

Stisted Parish Council

Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council

Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Feering Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Dear Sirs

Re. A120 Consultation on Route Options

Representatives of the above groups met on the 22nd February 2017 to discuss whether a shared response to the A120 route options consultation was possible. **Route E was chosen as the favoured route**, judging against a range of criteria. The group also would like to make a number of recommendations which would allow the A120 to make a positive contribution to the development of the four communities.

Each area is likely to make its own response to this consultation, to add particular issues pertinent to that area alone. The response below is that agreed by the representatives of the four communities together.

Criteria considered neutral to the route discussion

- There is evidence that all new roads lead to greater traffic. Each of the 5 routes would have this effect and the only differentiating issue would be how close to existing communities this additional noise, light and air pollution would pass.
- New routes offer the potential for developers to put in new proposals for additional housing, new settlements and industrial / business development. Each of the routes would offer this potential since new areas would be 1) be more accessible, and 2) because new roads have a negative environmental and visual impact on the landscape. The visual and environmental impact of additional future development is therefore considered to be reduced as the damage to the landscape has already occurred. While all the groups acknowledge the need for Braintree Council to achieve its housing quota, allowing the new road to give opportunity to go beyond this, or approve industrial or large scale business units or retail park would be stoutly resisted by all groups. This could irrevocably alter the character and nature of this area of villages in a rural setting.
- All the above groups are in complete opposition to the Integrated Waste Management Facility and continue to lobby against this disastrous threat to the environment and the health of the local populace. It is noted that 4 of the 5 proposed routes would provide direct access to the Integrated Waste Management facility. Planning permission has been granted with access onto the existing A120, it assumed therefore that an amendment to that permission would be required to gain access to options B, C, D or E.
- The Feering and Kelvedon groups are already expecting significant new housing and there is a County Council backed proposal for a new 'garden village' at Marks Tey. There were

arguments for and against each route in connection with these likely developments. In that there are different opinions about the developments viability and, given that the choices of connection to the A12 probably make marginal difference to how these are progressed, it was agreed that these should not determine which option was chosen. Either connection to the A12 is viable.

- Cost as a criteria was not considered since this was outside the remit of the groups taking part.

Criteria used by the groups to determine the choice of route

- Severance of communities
- Linking communities/enhancing existing communities
- Creating barriers within the countryside
- Access to recreation in the countryside
- Plans for the existing A120
- Congestion relief and road building
- Mitigation of negative impacts

Route A

- Option A was the least preferred by those present for the discussion for following reasons:
- It separates Stisted, Bradwell and Pattiswick, and creates a much more impermeable barrier between Coggeshall and Earls Colne
- By utilising the existing A120 route and increasing the amount of traffic, the route would create chaos if there was an accident blockage, since there would be no alternative routes other than rat runs through villages. All the other routes leave the existing A120 as an alternative route.
- Although it would be short term, the potential for this route to create substantial disruption during the building period for the 3 of 5 communities (Coggeshall, Stisted & Bradwell) was felt to be very negative
- There is a lack of detail regarding the junctions that would need to be built if option A is selected. This would be of particular concern at the middle junction/road to Earls Colne as there are houses and a school where the junction would need to go.

Routes B and D

- The start of these routes with associated substantial redevelopment and the creation of a new large road junction north east of the Galleys Corner roundabout was felt to be the most disruptive of the two connections to the existing A120 dual carriageway. The impact on this side of Braintree town was avoidable if the route in option C and E was chosen.

- Existing preparatory works on the Stansted to Braintree section of the A120 favour option C and E.

Routes B and C

- These routes are longer and therefore inherently more disruptive to the environment. They cross the Blackwater and a flood zone with all associated risks to flooding, drainage, and wildlife access along the valley.
- The flood plain would necessitate a flyover at some height over the Blackwater and the two roads connecting Coggeshall with Kelvedon and Feering. This would create constant visual, noise and light pollution for Feering, Kelvedon, Coggeshall and Bradwell.
- Both routes sever Coggeshall from Kelvedon and Feering
- Kelvedon and Feering would be sandwiched between an expanded A12 and the dualled A120
- Coggeshall would be sandwiched between the rerouted A120 and the old A120 which will host existing levels of traffic in the near future as a consequence of induced demand and new development, particularly at Marks Tey.
- The Countryside setting of these rural communities will be further eroded.

Routes C and E

- The start of these routes from a new separated junction at “Panners Farm” will enable local traffic for communities east of Braintree and through traffic to the A131 to flow more easily causing less delays, maintain the flow of traffic and reduce pollutants emitted from stationary vehicles with engines running.

Route E

- This is the shortest route from our favoured start position at the Braintree end, and therefore inherently less disruptive to the environment.
- It severs the least number of rights of way
- Routes B, C, D and E leave the existing A120 as an alternative route but potentially much quieter. This would open up the opportunity to create a cross-Borough cycle route between Braintree, connecting to the 'Flitch way', Bradwell and Coggeshall and onto Kelvedon and Feering. This could be achieved via planning gain for the 5 communities. The aim will be to promote all 5 communities as part of the national cycle network, improving ecologically sound tourism, employment and economic benefits. Route E makes the Kelvedon to Coggeshall cycle way section easier to achieve since it would not need to pass under a new road, this would relieve some traffic congestion between Coggeshall and Kelvedon station. We would recommend that section 106 monies generated by the development should be put toward achieving these cycle routes.
- While the existing A120 route should become a local road, safety and aesthetic qualities as a gateway to the existing communities and the proposed 'garden village' at Marks Tey, should be improved. This should include pedestrian / cycle and bridle way routes along its length, together with safe crossings for people and wildlife. If options B, C D, or E were to progress, then a 'do nothing' approach to the exiting A120 between Marks Farm and Marks Tey is not

an option for the wellbeing and safety of the communities who will continue to use this road on a daily basis.

Conclusion

The conclusion was that route E minimised the impact of a new route, impacted the 5 communities the least and offered some attractive potential gains which would be supported in the neighbourhood and parish plans being developed.

Yours sincerely

Peter Kohn - Chair of Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Kohn'.

Christine Marshall, Parish Clerk

On behalf of **Anthony G Dunn, Chairman**
Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Christine Marshall'.



Alan E Moor, Chairman
Stisted Parish Council

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Moor'.



pp Paul Lees - Chair of Feering Parish Council