	Action
<p>development and it will not include emerging local plans as they have not been approved through planning.</p> <p>CS also confirmed that the purpose of traffic model is used to predict the traffic growth based on the expected demand; therefore it will include committed developments as they have been approved and will have a more general growth factor applied to trips where the precise location of development is not yet known.</p> <p>PJ questioned whether the traffic from Rivenhall incinerator scheme will be estimated and whether this will be fed into the model.</p> <p>PG confirmed that this will be included in the model as this is a committed scheme.</p> <p>ML asked what is the projected traffic year and PG confirmed that its 2041.</p> <p>CS stated that the design year is 15 years after opening and this is an accepted benchmark year to test how the scheme would operate.</p> <p>RMA questioned on the level of joined up thinking between the traffic modelling team for the A120 and A12.</p> <p>CS confirmed that we have different traffic modelling teams and models for both projects however they do have weekly meetings and share findings. Sensitivity testing will also be carried out on the traffic model to validate the results obtained from the model. Both models have the A12 and A120 incorporated within their modelled networks.</p> <p>KE stated that there are a number of questions raised regarding the junction between A12 & A120. Will the A12 scheme be considering it and who will be paying for it. She also stressed that even if the answer is not known at the moment, it will be best to state this to the members.</p> <p>CS stated that the A12 team would be designing the widening in such a way that it would be able to incorporate a new junction for the A120 wherever it eventually was located.</p> <p>On a point of information CS reminded Forum members</p>	<p>PG to send response on who will be funding the new junction between A120 & A12.</p>

Notes	Action
<p>that there is some traffic data available online for the public. PG stated that it is on the A120 website under project update tab.</p> <p>3 Commitment of Community Consultation</p> <p>PG gave an overview of public consultation and what will it include. She also stated that we are currently in the process of developing the statement to community consultation. SCC is a small document that will confirm what we are hoping to achieve by undertaking the consultation and details on how we will consult.</p> <p>PG also stated the locations at which the A12, A120 and combined consultations will be held. She also asked the forum members to put forward any locations that we have missed out.</p> <p>LG asked whether an event will be held in the centre of Colchester. PG confirmed that we are in the process of choosing venue and we aim to find a venue at the centre of Colchester.</p> <p>KE stated that people from Coggeshall will be interested in the A12 scheme, hence it would be best have a combined event at Coggeshall. PG agreed to look into this.</p> <p>LG questioned whether the consultation events will be advertised on radio.</p> <p>PG confirmed that we will be advertising the event in printed press and through social media. We will send press releases to local radio.</p> <p>RM clarified that there are local publications which the parish council can help. He also stated that not all publications arrive at the beginning of the month therefore it's better to get it in the January edition.</p> <p>JH mentioned that it will be best to publish it in two parts. So use the first edition to inform local people about the upcoming public consultation and use the second edition to publish the dates for the consultation.</p> <p>PC stated that Great Tey has their own magazine and it would be best to contact them to find out about their deadline for the next edition.</p> <p>GW question on when the final dates for the public consultation will be released.</p>	<p>Investigate a combined event at Coggeshall</p>

Notes	Action
<p>PG stated that the dates are not confirmed yet but it will be updated on the website as soon as possible. We are currently in the process of choosing venue and their availability. We are carrying out risk assessment for each venue and this will help us choose the final venues for consultation.</p> <p>GW stated that a Marks Tey questionnaire will be distributed during the Christmas period and asked whether there will be anything ready to advertise by then.</p> <p>CS confirmed that we will look to have something ready by then, so that it can be distributed with it.</p>	<p>Investigate whether an insert could be incorporated</p>
<p>4 Consultation response analysis</p> <p>PG outlined how the responses from the consultation will be analysed. Any responses received will get a unique ID. We will be picking out key words from the responses and use coding framework to group them together. The responses will be discussed within the response analysis team to produce themes which will be used to produce response analysis report.</p> <p>JH asked whether there will be pre-set questions which need to be answered during consultation.</p> <p>PG confirmed that there will be pre-set questions to obtain answers that will help us with the coding of the responses. She stressed that we still have scope and details to be decided; therefore it's important to have questions at the event.</p> <p>KE questioned whether there is a specific responses method for different users e.g. for parish councils, individuals etc.</p> <p>PG stated that they will all have the same format.</p>	
<p>5 Project Update</p> <p>CS outlined the process used to develop route options. He also showed the nine short listed options that will be presented at the consultation events.</p> <p>GW stated that the option which connects onto the A12 between Rivenhall and Kelvedon (red & orange) option have been analysed before.</p>	

Notes	Action
<p>CS confirmed that these options have been analysed before the previous study, however previously this option was dropped due to the fact that it would have borne the cost of widening of A12.</p> <p>ML suggested that an option showing the location of junctions will be beneficial.</p> <p>RM stressed that without any junction locations on plan, people would think of it as a race track which will be misleading.</p> <p>CS stated that we will be having coloured circles to represent the location of junctions and there will be no more detail on the type of junction proposed.</p> <p>KE suggested to add Rivenhall and Witham to the schematics. This was agreed.</p> <p>PC suggested to include an A12 consultation event at Tiptree.</p> <p>PG confirmed that this will be fed back to Highways England.</p> <p>PJ asked whether the benefit to cost ratio and the capital cost for each option will be published during consultation. CS stated that these will be included.</p> <p>JR queried whether the impact of each option will be stated at the event and villages to the South West of Braintree/ nearer Stansted will be consulted as there will be some impact on their network caused by the A120 improvement.</p> <p>CS stated that we will be showing the effect of each option on the overall traffic flow. PG stated that the effects on villages will be highlighted in the consultation material.</p> <p>KE suggested that taking two deviation points from the Braintree roundabout would cause confusion. CS stated that we have decided to have two deviation points because they allowed a greater range of options and each starting point had its own pros and cons..</p> <p>JR requested to display information on the current use of the A120 by Heavy Good Vehicles instead of the new built A120.</p>	<p>Suggest consultation event at Tiptree to Highways England</p>

Notes	Action
PG responded that we have to check this with the traffic team.	
6 AOB PJ questioned the need for resurfacing the A120 now and the budget allocated for this. AL stated that Highways England is tasked to maintain the standard of all major road networks and they are planning to resurface the existing A120 based on this.	
7 Public statements / questions	
8 Date of the next meeting PG confirmed that there will be further rounds of forum after consultation events and the members will be informed when the dates are confirmed.	