

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 Environmental Forum		
Project	A120 Braintree to A12 Feasibility Study	Project No.	B3553T41
Prepared by	Chloe Spinks	Date/Time	27 July 2017
Location	County Hall, Chelmsford, CM1 1QH		
Participants	Chris Stevenson (CS) Gary MacDonnell (GMD) Virginia Vandermeer (VV) Chloe Spinks (CAS) Sue Dobson (SD) Mandy French (MF) Paul Evans (PE) Katherine Evans (KE)		

Notes	Action
<p>1 Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>CS welcomed attendees and commenced introductions, before providing an overview of the format of the forum.</p>	
<p>2 Environmental Forum Presentation</p> <p>VV thanked the attendees for their help in encouraging people to get involved with the consultation.</p> <p>VV discussed the findings from the consultation which ran between 17th January and 14th March 2017.</p> <p>The aim of the public consultation was to inform the selection of a favoured route option recommendation for the A120 between Braintree and the A12.</p> <p>The 11 consultation events resulted in 3143 attendees, and 2795 responses on the proposed route options.</p> <p>KE expressed surprise that the consultation event at Marks Tey was not as well attended as some of the other events when figures of event attendance were displayed.</p> <p>VV responded that the options all benefit Marks Tey so there was a positive response from the area.</p> <p>VV discussed the consultation outcomes summary; 82% of respondents felt that the A120 required a complete upgrade to meet current and future demand.</p> <p>Through agreement to a series of statements, respondents indicated that they strongly agreed or agreed that they would like to see upgrades which</p>	

would: reduce queuing at junctions (86%), reduce HGVs' need to travel through villages (85%), improve journey times (82%) and upgrade the A120 to dual carriageway (80%). 46% also agreed or strongly agreed that pedestrian, cycling and equestrian facilities should be improved.

SD noted that equestrian groups are often not considered by planners and expressed appreciation that Highways England and Essex County Council do take these groups into consideration.

KE added that people won't be interested in improving the A120 to cater for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders unless they walk, cycle or ride along main roads.

VV noted that a lot of respondents said they do not want to go through the existing Galleys Corner roundabout.

PE responded that releasing the detail of the junction for the consultation would have helped to clarify this.

CS said that the point of a route selection consultation was to present the findings to date to select the route corridor. Each junction that is considered essential at this stage was highlighted on the consultation boards. Once a route was ultimately selected greater detail would follow on junction design and options including further consultation on these aspects and choices. He emphasised that there are a number of elements that can still change at this early stage of the project.

KE added that there was a discussion at Feering Parish Council to this effect as they were unsure whether the junction would go through or replace Galleys Corner.

CS responded that all of the junctions would be grade separated.

In the consultation questionnaire, respondents were asked to rank the five options presented from 1 to 5. VV proceeded to describe the outcomes of this: Of those respondents who provided a ranking, options C and E were favoured. Option C received the highest number of '1' rankings, followed by option E, when '1' and '2' rankings are considered there is little difference between the two however.

VV stated all routes have varying support but they are relatively close. If you add the first and second preference together, routes C&E are favoured, but there is no clear winner from the options.

KE asked what the conclusion is that can be drawn from this at the moment.

CS responded that no one route is definitively the most preferred but that C and E come out as more popular from the consultation, and that from analysis of the ranking route A appears to be the least popular. CS also highlighted that there are many factors that will influence the decision of the preferred route option recommendation, in addition to the results from the

public consultation.

VV stated that the qualitative analysis has shown that environmental impacts of all the options were important to respondents from all locations.

KE asked why Babergh and Mid-Suffolk wouldn't support any of the southern routes.

SD responded that the mid routes are closer to Babergh and Mid-Suffolk.

PE expressed surprise that according to the map of postcode data showing where responses had come from, there were not many responses from Tiptree.

KE suggested that the map of postcode distribution of responses could be published.

CS presented the outcome from the independent survey carried out by Transport Focus. This asked A120 road users a series of questions on how they use the road.

CS highlighted that the Transport Focus study and the consultation provide a good case for something to be done, and reiterated that Essex County Council wants one of the routes to be built.

SD asked if the preferred route option recommendation is likely to be a hybrid choice of the route options presented at consultation.

CS responded that it will be a hybrid of the points to consider (strategic, managerial, economic and financial).

VV noted that if anyone came up with other routes it may have already been considered and discounted earlier in the sifting process.

When discussing the cost of the route options, KE asked why the routes are expensive.

CS responded that cost is something we are examining in greater detail and that the Department for will be expecting greater clarity on this aspect including comparison with other trunk roads under Highways England's jurisdiction.

CS noted that it will also be necessary to look at the decision made by Highways England on the A12 Chelmsford to Marks Tey scheme.

CS then explained the timeline of continuing activity and requirements to progress the study. ECC will make an announcement in the autumn on its recommendations and we would hope that Highways England announce the RIS2 (Road Investment Strategy 2) at some point in 2018.

3 Any Other Business

CS asked if there was anything else attendees would like to discuss.

KE asked about responding to the Braintree District

VV to find out what level of postcode data was used (ie. CO6 4).

Council local plan and garden communities.

CS said that the routes were selected independent of any Garden Community proposals and were aimed at strategic connectivity.

SD asked what would take precedence between the preferred route for a strategic road, or a garden city.

CS stated that it's the preferred route for a strategic road since this is the purpose of the work.

KE highlighted that, related to community forums, the information about the forums might not be reaching the neighbourhood plan groups from clerks etc.

SD asked if ECC could make links with the Essex Association of Local Councils (EALC), Braintree Association of Local Councils (BALC) and Colchester Association of Local Councils (CALC) to update records.

4 END OF MEETING

VV to update list of forum invitees based on EALC, BALC and CALC records.

Post meeting note: Regarding action #1 (VV to find out what level of postcode data was used (ie. CO6 4)), it is confirmed that the full postcode data (ie. XXXX XXX) was used to generate this map.