



**THE HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (A120 BYPASS (LITTLE HADHAM))
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2017**

and

**THE HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (A120 (LITTLE HADHAM) BYPASS
CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2017**

STATEMENT OF CASE

Rule 7 – Compulsory Purchase (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007

Rule 16- Highways (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994

Department for Transport Reference: NATTRAN/E/LAO/136

HIGHWAYS ACT 1980

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (A120 BYPASS (LITTLE HADHAM))

COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2017

and

THE HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (A120 (LITTLE HADHAM) BYPASS

CLASSIFIED ROAD) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2017

STATEMENT OF CASE OF HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Contents:

Introduction

1. Section (i) a brief description of the order land and its location, topographical features and present use
2. Section (ii) an explanation of the use of the particular enabling power
3. Section (iii) an outline of the authority's purpose in seeking to acquire the land
4. Section (iv): a statement of the authority's justification for compulsory purchase, with regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, and Article 8 if appropriate
5. Section (v): a description of the proposals for the use or development of the land
6. Section (vi) a statement about the planning position of the order site. See also Section 1: advice on Section 226 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 for planning orders
7. Section (vii) information required in the light of government policy statements where orders are made in certain circumstances.
8. Section (viii) any special considerations affecting the order site, e.g. ancient monument, listed building, conservation area, special category land, consecrated land, renewal area, etc.
9. Section (ix) if the mining code has been included, reasons for doing so
10. Section (x) details of how the acquiring authority seeks to overcome any obstacle or prior consent needed before the order scheme can be implemented, e.g. need for a waste management licence
11. Section (xi) details of any views which may have been expressed by a government department about the proposed development

12. Section (xii) what steps the authority has taken to negotiate for the acquisition of the land by agreement
13. Section (xiii) any other information which would be of interest to persons affected by the order, e.g. proposals for rehousing displaced residents or for relocation of businesses.
14. Section (xiv) details of any related order, application or appeal which may require a co-ordinated decision by the confirming minister, e.g. an order made under other powers, a planning appeal/application, road closure, listed building.
15. Section (xv) if, in the event of an inquiry, the authority would intend to refer to or put in evidence any documents, including maps and plans, it would be helpful if the authority could provide a list of such documents, or at least a notice to explain that documents may be inspected at a stated time and place.

Introduction

This is the Statement of Case of Hertfordshire County Council (“**HCC**”) as the acquiring authority in relation to The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017 (“the **Order**”) and as highway authority in relation to The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 (Little Hadham) Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2017 (“the **Side Roads Order**”).

This statement is made for purposes of and in accordance with:

- (a) the Compulsory Purchase (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007.
- (b) Highways (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 1994.
- (c) ‘Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Cricchel Down Rules for the disposal of surplus land acquired by, or under the threat of, compulsion.’
- (d) ‘Local Authority Circular (Department of Transport) 1/97: Orders under Section 14 of the Highways Act 1980 and opposed orders under Section 124 of that Act.’
- (e) ‘Local Authority Circular (Department of Transport) 2/97: Notes on the Preparation, Drafting and Submission of Compulsory Purchase Orders for Highway Schemes and Car Parks for which the Secretary of State for Transport is Confirming Authority’.

HCC is the highway authority for the administrative area of Hertfordshire. On 24 March 2014, the Cabinet of HCC resolved to make a compulsory purchase order to acquire land described in the Order required to construct the A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) (“the Bypass Scheme”). Cabinet also resolved to make a Side Roads Order to enable the delivery of the Bypass Scheme.

HCC published notices for the Order and the Side Roads Order in local newspapers on 10 August and 17 August 2017. Notices were also posted on site. Notice was served on qualified persons listed in the Order. The Side Roads Order notice was also published in the London Gazette (10 August 2017).

The notices set out that objections to the Order and Side Roads Order were to be returned to the Secretary of State for the Department for Transport (‘DfT’).

On 20 October 2017, DfT advised that unless all statutory objections are withdrawn, the Secretary of State would cause Public Local Inquiries to be held to afford objectors the opportunity of appearing before and being heard by a person appointed by him for that purpose. 20th October 2017 is ‘the relevant date’ for purposes of the rules.

A summary of the objections is included at Section (x) below.

This purpose of this Statement is to describe the proposals for the Bypass Scheme and to explain the case for making the Order the Side Roads Order.

The purpose of the Order is to enable HCC to acquire land and rights required for the construction of the Bypass Scheme which will provide a single carriageway bypass to the village of Little Hadham, Hertfordshire, and the Order incorporates land from the parishes of Albury and Little Hadham.

The purpose of the Side Roads Order is to alter highways that cross or enter the route of the classified road, or are otherwise affected by the construction or improvement of the classified road.

HCC has been working in partnership with the Environment Agency (the “**EA**”) to incorporate a Flood Alleviation Scheme (“**Flood Alleviation Scheme**”) within the Bypass Scheme and this combined project is known as A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) and Flood Alleviation Scheme (“the **Project**”).

The EA published The Environment Agency (Little Hadham Flood Alleviation Scheme) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017 (the “**EA Order**”) on a similar timeline to the publication of the Order and Side Roads Order.

Working in partnership means that the EA and HCC can pool resources to make the combined project cost efficient and affordable. Reference is made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which sets out the options considered by the EA.

In this Statement;

Section (i) a brief description of the order land and its location, topographical features and present use

Section (ii) an explanation of the use of the particular enabling power

Section (iii) an outline of the authority’s purpose in seeking to acquire the land

Section (iv): a statement of the authority’s justification for compulsory purchase, with regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, and Article 8 if appropriate

Section (v): a description of the proposals for the use or development of the land

Section (vi) a statement about the planning position of the order site. See also Section 1: advice on Section 226 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 for planning orders

Section (vii) information required in the light of government policy statements where orders are made in certain circumstances

Section (viii) any special considerations affecting the order site, E.g. ancient monument, listed building, conservation area, special category land, consecrated land, renewal area, etc.

Section (ix) if the mining code has been included, reasons for doing so

Section (x) details of how the acquiring authority seeks to overcome any obstacle or prior consent needed before the order scheme can be implemented, E.g. need for a waste management licence

Section (xi) details of any views which may have been expressed by a government department about the proposed development

Section (xii) what steps the authority has taken to negotiate for the acquisition of the land by agreement

Section (xiii) any other information which would be of interest to persons affected by the order, E.g. proposals for rehousing displaced residents or for relocation of businesses

Section (xiv) details of any related order, application or appeal which may require a co-ordinated decision by the confirming minister, e.g. an order made under other powers, a planning appeal/application, road closure, listed building

Section (xv) if, in the event of an inquiry, the authority would intend to refer to or put in evidence any documents, including maps and plans, it would be helpful if the authority could provide a list of such documents, or at least a notice to explain that documents may be inspected at a stated time and place

1. Section (i) a brief description of the order land and its location, topographical features and present use

1.1. Site Description

- 1.1.1. The A120 is an important east-west link in Hertfordshire's primary road network. The road runs from the A10 at Puckeridge eastwards to join the M11 near Bishop's Stortford and Stansted Airport, before continuing through Essex, past Braintree and Colchester, to the port of Harwich. The A120 is also used as part of an official signed emergency diversion route for the M11 and M25.
- 1.1.2. The Bypass Scheme straddles the boundary between the parishes of Little Hadham (population of 2,468) and Albury (population of 592). Both are located in East Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire, England, approximately 5km west of the centre of Bishop's Stortford.
- 1.1.3. The parishes are predominantly made up of arable agricultural land, with small settlements scattered throughout. One of the largest clusters is The Ash, located at the junction between the A120 (traveling east to west) and Albury Road (traveling north to south). The confluence of the River Ash, the Albury Tributary and the Lloyd Taylor Drain are also located in this vicinity.
- 1.1.4. The A120 currently experiences severe congestion and delays, as a result of a signal controlled junction at the junction between the A120 and Albury Road that allows traffic from one of the four arms through at a time only. This area is known locally as The Ash traffic lights.
- 1.1.5. The Ash and The Ford, in the parish of Little Hadham are at risk of flooding from the River Ash and its tributaries. Both have suffered from flooding from rivers on several occasions, most recently in February 2014.
- 1.1.6. Flood modelling indicates that currently 72 properties in The Ash and The Ford are assessed as having a 1 in 100 (1%) or greater annual probability of river flooding.

1.2. Site Context

- 1.2.1. The Bypass Scheme comprises mostly agricultural land and is semi-rural in nature. The River Ash flows north to south across the order land. The crossing point is located approximately 1 km north east of Little Hadham.
- 1.2.2. The Bypass Scheme lies entirely within the single National Character Area (NCA) known as No.86 the South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland. The Local Landscape Character Assessment by East Herts Council (EHC) identifies that the Bypass Scheme passes through or is adjacent to five Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) including; Perry Green Uplands, Wareside / Braughing Uplands, Hadhams Valley, Upper Ash Valley and Hadham Plateau.

- 1.2.3. The landscape is characterised by strongly undulating river valley slopes in the west with a flat valley floor. Steeper, undulating slopes define the valley sides, some of which are densely vegetated others wide and open. Arable fields are irregular in shape but generally medium/large in scale and bounded with managed hedgerows; there is little pasture.
- 1.2.4. Little Hadham is a Conservation Area in which there are several Listed Buildings. Mill Mound is a Scheduled Monument. Hadham Hall to the east of Little Hadham formed the centre of a 14th century estate that included 980 acres of farmland. St Cecilia Church, Hadham Park, Church Farm and extensive farm buildings and barns are located between the existing and proposed A120 alignments. Public Rights of Way (PRoW) footpaths and bridleways cross the study area including the Hertfordshire Way Long Distance footpath.
- 1.2.5. Hadham Plateau local character area characterises the eastern half of the site. Gentle undulations and gentle slopes towards the River Ash valley floor characterise this landscape. Large, agglomerated, arable geometric fields bounded with managed hedgerows and interspersed with occasional woodland blocks distinguish the landscape pattern.

2. Section (ii) an explanation of the use of the particular enabling power

- 2.1. The Bypass Scheme requires the acquisition of land and rights for the construction of a public highway which is to be a highway maintainable at public expense. Therefore, the powers to make the Order are under sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 2.2. The relevant procedures for the making, confirming and progressing the Order are contained within the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, the Highways Act 1980, the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and the Compulsory Purchase of Land (Prescribed Forms) (Ministers) Regulations 2004.
- 2.3. The powers to make the Side Roads Order, in relation to the Order Land, are under sections 14 and 125 of the Highways Act 1980.
- 2.4. Reference is made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which explains the EA's relevant powers and duties.

3. Section (iii) an outline of the authority's purpose in seeking to acquire the land

3.1. The Purpose of the Proposed Bypass Scheme

3.1.1. The purpose of the Proposed Bypass Scheme is to:

- Reduce the majority of through traffic which creates congestion, thereby improving the environment for residents along the current route through Little Hadham village; and
- Decrease journey times and improve journey time reliability along the A120 between Bishop's Stortford and the A10 and in doing so, provide an improved transport network to support the East of England region by 2020.

3.1.2. The purpose of the Proposed Flood Alleviation Scheme is to:

- Reduce the risk of flooding in the village and surrounding communities downstream as part of the delivery of the bypass

3.2. The Need for the Proposed Bypass Scheme

3.2.1. The A120 is an important east-west link in Hertfordshire's primary road network. The road runs from the A10 at Puckeridge eastwards to join the M11 near Stansted Airport and then through Essex, past Braintree and Colchester, to the port of Harwich. The road is also used as part of an official signed emergency diversion route for the M11 and M25. A single carriageway bypass carries the A120 around Bishop's Stortford but at Little Hadham the road goes through the village and is constrained by a signalised junction in the centre. Increasingly severe delays to traffic have occurred on a daily basis in the centre of the village since the 1970s and this congestion is forecast to increase with future development growth in the area.

3.2.2. A Bypass Scheme has been developed over a number of years and consideration was given to alternative transport solutions and alternative bypass routes before selecting the preferred option. With the bypass in place, congestion would be removed in the village and journey times along the A120 would be reduced, improving the quality of life for residents, particularly as it presents the opportunity to provide enhancements to the village streetscape, which are planned as a complementary project.

3.2.3. Furthermore, a Flood Alleviation Scheme for the River Ash, its tributaries, and the Lloyd Taylor Drain, can be brought forward as part of the Project to help reduce the risk of flooding to Little Hadham and communities south of the bypass route. This is supported by the Environment Agency.

3.2.4. Currently, the one-way working signal controlled junction in the centre of Little Hadham causes severe congestion and delays, especially at peak hours. This situation is likely to deteriorate considering the major

housing developments in and around Bishop's Stortford and the projected growth of London Stansted Airport.

- 3.2.5. The forecasted growth in the surrounding area would be likely to increase traffic flows along the A120 and have a negative impact on the area causing higher congestion levels and detrimental impacts on the community and environment. With the bypass in place, congestion would be alleviated in the village and journey times along the A120 would be reduced, improving the quality of life for residents and supporting the local economy.
- 3.2.6. The 2011 Government Transport White Paper provides key objectives for future transport investment: to create growth in the economy and to tackle climate change by cutting carbon emissions. The White Paper also aims to tackle places where congestion causes slow and unreliable journeys with significant impacts on the economy and environment. It highlights that public transport does not represent a viable alternative to the private car for all journeys, particularly in rural areas and for some longer or multi-leg journeys. The A120 Bypass supports these objectives by encouraging economic growth and reducing congestion within a rural area.
- 3.2.7. The A120 Bypass is identified as strategic infrastructure required to support the development in the East Hertfordshire District Plan (2011-2033) which is currently at examination stage. As such the bypass is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the District plan.
- 3.2.8. In 2012, the Department for Transport (DfT) announced its intention to devolve funding for local major transport schemes to Local Transport Bodies (LTBs) from 2015. LTBs are voluntary partnerships between local authorities, Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and other organisations. Their primary role is to prioritise investments, to review and approve individual business cases for those investments, and to ensure effective delivery of the programme.
- 3.2.9. In March 2013, the government, in its response to a report by Lord Heseltine commissioned to look at all aspects of government policy that affect economic growth, announced the creation of a Single Local Growth Fund to be made available through LEPs. The fund is an amalgam of other funding streams including the local major transport scheme funding devolved to LTBs. LTBs and promoting local authorities were instructed to continue developing proposals in order to be ready for 2015.
- 3.2.10. In Hertfordshire, an initial priority list of schemes was identified by HCC and recommended by the LTB Shadow Board in March 2013. These schemes were then taken forward to develop a programme of expenditure for 2015-2019. The Hertfordshire priority list submission, in July 2013, to enable the DfT to be able to determine LTB

allocations, comprised three transport schemes identified as high priorities for the county. Subsequent to the submission of the priority schemes, an indicative funding allocation of £18.5m was announced for the Hertfordshire LTB with a profile of funding to be finalised by autumn 2013.

- 3.2.11. The LEPs produced Strategic Economic Plans for bidding to the Local Growth Fund. The government's position is that as LTB plans should have been developed in close collaboration with LEPs, the LEP Strategic Economic Plans should include schemes identified in the prioritised list and the government will confirm a guaranteed minimum allocation for this element of the Local Growth Fund in line with the indicative funding allocation. HCCs Framework Consultants were consequently commissioned to prepare business cases for schemes on the prioritised list for consideration by the LTB.

3.3. The Case for the A120 Bypass Scheme

- 3.3.1. A proposed bypass for Little Hadham has been considered since the 1970s. The existing traffic signals have been upgraded several times over the years but there is no further scope for improvement in reducing congestion.
- 3.3.2. The current proposed Bypass Scheme was originally developed in 2006-2008 with a preliminary route which was refined further to form the Preferred Route. The Bypass Scheme provides a northern 3.9 km bypass to the village of Little Hadham, which currently experiences congestion and delays as a result of a one-way working signal controlled junction in the centre of the village. This junction acts as a bottle neck for vehicles travelling through the village. An increase in current traffic would cause the existing A120 to be operating over capacity if the route is not improved, or if no alternative route is provided. This would further delays to journey times.
- 3.3.3. The traffic congestion and delays in Little Hadham originate from the constraints imposed by a narrow "S" bend on the A120 as it passes east to west in the centre of the village. Two minor side roads, from Albury to the north and Much Hadham to the south, join the main road at this location, forming a staggered crossroad. The roads and footways are very constricted by adjacent historic buildings and a bridge over the River Ash.
- 3.3.4. The width restrictions mean that only one-way working is possible, with only one arm at green at any one time. The two junctions lie at the bottom of a shallow dip with the A120 climbing away in both directions. This junction acts as a bottle neck for vehicles travelling through the village and an increase in current traffic would cause the existing A120 to be operating further over capacity if the route is not improved, or if

no alternative route is provided. This would further delay journey times.

- 3.3.5. The current situation results in delays to road users as a result of the capacity restraints and traffic signals in the village of Little Hadham. Long queues occur at the traffic signals, particularly during peak hours. The traffic signal cycle at the junction can be as long as five minutes, which can result in a long delay for road users in both directions even when the traffic volume is low, should they arrive shortly after the signal turns red.
- 3.3.6. The existing traffic signals have been upgraded on a number of occasions. However, there are no further options for widening or improving the junction due to the proximity of Grade II listed buildings.
- 3.3.7. Reference is made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which explains the case for the flood alleviation element of the Bypass Scheme.

3.4. The Benefits of the Bypass Scheme

- 3.4.1. The Bypass Scheme will remove congestion from the village of Little Hadham, resulting in journey time savings. This will improve the travelling experience, provide more consistent journey times and improve air quality in the centre of the village.
- 3.4.2. The removal of traffic from the village centre will improve the environmental quality and setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings. There will be a beneficial impact on historical heritage as noise and vibration will be reduced in the centre of Little Hadham. A reduction in passing traffic will help prolong the life of the listed buildings in the centre of the village.
- 3.4.3. For the residents of Little Hadham the levels of noise will reduce as the majority of traffic will displace to the bypass. The removal of large queues of stationary/slow moving traffic through Little Hadham will enhance the air quality for residents and motorists.
- 3.4.4. Community severance within the village will be reduced with the reduction in traffic, thereby providing a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The removal of long queues of stationary traffic will allow Little Hadham to become a quiet rural village again. The removal of traffic from Little Hadham would result in a more cycle and pedestrian friendly environment.
- 3.4.5. The Bypass Scheme has been designed to integrate with the existing landform and landscape as far as possible. The loss of existing vegetation and trees would be minimised and planting and habitat provided.
- 3.4.6. Providing the bypass will help improve the strategic east/west link network which the A120 provides between the A10 and M11. It will

result in savings in travel time and vehicle operating costs. The transport modelling undertaken has shown that the majority of user benefits will be generated by business trips.

- 3.4.7. Journey times for commercial vehicles will be shortened and the bypass will also improve the reliability of trips to and from areas of business (particularly Stansted airport) and industrial premises. Public transport operators will benefit from more reliable journey times through Little Hadham, and will have the opportunity to use the bypass to provide additional bus services with improved journey time and reliability.
- 3.4.8. The bypass could help unlock and future-proof planned development along the A120 corridor, especially in and around Bishop's Stortford. The strategic transport network assessment suggests the bypass operates under capacity meeting increasing demand from additional dwelling and commercial developments proposed for the area.
- 3.4.9. In addition, a key benefit is the opportunity for flood alleviation afforded by the Project. At present, many properties within Little Hadham are at risk of flooding. With the implementation of the Project, the risk to property would be substantially reduced, with associated long term environmental, social and economic benefits.
- 3.4.10. The Bypass Scheme is identified in Hertfordshire County Council's adopted Local Transport Plan (LTP3) and is fully compliant with its policies and vision to promote sustainable transport, address climate change and support economic growth. The bypass remains key priority for the County Council and is also included in the draft Local Transport Plan 4 which is at a public consultation stage
- 3.4.11. The bypass will help provide quicker journey times on this section of the A120. Commuters may be encouraged to use the A120 rather than avoiding the area due to existing delays at the Little Hadham signalised junction. The reductions in congestion at the junction and improved journey times will improve the reliability of journeys. The bypass will help reduce traffic volumes parallel to and around the A120 as existing 'rat-runs' will no longer be used. The Project will deliver a sustainable scheme, with the multiple benefits of transport improvement, flood alleviation and climate change mitigation. Similarly, the Project complies with the policies of the adopted development plan for the area and with the emerging policies of the East Herts District Plan.
- 3.4.12. The Project was supported by the local community during pre-planning application consultation, with the majority of respondents supporting the proposed location, layout and format of the Project.
- 3.4.13. In conclusion, the Project accords with the objectives of national and local planning and transport policy, providing a significant

improvement to the travel experience within and surrounding Little Hadham and essential flood alleviation works.

3.5. The Case and Benefits for the associated Flood Alleviation Scheme promoted by the EA

3.5.1. Reference is made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which explains the case and benefits for the flood alleviation element of the Project.

3.6. The Environmental Requirement for the Flood Alleviation Scheme

3.6.1. Reference is made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which sets out the EA's requirements for the Flood Alleviation Scheme.

3.7. Bypass Scheme - Alternatives Considered

3.7.1. In 2004, a number of studies were carried out to examine the options for improving the A120. This was a broad 'corridor' assessment, which considered environmental, engineering, traffic and economic constraints and opportunities. The range of options included improvements to the junction in the centre of Little Hadham, a local bypass to Little Hadham, upgrading the A120 between the A10 and M11 and alternative east-west routes.

3.7.2. There were five levels of option (as summarised in A-E1 below), all involving road construction and traffic management, with each leading to very different benefits and disadvantages. In addition there is a railway option (E2) and a range of passenger transport solutions (F).

A. Local improvements in the centre of the village of Little Hadham;

B. A local bypass to Little Hadham;

C. Upgrading the A120 between the A10 and M11 to local standard;

D. Upgrading the A120 between the A10 and M11 to strategic standard (i.e. dual carriageway);

E1. Alternative east-west highway routes for strategic traffic movements;

E2. Alternative east-west rail routes; and

F. A range of Passenger Transport Solutions.

3.7.3. Option A solutions for local improvements in the centre of the village of Little Hadham included;

A1. Road widening on the line of the existing road to remove the current pinchpoint.

A2. Construction of a relief road close to the village centre as a low speed diversion to avoid current pinchpoint.

A3. Traffic signal changes to give more time to A120 at the expense of the side road traffic.

A4. A TRO banning the movement of HGV's through the village, thereby allowing two way vehicle flow to resume.

- 3.7.4. Option A solutions were low scoring, offering limited benefits to the local community.
- 3.7.5. It was clear from the assessment that the maximum benefits for the A120 would be derived through the implementation of Option C, the local bypass to both Little Hadham and Standon. It scored higher than a bypass to Little Hadham due to the benefits that can be gained in accident reduction between the two villages, and in forming a good quality link between the A10 and M11.
- 3.7.6. It was considered feasible to implement Option C in a staged approach with bypasses for Little Hadham and later Standon being linked by on-line improvements. In this way Option C provides a whole route strategy for the A120 from the A10 to Bishop's Stortford.
- 3.7.7. The studies therefore recommended that the following strategy should be adopted for the A120 corridor between A10 and Bishop's Stortford:
- To recognise the important role of the A120 between A10 and Bishop's Stortford as a Primary Route, by bringing the route up to modern safety standards and providing appropriate capacity, whilst minimising adverse environmental impacts;
 - To make future improvements within the corridor 'on-line' where possible, but to promote local bypasses for Standon and Little Hadham; and
 - The local bypasses for Standon and Little Hadham should be of single carriageway standard.
- 3.7.8. In accordance with the Local Transport Plan priorities for major projects a bypass for Little Hadham was identified to be promoted as the first phase of the strategy.
- 3.7.9. To progress the strategy further HCC consulted with Standon residents in 2016 on options to improve the A120 at Standon including bypass options. HCC concluded that improvements to the existing road would be the best option. The decision was made on the basis that there was no clear support shown for a bypass due to a number of local environmental issues. The approach was agreed at the HCC Environment Planning and Transportation Panel in June 2016. A separate scheme for Standon is now being progressed.

3.8. **Dual Carriageway Solution.**

- 3.8.1. At Highways and Transport Panel (March 2006) the policy context for the A120 options was that 'for all roads new construction will be limited

to meeting the needs for the levels of traffic existing at the time when a decision is taken to adopt a preferred route. A capability to cater for future growth except that generated by planned development will not be incorporated in to the design and future demand will be met by promoting alternative modes of travel’.

- 3.8.2. As set out above, the A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment (November 2015) forms part of the planning application documents, and based on the Harlow Stansted Gateway Transport Model (HSGTM), set out the existing traffic conditions and the base traffic flows for the assessment.
- 3.8.3. Recent traffic forecasts suggest that traffic levels are expected to be in the region of 55-65% of the maximum flow associated with a single carriageway. The proposed design of a single carriageway has a capacity of around 27,000 vehicles. Traffic modelling indicates that the predicted traffic flow along the bypass would remain within capacity in 2034 (15 years after opening) even allowing for the development currently forecast in the local plans for Hertfordshire, Uttlesford and Harlow. The design includes climbing lanes in certain locations for overtaking slow vehicles.

3.9. **Bishops Stortford North Transport Assessment.**

- 3.9.1. Objectors set out an alternative solution, as presented in a report produced as part of the Bishop’s Stortford North development. HCC understands that the report referred to is the ‘Bishop’s Stortford North Transport Assessment’ dated 2013 produced for The Bishop’s Stortford North Consortium by WSP UK Limited (the “**BSN Report**”). The BSN report formed part of the Bishop’s Stortford North planning submission and included (at Appendix C) a ‘Proposed Improvement Scheme, Little Hadham, Concept Design’.
- 3.9.2. As Option A ‘on-line’ solutions had previously been discounted, HCC responded that the concept design included in the BSN report did not align with the adopted strategy for the A120.
- 3.9.3. Owners of BSN subsequently entered into a section 106 agreement dated (2 April 2015) with HCC, for purposes of the BSN planning permission. That agreement includes a provision for payment by the owners of a ‘Little Hadham Improvements Contribution’ (in the sum of £84,730) towards the costs of the Little Hadham Bypass.

3.10. **Removals of signals**

- 3.10.1. Objectors contend that, when the traffic lights fail in the Little Hadham that, traffic moves more freely. As previously set out, the Option A corridor solutions reviewed as part of the scheme development which involved local improvements in the centre of the village were typically lower scoring than other options as they offered limited benefits to the local community, and therefore discounted.

- 3.10.2. The objection raises concerns regarding the potential impacts elsewhere on the road network by the removal of the queues at Little Hadham. The Council responds as follows:
- 3.10.3. The A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment recognises that the introduction of the bypass would have a detrimental impact on the future operation of the following junctions:
- A120/A10
 - A120/Cambridge Road
 - A120/Station Road
 - A120/Horse Cross; and
 - A120/A1184
- 3.10.4. The Schedule of Conditions to the planning permission sets out at Condition 28:
- ‘Within 12 months of the opening an operation of the bypass, the applicants shall carry out post-construction traffic monitoring. Associated studies shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority in order to determine the extent of mitigation measures necessary on the existing route. Should it be determined that significant capacity issues have arisen, appropriate interim mitigation measures shall be carried out at appropriate locations within Standon within a timescale to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.’
- 3.10.5. The Council is committed to addressing the requirements of the Condition, which relates to the A120/A10, A120/Cambridge Road, A120/Station Road and A120/Horse Cross junctions.
- 3.10.6. The current bypass scheme includes improvements to the A120/A1184 junction to improve capacity which may be co-ordinated with other developer improvements for the junction.

3.11. **Bypass Route Selection**

- 3.11.1. Six route options, plus a ‘Do Minimum’ option of minor improvement works within the village were identified for further assessment:
- Option 1 - Minor local improvements / safety schemes.
 - Option 2 - Construction of a bypass to the north of Little Hadham. This option would require a new junction on the existing A120 approximately 350 m to the west of the village. It would then pass to the north, across Albury Road and the River Ash valley on an embankment. Finally passing through a cutting between Hadham Hall and Mill Mound to another new junction on the existing A120 close to the road to Cradle End.

- Option 3 - Construction of a bypass to the north of the A120. It would require a new junction on the A120 approximately 1 km to the west of the village, to the west of the veterinary hospital. It would then pass to the north of Tilekiln Farm, across the Albury Road and then follow the line of Option 2.
- Option 4 - Construction of a bypass to the north of the A120. It would require a new junction on the A120 approximately 350 m west of the village. It would then pass to the north, across Albury Road, across the River Ash valley on an embankment and through a cutting to the north of Mill Mound. It would then pass to the north of Hadham Park and re-join the existing A120 in the vicinity of the roundabout on the A120 Bishop's Stortford northern bypass.
- Option 5 - Construction of a bypass to the north of the A120. It would involve a new junction on the A120 approximately 1 km west of the village, to the west of the veterinary hospital. It would then pass to the north of Tilekiln Farm, across the Albury Road, across the River Ash valley on an embankment and through a cutting to the north of Mill Mound. It would then pass to the north of Hadham Park and re-join the existing A120 in the vicinity of the roundabout on the A120 Bishop's Stortford northern bypass.
- Option 6 - Construction of a bypass to the south of the A120. It would require a new junction on the A120 approximately 200 m west of the village. The bypass would then pass to the south of the village, between The Smithy and Halfway House, on an embankment approximately 7 metres high. A viaduct would then take the bypass over the Much Hadham Road and the River Ash floodplain, to re-join the existing A120 at another new junction approximately opposite Hadham Hall.
- Option 7 - Construction of a bypass to the south of the A120. It would require a new junction on the existing A120 approximately 1 km to the west of the village, to the west of the veterinary hospital. The bypass would then pass to the south of Little Hadham Place in a cutting, and cross between Halfway House and Hadham Ford. It would then be taken on a viaduct over the Much Hadham Road and the River Ash floodplain to re-join the A120

3.11.2. Public Consultation found that generally the public were pleased that all northern options for the Bypass Scheme could potentially provide the opportunity to construct flood alleviation measures to protect the village.

3.11.3. Overall Option 5 was considered to be the best performing route gaining support of the East Herts Council and Little Hadham Parish Council. The Environment Agency also welcomed any Bypass

Scheme which has the potential to provide flood alleviation to Little Hadham and the villages downstream.

- 3.11.4. During 2008 further detailed investigation and design of Option 5 (the preferred bypass route) was undertaken to determine the preferred alignment at each end of the bypass route, seeking in particular to minimise the impact on local farms, the village of Albury and the environment.
- 3.11.5. As a result of analysis it was recommended to amend the tie-in at the western end of the Bypass Scheme and provide a new roundabout at the eastern end.
- 3.11.6. The recommendations were adopted in the Bypass Scheme and overall result in less land take and severance of farm land. They also offer greater overall environmental benefits than the original preferred route.

3.12. **Bypass Eastern Tie-in**

- 3.12.1. One of the objections (Mr Harvey) queries the provision of a roundabout at the eastern end of the bypass adjacent to Plantings Cottages, suggesting that the bypass should tie into the 'Tesco's' roundabout. The suggestion for the bypass to tie-in into the existing 'Tesco's' roundabout relates to the original Option 5 solution.
- 3.12.2. The eastern bypass tie-in was considered in detail following the Cabinet decision (17 September 2007) which endorsed the provision of a bypass (Option 5), subject to further detailed investigation of the route, to minimise the impact on local farms, Standon and the environment, and to determine the alignment at each end of the route.
- 3.12.3. The further investigation involved the development of alternative tie-in options (Options 5A and 5B) which were discussed further with affected landowners, including Mr Harvey. These options/alternatives involve less land take, less severance of farmland and less overall capital cost with greater environmental benefits/cost ratio. As a result of the investigation and subsequent consultation, it was considered that Option 5B offered the better solution (to Option 5).
- 3.12.4. Option 5B was presented to Highways and Transport Cabinet Panel (29 April 2008) and approved at Cabinet (16 June 2008).

4. Section (iv): a statement of the authority’s justification for compulsory purchase, with regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, and Article 8 if appropriate

4.1. The Human Rights Act 1998 requires (amongst other things) that every public authority must act in a manner which is compatible with the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“the Convention”).

4.2. Relevant parts of Article 1 of First Protocol of the Convention provide:

“Every natural or legal person is entitled to peaceful enjoyment of his possessions” and “ no one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law ...”

4.3. Relevant parts of Article 8 of the Convention provide:

“(1) Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

(2) There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interest of ...the economic well-being of the country...”

4.4. The European Court of Human Rights has recognised, in the context of Articles 1 and 8, that regard must be had to the fair balance which has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and the community as a whole. In this case, HCC has carefully considered the benefits the Bypass Scheme will bring to the village of Little Hadham and users of the existing A120. In particular, residents who live in the village and the community surrounding Little Hadham will benefit from the removal of traffic congestion and the risk of flooding, and the users of the highway will benefit from improved journey times. These benefits could not be achieved otherwise, in the context of the interference with the existing rights and interests of the existing landowners. It is concluded that any interference with Convention Rights has been minimised by careful design and is proportionate, justified and necessary in the public interest to secure the objectives of the Bypass Scheme. The interference is in accordance with law (namely Sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980), pursues a legitimate aim (delivery of the Bypass Scheme) and is both necessary and proportionate in a democratic society.

4.5. Relevant parts of Article 6 provide that:

“In determining his civil rights and obligations ... everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law.”

4.6. The proposals have been extensively publicised and persons likely to be affected by them will have had an opportunity to make representations in relation to the planning application. So far as the Order is concerned, any owner, lessee or occupier of land included in the Order will have had the

opportunity to make an objection and to appear before a person appointed by the Secretary of State before a decision is made whether or not the Order should be confirmed.

- 4.7. If the Secretary of State agrees with HCC that there is a compelling case in the public interest, he may confirm the Order. If the Order is confirmed, compensation may be claimed by persons whose interests in land have been acquired or whose possession of land has been disturbed. In the circumstances, if the Order is confirmed, the compulsory acquisition of the Order Land will not conflict with Article 1 of the First Protocol or Article 8 of the Convention.
- 4.8. HCC is required to comply with the Equality Act 2010 An Equality Impact Assessment (“EqIA”) has been developed for the Bypass Scheme.
- 4.9. In the promotion of this Order, HCC has been mindful of the need to properly discharge its obligations under the provisions of this legislation paying careful attention to any impacts identified in the EqIA on protected characteristics.
- 4.10. The land being acquired for the Bypass Scheme lies to the north and south of the existing A120 road. It is the arable land surrounding the village of Little Hadham to the west and the north, land to the north of Church End and land to the north and east of Hadham Park, all in East Hertfordshire.
- 4.11. HCC has established the interests and ownership for the majority of the land for the Bypass Scheme through Land Registry records and responses to notices issued under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act. The Land Registry does not hold any records for an area to the eastern end of the Bypass Scheme, south of the A120, Notices under Section 16 were posted on site. The Land Registry does not hold records for some areas of the existing highway affected by the Bypass Scheme. Where no landowner has been identified, an ‘unknown’ interest has been included in the Compulsory Purchase Order schedule.
- 4.12. The EA has established the interests and ownership for the land for the Flood Alleviation Scheme through Land Registry records and responses to notices issued under Section 5A of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. Where no landowner has been identified, an ‘unknown’ interest has been included in the EA Order schedule.
- 4.13. The Order Land is described in some detail in the Schedule to the Order but in summary the Order Land comprises:
 - a) Land and a right in land needed on a permanent basis and;
 - b) Land needed for construction purposes. Where land included in the compulsory purchase order is not needed permanently, HCC will discuss with the owner the acquisition by agreement of temporary rights which may make a permanent acquisition of such land unnecessary. HCC anticipate that temporary rights will be achieved

in each case and that the affected land will be reinstated before its return.

- 4.14. HCC is satisfied that all the land scheduled in the Order is necessary for the Bypass Scheme, and its construction, and that no extra land has been included.

5. Section (v): a description of the proposals for the use or development of the land

- 5.1. The proposed new road alignment is situated to the north of Little Hadham parish, along the boundary of Albury parish. The combined site area of the new bypass and flood alleviation areas is approximately 40 hectares.
- 5.2. The proposed bypass will consist of 3.9km of new single carriageway with a national speed limit. The typical carriageway width will be 9.3m (excluding verges), which will consist of two 3.65m wide lanes, with a 1m hard strip on either side of the carriageway. The Proposed Bypass Scheme will also include a Segregated Left Turn Lane taking eastbound traffic onto the bypass, a differential acceleration lane on the exit from the western roundabout, and a 1km eastbound climbing lane in the middle of the Proposed Bypass Scheme due to the gradient of the carriageway. The segregated Left Turn Lane has been included in the design to address safety concerns related to a potential collision risk at the roundabout between vehicles using the A120 and those vehicles using the new roundabout to exit Little Hadham village. The typical cross section would include 2.5m grass verges along both sides of the Proposed Bypass Scheme, increasing in width to accommodate forward visibility requirements and bridge piers as required. The proposed bypass, with the exceptions of the roundabouts, would not have road lighting.
- 5.3. With the majority of traffic diverted to the new bypass, congestion would be alleviated in Little Hadham reducing queuing and delays; access to the existing A120 between the bypass roundabouts would also become easier from the existing side roads. Priority of the signals at traffic lights at The Ash adjusts with demand, therefore with changed demand, the timing will automatically re-prioritise.
- 5.4. The Proposed Bypass Scheme includes new roundabouts to link the proposed bypass to the existing A120. These are located between Hadham Park and Hadham Lodge in the east, and between The Ash and Albury End Road junction in the west.
- 5.5. Albury Road would pass over the proposed bypass when it is in cutting via a new bridge. The crossing would be located slightly west of the existing road to allow for offline construction. No connection is proposed between Albury Road and the bypass.
- 5.6. North of Hadham Hall, to the south of the bypass, a noise bund to mitigate noise impacts to 19 dwellings in Hadham Hall community is proposed. The bund will be located between Mill Mound and Cradle End Brook. A bridge is proposed to accommodate the public bridleway (Little Hadham Bridleway 035) and agricultural access.
- 5.7. The Proposed Bypass Scheme also includes a new underpass which will accommodate the public bridleway (Little Hadham Bridleway 036), provide agricultural access and provide a crossing point for bats under the proposed bypass.

5.8. The Project incorporates;

- a roundabout at the western end (at Tilekiln Farm) where it ties into the existing A120 carriageway;
- an embankment, including flood alleviation structures, at Albury Tributary;
- a bridge to carry Albury Road over the new bypass (Albury Road Bridge);
- an embankment, including flood alleviation structures, at the River Ash;
- a bridge to carry bridleway (Little Hadham Bridleway 035) and provide agricultural access over the bypass (Mill Mound Bridge);
- culverts to carry the new bypass over Cradle End Brook;
- an underpass to carry the new bypass over a diverted bridleway (Little Hadham Bridleway 036) and provide an agricultural access under the bypass, (Hadham Park Underpass);
- a roundabout to the eastern end (Plantings Cottages) where it ties into the existing A120 carriageway;
- other local diversions of footpaths (Little Hadham 057, Little Hadham 058, Little Hadham 034);
- environmental mitigation throughout the Project, including an area of planting at the eastern end as part of the bat mitigation works.

5.9. The Project also incorporates;

- a culvert below the existing carriageway The Ford to carry the diverted Lloyd Taylor Drain;
- highway changes to Upwick Green Road.

5.10. The Project affects a number of existing highways;

- Footpath Little Hadham FP057: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment to the north of the western roundabout.
- Footpath Little Hadham FP057: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment over the new embankment at Albury Tributary. (A secondary permissive pedestrian route will be provided through the Albury Tributary spillway.)
- Footpath Little Hadham FP058: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment to the north of the embankment at Albury Tributary.
- Albury Road C15: road to be realigned over a new bridge over the new bypass
- Bridleway Little Hadham BR037: route to be improved at its junction with C15 Albury Road.
- Bridleway Little Hadham BR035: route to be improved over a new bridge over the new bypass;

- Bridleway Little Hadham BR036: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment to the west of the bypass, connecting via an underpass (Hadham Park Underpass) to a new alignment Bridleway Bishop's Stortford BR009;
- Footpath Little Hadham FP034: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment around the eastern roundabout:
- Bridleway Bishop's Stortford BR009: route to be stopped up and re-provided on a new alignment east of the bypass.

6. Section (vi) a statement about the planning position of the order site. See also Section 1: advice on Section 226 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 for planning orders

- 6.1. An application for full planning consent was submitted to HCC's Spatial and Land Use Planning Unit on 18th November 2015 on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council and the Environment Agency. The application process was paused to allow a review of the application in light of consultee comments relating to protected species and a recent change in government mitigation guidance.
- 6.2. In October 2016 additional information was submitted to the planning authority and the application was considered at the December 2016 HCC Development Control Committee where it voted unanimously to support planning permission. As part of the Bypass Scheme lies within Green Belt the matter was referred to the Secretary of State for consideration.
- 6.3. A Decision Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) was issued on the 19th January 2017, granting permission, subject to 43 conditions.
- 6.4. A non-material amendment approval notice was issued by the planning authority (15 November 2017) in relation to changes to the Hadham Park underpass design.

7. Section (vii) information required in the light of government policy statements where orders are made in certain circumstances.

7.1. National Planning Policy Framework

7.1.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

7.1.2. Sustainable Development

The NPPF confirms, in Paragraph 6, that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that sustainable development is at the heart of NPPF and should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking. For decision taking, Paragraph 14 also states that,

“approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and

where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted”.

The NPPF also supports sustainable development by encouraging local planning authorities to:

- support development that facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport, including the potential to locate developments where the need to travel will be minimised;
- develop strategies for the provision of viable transport infrastructure to support sustainable development;
- identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice.

The NPPF sets out that planning authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including “transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas.”

With this in mind, London Stansted Airport is located just 10 kilometres to the east of the proposed bypass. In fact, the A120 is identified in the airport's Sustainable Development Plan as being a major point of access. London Stansted has planning permission to expand, thus increasing the number of

passengers from 20 million to 35 million per annum, with it anticipated that this higher figure will be reached in the next 10 years. Furthermore, future capacity will exist to allow further increases up to approximately 40 to 45 million passengers per year.

7.1.3. Core Planning Principles

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF refers to 12 core planning principles. In particular, it notes that planning should “encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production).” In this case, the Project will provide multiple benefits of improving transport connectivity, alleviating congestion and delivering flood risk storage for the area.

7.1.4. Promoting Sustainable Transport

With regard to transport, the NPPF notes in Paragraph 29 that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development and in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Encouragement should also be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (Paragraph 30). The Bypass Scheme will substantially reduce congestion through the centre of Little Hadham by diverting traffic onto the bypass. Residential receptors in Little Hadham next to the existing A120 will experience an improvement in air quality. The largest improvements would be seen close to the junction, where traffic congestion is expected to reduce to give a moderate beneficial effect on air quality.

7.1.5. Requiring Good Design

The NPPF requires good design and the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people (Paragraph 56). Paragraph 65 notes that local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design. In this case, the Project has been subject to design evolution and public consultation, with mitigation measures incorporated in the preferred design. Visual receptors (such as residential properties and users of public rights of way) will be exposed to permanent significant adverse effects, ranging from moderate, to very large adverse on existing rural rights of way, as a result of their views of the Project in a previously rural setting. These impacts have been reduced as far as reasonably possible by the inclusion of screening planting within the Project, which will mature over time.

7.1.6. Climate Change and Flooding

Paragraph 93 of the NPPF notes that planning plays a key role in helping to shape places, including minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the

impacts of climate change. Paragraph 94 further requires local planning authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. The provision of flood storage areas as part of the Project will reduce flood risk in Little Hadham and downstream communities.

7.1.7. Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, and soils;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains to biodiversity; and
- preventing both new and existing developments from being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution.

Further guidance on conserving and enhancing biodiversity is provided in Paragraph 118. An Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project has been undertaken. Where potential impacts were identified, mitigation and enhancement measures will be provided as part of the Project. The incorporation of mitigation measures will result in no significant adverse impacts on nature conservation, with beneficial impacts predicted as a result of the provision of new hedgerows. In addition, the Project will be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

In order to conserve the natural environment and avoid significant harm, the design includes lower physical mass and footprint for bridges in order to be less visually intrusive. Positioning Albury Road Bridge to the west of the existing alignment rather than east also reduced the amount of earthworks required and retained more vegetation in the view for receptors to the east. Where adverse impacts could not be avoided, proposed native species planting and maturing of vegetation will provide more visual integration of the Project within the landscape.

The Environmental Statement included an assessment of the effect on the landscape and visual resource as a result of the Bypass Scheme. Best practice guidance was used to inform the landscape and visual impact assessment and to develop appropriate landscape mitigation proposals:

- DMRB Volume 11: Section 2, Part 5, HA/205/08 Assessment and Management of Environmental Effects; and Section 3, Part 5, Landscape Effects.
- DMRB Interim Advice Note 135/10 Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment.

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA), The Landscape Institute/ Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. Third Edition (2013).

A Landscape Strategy was submitted as part of the planning application. Detailed planting plans have since been produced as part of the construction proposals and will be submitted to discharge planning condition 25, together with a management plan.

Lighting will be designed to be directional so as to avoid illumination of the hedgerows and habitat features close to the Bypass Scheme. A bridge and culvert will allow for safe passage of animals and prevent fragmentation of the foraging habit mammals. Mesh fencing will be included in order to exclude fallow deer and badgers from the proposed road thereby reducing the risk of vehicle collisions and human fatalities/injuries

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF refers to agricultural land. It states that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. The Project will involve the permanent change of use of approximately 40 hectares of agricultural land. The land is a mix of good quality land in Subgrade 3a and moderate quality land in Subgrade 3b. The areas proposed for flood storage are currently predominantly classified as Subgrade 3a land. It has been concluded that agricultural land quality will be unaffected in the flood storage areas, and that the existing land uses will be able to continue as at present in these areas

To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, including the cumulative effects of pollution (Paragraph 120). There is low potential for contaminated material to be generated from the site as a result of the rural nature of the area. Best practice, such as the adoption of a CEMP throughout construction would ensure human health and environment incidents are avoided.

Paragraph 123 and 124 refer to noise and air quality. With regard to noise, adverse noise impacts have been identified at some residential properties including some at Albury End, Albury Lodge, properties along Albury Road, Church End and Hadham Industrial Estate, Hadham Hall and Hadham Park. However, noise levels at these locations remain below given limits and significant effects are not predicted. A potential significant adverse effect has been identified on the community of Hadham Ford. This is a result of indirect increases in traffic predicted in the village causing increased traffic noise. Mitigation measures have been considered in this area but are not considered practical in this location. Significant beneficial effects on noise are predicted around the properties in the vicinity of the junction in Little Hadham and those in the vicinity of Green Street and Cradle End, due to the predicted reduction in traffic.

With regard to air quality, residential receptors in Little Hadham will experience an improvement in air quality as a result of reduction in pollutant concentrations in the area, Construction activities and the introduction of new man made infrastructure will change the tranquillity and views of the rural landscape. In order to counteract these impacts, the Project will provide mitigation planting, using native species, to screen views and integrate the Project into the rural landscape

7.1.8. Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Guidance on the historic environment is set out in Paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF and requires the significance of heritage assets affected by a proposal to be assessed. It has been concluded that the setting of listed buildings and the Scheduled Monument, Mill Mound, will not be significantly affected during construction due to the temporary nature of works. Little Hadham is a Conservation Area in which there are a number of Listed Buildings. The reduction of traffic in the village is considered to have a moderate beneficial effect on the setting of many of these heritage assets. The effect on the setting of other listed buildings in the wider area is not predicted to be significant or result in substantial harm. The combined operational effect of visual and noise impacts upon the rural setting of Mill Mound is considered to represent a moderate adverse effect. The visual impact of the Project has been minimised by planting where practicable.

7.1.9. Pre-application Engagement

The NPPF advocates early engagement to enable improved outcomes for the community and better coordination of resources (Paragraph 188). Extensive pre-application engagement was undertaken for the Project, dating back to 2007. In addition, discussion was undertaken with the local planning authority, to establish requirements for the planning application, including application for EIA screening and scoping opinions, in accordance with the Regulations and Paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

7.2. Local Transport Plans

7.2.1. Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan (2011-2031)

The HCC Local Transport Plan (LTP) sets out the County Council's vision and strategy for the long term development of transport in the county. Its vision is to provide a safe, efficient and resilient transport system that serves the needs of business and residents across Hertfordshire and minimises its impact on the environment.

The improvement of highways is a core strategy of HCC, which supports economic growth; enhances and maintains the natural environment; improves the connection between neighbourhoods; and addresses design infrastructure in light of future constraints. The Project is shown as an identified scheme on the LTP Transport Schemes Map.

The Local Transport Plan advocates for reducing the level of stop-start conditions through traffic management and to construct, maintain, and operate all infrastructure as part of its response to climate change adaptation. Currently, the one-way working signal controlled junction in the centre of Little Hadham causes severe congestion and delays, especially at peak hours. The new A120 Bypass Scheme would accommodate this existing demand and divert traffic away from the village centre, which would reduce the amount of idle time and stop-start conditions from waiting in long queues for the traffic lights and improve traffic flows and congestion.

The LTP also aims to improve the quality of life of individuals and manage the environmental impacts by enhancing the natural environment, improving connections between neighbourhoods and reducing the impact of transport noise and greenhouse gas emissions. Through emissions and transport noise displacement and reduced congestion, the quality of life for residents within Little Hadham would improve by improving the permeability of the village centre. Driver stress would also be improved by decreasing east west journey times and reducing delays and queuing.

In summary, the Project is set in the LTP as an identified project and the Project complies with the policies and objectives of the LTP.

7.2.2. Eastern Herts Transport Plan (2007)

The Eastern Herts Transport Plan covers the major settlements of Bishop's Stortford and Sawbridgeworth, and includes the surrounding rural area approximately bounded by the A10 in the west, the A120 to the north, and the county boundary to the south and east.

The Transport Plan is the long term framework which will provide a focus for transportation improvements over the next 15 to 20 years. It provides a base to deliver a more sustainable, integrated transport system for the towns and surrounding rural areas.

The Transport Plan vision states:

“To provide a safe, efficient and affordable transport system that allows access for all to everyday facilities. Everyone will have the opportunity and information to choose the most appropriate form of transport and time of travel. By maximising the capacity of the network we will work towards a transport system that balances economic prosperity with personal health and environmental wellbeing”

Ten objectives are identified within the plan, they complement the central and local government transportation and land use policies and reflect the transport issues raised by the consultation process. These objectives are:

- School Traffic
- Parking
- Safety

- Pedestrian and Cycle Facilities
- Maintenance
- Access to Facilities
- Passenger Transport
- Congestion/Ease of Movement
- Street Scene
- Future Developments

The Transport Plan recognises the importance role of the A120 between A10 and Bishop's Stortford as a Primary Route. It recognises the need for improvements on the existing road and new bypasses for Standon and Little Hadham.

7.2.3. Inter-Urban Route Strategy (2012)

Hertfordshire County Council, in its role as local transport authority, is responsible for producing spatial transport strategies. One of these is the Inter-Urban Route Strategy, which aims, amongst other things, to provide a strategy for each route and a county-wide strategy, identifying potential contenders for Major Projects. Corridor 8 of the Strategy focuses on the A120, which is identified as carrying a mix of local and strategic traffic as it is the main link to Stanstead Airport and the M11. The Strategy refers to the existing bottleneck at Little Hadham and the plan to address this through the provision of a bypass, which is a major aspiration of the Local Transport Plan.

7.2.4. Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Strategy (2009)

Furthermore, the Hertfordshire Infrastructure and Investment Strategy, published in November 2009, considered the locations of where investment in transport infrastructure should go between the years 2011 to 2031. This identified that east to west journeys were not as well catered for as existing north to south routes. The A120 was therefore identified within the strategy as being in need of a bypass to alleviate capacity issues and to assist with future forecast growth.

7.3. Local Planning Policy (East Herts District Council)

7.3.1. The Development Plan

The application site is located within East Herts District Council. The Development Plan for the area comprises the Saved Policies from the East Herts Local Plan Second Review (April 2007) and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). The Proposals Map indicates that the application site is not designated for any particular land use. The strategy diagram for the Local Plan identifies the application as lying within the rural area beyond the Green Belt.

East Herts District Council is currently preparing the new East Herts District Plan. Saved Policies from the East Herts Local Plan Second Review will

continue to form part of the statutory Development Plan until they are replaced by policies as part of the emerging East Herts District Plan.

7.3.2. Local Plan Saved Policies

Below is an overview of the saved policies which are relevant to the land required for the Project.

- **GBC14 Landscape Character**
Landscape Character Assessment prepared in accordance with an agreed methodology will be used to assess development proposals which will be required to improve and conserve local landscape character. Where damage is unavoidable, appropriate mitigation measures will be sought.
- **ENV1 Design and Environmental Quality**
All development proposals will be expected to be of a high standard of design and reflect local distinctiveness. Proposals will be expected to demonstrate compatibility (where relevant) with the surrounding area, relate well to the surrounding townscape, respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and future occupants, incorporate sustainable initiatives, consider the impact of any loss of open land, minimise loss or damage of important landscape features and provide landscape, recreation or amenity features, and where appropriate habitat creation.
- **ENV2 Landscaping**
Development proposals will be expected to retain and enhance existing landscape features. Where losses are unavoidable compensatory planting or habitat creation will be sought.
Detailed surveys of landscape features will be required to be submitted.
Proposals on prominent sites will be required to give special consideration to landscape treatment.
Landscaping proposals should include a statement setting out how they will meet the targets set in the Hertfordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.
- **ENV11 Protection of Existing Hedgerows and Trees**
In considering development proposals, including new roads, the Council will endeavour to ensure maximum retention of existing hedgerows and trees, and their reinforcement by new planting of native broad-leaved species. Where removal is unavoidable, replacement planting of native broad-leaved species will be expected.
- **ENV16 Protected Species**
Development and other land use changes which may have an adverse effect on badgers and other species protected by Schedules 1, 5, and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, and the Nature Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 will only be permitted where harm to the species can be avoided.
- **ENV17 Wildlife Habitats**
The district Council will support work to achieve targets contained within the

Hertfordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan, seek to realise opportunities for habitat creation and seek to improve nature conservation wherever possible.

- ENV 18 Water Environment
Development or change of use of land will be required to preserve and enhance the water environment.
- ENV19 Development in Areas Liable to Flood
Proposals for development including raising of land in the flood plains and washlands will not be permitted if they would materially impede the flow of flood water, increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, reduce the capacity of floodplains, or increase risk to people or property.
- ENV20 Groundwater Protection
Development which may cause the contamination of, or otherwise prejudice, groundwater will not be permitted. Development proposals in areas of known groundwater importance will be required to submit a detailed assessment of the impact the development proposals will have on groundwater resource, including measures to mitigate any potential threat to the groundwater.
- ENV21 Surface Water Drainage
Where appropriate and relevant, all development proposals will be expected to take into consideration Best Management Practices to surface water drainage, as advocated by the Environment Agency.
- ENV24 Noise Generating Development
The Council will expect noise generating development to be designed and operated in a way that minimises the impact of noise nuisance on the environment.

7.3.3. The emerging East Herts District Plan

The emerging East Herts District Plan is at the examination stage and has been subject to public consultation. The A120 Bypass of Little Hadham is listed as a strategic infrastructure requirement of the plan (Policy DPS4) and forms part of the plans Infrastructure Delivery Plan (DEL1). Below is an overview of the policies, which are relevant to the land required for the Project.

- Policies DPS4 & DEL1 Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery to ensure sustainable development

East Herts Council will prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and work with partners to ensure the timely and co-ordinated phasing of the delivery of strategic and local infrastructure. Little Hadham Bypass is highlighted as item e) of policy (DPS4).

- TRA1 Sustainable Transport

Proposals should comply with the provisions of the Local Transport Plan, ensure that a range of alternative options are available to users, priorities the provision of modes of transport other than the car, allow for the early

implementation of sustainable travel infrastructure, protect existing rights of way, cycling and equestrian routes, and ensure provision is made for long term maintenance.

- NE2 Species and Habitats

Development proposals which may impact on Species and Habitats of Principal Importance included in the England Biodiversity List under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 will only be permitted where harm to the species can be avoided.

Locally important biodiversity sites and other notable ecological features of conservation value will be protected and enhanced.

Developments which would result in the loss or significant damage to trees, hedgerows or ancient woodland sites will not be permitted. The Council will seek their reinforcement by additional native species planting where appropriate.

- NE3 Green Infrastructure

A diverse network of accessible, multi-functional green infrastructure across the district will be protected and enhanced for its biodiversity, recreational, accessibility, health and landscape value and for the contribution it makes towards combating climate change.

Development proposals should avoid the loss, fragmentation or impairment to the functionality of the green infrastructure network, and opportunities should be maximised in accordance with the Council's Green Infrastructure Plan, its Parks and Open Spaces Strategy, the Hertfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan, Living Landscape Schemes, locally identified Nature Improvement Areas and any future relevant plans and programmes as appropriate.

- DES1 Landscape Character

Development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve, enhance or strengthen the character and distinctive features of the district's landscape.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be provided to ensure that impacts, mitigation and enhancement opportunities are appropriately addressed.

In exceptional circumstances, where damage to landscape character is unavoidable and justified by other material considerations, appropriate mitigation measures will be sought.

Where an area is identified in the Council's Landscape Character Assessment this will be used to inform consideration of development proposals.

- DES2 Landscaping

Development proposals must demonstrate how they will retain, protect and enhance existing landscape features which are of amenity and/or biodiversity value.

In exceptional circumstances, where losses are unavoidable and justified by other material considerations, compensatory planting or habitat creation will be sought either within or outside the development site.

- HA1 Heritage Assets

Development proposals should protect and enhance the historic environment. Proposals that would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits which outweigh the harm or loss.

- WAT1 Flood Risk Management

The functional floodplain will be protected from development and where possible developed flood plain should be returned to Greenfield status with an enhanced level of biodiversity.

Development proposals should neither increase the likelihood, intensity or risk to people, property, crops or livestock from flooding.

- WAT3 Water Quality and the Water Environment

Development proposals will be required to preserve and enhance the water environment, ensuring improvements in surface water quality and the ecological value of watercourses and their margins.

- WAT5 Sustainable Drainage

Development must utilise the most sustainable forms of drainage systems in accordance with the SUDS hierarchy unless there are practical engineering reasons for not doing so.

- EQ2 Noise Pollution

Development should be designed and operated in a way that minimises the direct and cumulative impact of noise on the surrounding environment.

Noise sensitive development should be located away from existing noise

generating sources or programmed developments where possible to prevent prejudicing the continued existing operations. The use of design, layout, landscaping tools and construction methods should be employed to reduce the impact of surrounding noise sources.

8. Section (viii) any special considerations affecting the order site, e.g. ancient monument, listed building, conservation area, special category land, consecrated land, renewal area, etc.

8.1. Scheduled Ancient Monument

8.1.1. The bypass will pass to the north of the scheduled monument, known as Mill Mound (List Entry No: 1005257). No land within the extents of the scheduled monument is included in the Order. The mound is currently surrounded by trees, and additional planting is proposed which will screen the bypass from the monument.

8.1.2. Little Hadham Bridleway BR035 lies to the east of Mill Mound scheduled monument. A new bridge will be constructed to carry the bridleway over the new bypass. To provide the new bridge construction works will be undertaken to the bridleway, within 15 m of the monument.

8.2. Green Belt

8.2.1. The eastern end of the bypass lies in Bishops Stortford Green Belt. The planning application was referred to the Secretary of State, as outlined in the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) direction 2009.

8.2.2. The Secretary of State notified the planning authority to continue with their determination in the usual form.

8.2.3. A Decision Notice under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) was issued on the 19th January 2017, granting permission, subject to 43 conditions.

8.2.4. Green Belt land lies within the Order limits.

8.3. Conservation Area

8.3.1. Little Hadham village is a conservation area in which there are several listed buildings. The reduction of traffic in the village is considered to have a moderate beneficial effect on the setting of many of these heritage assets.

8.3.2. HCC propose to make other enhancements in the village after the construction of the bypass, which will enhance the setting and discourage ongoing through traffic.

8.3.3. No land within the extent of the Little Hadham conservation area is included in the Order land.

8.4. Listed Buildings

8.4.1. There are numerous listed building identified in Little Hadham, Hadham Ford, Green Street and Cradle End, Hadham Hall, Hadham Park, Little Hadham Place, Albury End, Albury, Upwick Green, Walnut Tree Green and Church End.

8.4.2. The Order land does not include any listed buildings.

9. Section (ix) if the mining code has been included, reasons for doing so

9.1. The mining code has not been applied to the Order land.

10. Section (x) details of how the acquiring authority seeks to overcome any obstacle or prior consent needed before the order scheme can be implemented, e.g. need for a waste management licence

10.1. HCC has considered the approvals and consents that are required for the implementation of the Bypass Scheme and considers that mechanisms are in place to secure necessary approval to progress. A summary of the relevant approvals is set out below;

10.2. Political

10.2.1. Approval to progress with the Bypass Scheme was granted by HCC at a series of Highways & Transport Panels and Cabinet meetings. These include endorsement to proceed with the consultation, approval to progress with the preferred option, and authority to seek any necessary Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Order.

10.2.2. HCC and the EA agreed a Memorandum of Understanding in August 2014, and signed a Collaborative Agreement (relating to A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) and Flood Alleviation Scheme) on 1 February 2017. The Collaborative Agreement sets out the joint arrangements for the delivery of the Project.

10.3. Funding

10.3.1. The A120 Little Hadham Bypass Scheme is one of the Hertfordshire Local Transport Bodies prioritised major transport schemes. In 2014 the Bypass Scheme secured £27.4 million from the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership as part of a successful bid to the Governments Single Local Growth Fund. This completed a funding package for the project supported by the Environment Agency and Hertfordshire County Council. The scheme now forms part of the Department for Transport Retained Local Major Projects portfolio.

10.4. Environment Agency

10.4.1. The EA is implementing a Compulsory Purchase Order for their Flood Alleviation Scheme elements concurrently with the Order and Side Roads Order. The EA Order was published in a similar timeframe to the HCC CPO.

10.4.2. HCC would welcome dual consideration of the Orders to support in the co-ordination of the delivery of the Project.

10.4.3. To ensure that HCC can construct any works on behalf of the EA, a Public Sector Co-operation Agreement will be entered into.

10.4.4. A Collaborative Agreement dated 1 February 2017 reflects the agreement between HCC and the EA in terms of joint working, including funding arrangements and mechanisms for approvals. The collaboration agreement formalises the relationship, which was agreed

in principle by the memorandum of understanding dated 7 August 2014.

- 10.4.5. HCC and the EA have both included powers to acquire land at the embankments at the Albury Tributary and the River Ash. Where there is a duality of purpose in relation those parcels, the EA will exercise its CPO and undertake to give the necessary rights to HCC to carry out the construction of the road and dedicate so much of the land as is required for highway purposes thereafter.

10.5. **Side Roads Order**

- 10.5.1. The Side Roads Order includes provision to make improvements of the highway, stopping up and construction of new highways, stopping up and provision of new means of access to premises, and the provision of temporary highways.

- 10.5.2. The highways affected by the Side Roads Order are;

- Footpath Little Hadham FP057
- Footpath Little Hadham FP058
- Albury Road C15
- Bridleway Little Hadham BR037
- Bridleway Little Hadham BR035
- Bridleway Little Hadham BR036
- Footpath Little Hadham FP034
- Bridleway Bishop's Stortford BR009

- 10.5.3. HCC seeks for the Secretary of State to amend the Side Roads Order to include a statement setting out that the new bridleway routes, over Mill Mound Bridge and through Hadham Park underpass, will coexist with a new private access which include vehicular rights and the new highway is provided subject to those rights. HCC would welcome an amendment to the draft Side Road Order plans to reflect the inclusion of the following note:

Site Plan 5: 'Bridleway A coexistent with a private vehicular right of access for Wickham Hall'

Site Plan 6: 'Bridleway A coexistent with a private vehicular right of access for Wickham Hall'

10.6. **Traffic Regulation Orders**

- 10.6.1. Traffic Regulation Orders will be required to amend the existing speed limits through Little Hadham village and shall be made during the detailed design phase of the Bypass Scheme. The amendment of any existing Traffic Regulation Orders does not directly affect the bypass,

and would therefore not be considered an impediment to the delivery of the Bypass Scheme.

10.7. Road space booking

10.7.1. In order to deliver the Project temporary closures of the existing A120 may be required. Any closures, and agreed diversion routes, would be carried out under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

10.8. Reclassification of existing A120

10.8.1. HCC will progress the reclassification of the existing A120, between the proposed new roundabouts at the eastern and western end of the bypass, following construction of the bypass. The reclassification of the existing A120 does not impede the implementation of the bypass.

10.9. Environmental Licences

10.9.1. HCC will seek the necessary environmental licences required for the delivery of the Project, as set out in the planning permission and any conditions applied thereto.

10.9.2. The planning application addendum submission (Section 8) sets out an explanation as to how the Project meets the three tests required for Natural England to grant a European Protected Species (EPS) licence for great crested newt (definitely required) and an EPS licence for bat species (potentially required, to be determined by ongoing survey work). The justification is provided in the following extract from the planning addendum:

In the absence of mitigation, the Proposed Bypass Scheme is predicted to result in significant adverse impacts to European Protected Species (EPS) protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, namely bats (including barbastelle) and great crested newt.

The Regulations transpose the requirements of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) into English law. The Regulations transpose certain prohibitions against activities affecting EPS. These include prohibitions against the deliberate capturing, killing or disturbance and against the damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place of such an animal.

The Habitats Directive provides for the derogation from these prohibitions for specified reasons and providing certain conditions are met. Those derogations are transposed into the Regulations by way of a licensing regime that allows what would otherwise be an unlawful act to be carried out lawfully. Natural England (NE) is the licensing authority for the purposes of this licensing regime. In determining whether or not to grant a licence NE must apply the three tests in Regulation 53(2)(e), 53(9)(a), 53(9)(b), which requires NE to satisfy itself that imperative reasons of overriding public interest exist to justify

the impact to EPS, that there is no satisfactory alternative and that any action licensed will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species at favourable conservation status in its natural range.

The Regulations also provide that a competent authority, including a planning authority must, in the exercise of any of their functions, have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions. It is this duty that was considered in the Supreme Court decision in *R (Vivienne Morge) v Hampshire County Council* (the Morge case). In that case the Supreme Court stated that it could not see why planning permission should not ordinarily be granted unless it is concluded that the proposed development would (a) be likely to offend one of the prohibitions referred to above and (b) be unlikely to be licensed under the regime described:

“The planning committee must grant or refuse planning permission in such a way that will ‘establish a system of strict protection for the animal species listed in Annex IV(a) in their natural range ...’ If in this case the committee is satisfied that the development will not offend art. 12(1)(b) or (d) it may grant permission. If satisfied that it will breach any part of article 12(1) it must then consider whether the appropriate authority, here Natural England, will permit a derogation and grant a licence under regulation 44. Natural England can only grant that licence if it concludes that (i) despite the breach of regulation 39 (and therefore of article 12) there is no satisfactory alternative; (ii) the development will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of bats at favourable conservation status; and (iii) the development should be permitted for imperative reasons of overriding public importance. If the planning committee conclude that Natural England will not grant a licence it must refuse planning permission. If on the other hand it is likely that it will grant the licence then the planning committee may grant conditional planning permission. If it is uncertain whether or not a licence will be granted, then it must refuse planning permission.”

Therefore, it is clear that there will be circumstances in which planning authorities will be required to form a view on the likelihood of a licence being granted by NE, i.e. that the development would satisfy the three tests of Regulation 53.

In order to assist the planning authority with forming this view, the three tests are set out below together with information on how they are addressed by the Proposed Bypass Scheme:

- (1) Regulation 53(2)(e)** states: a licence can be granted for the purposes of “preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of

overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment”.

Section 3 of the Arup Planning Statement (Ref:235086-ARP-XX-XX-RP-YP-00001) dated November 2015, sets out the purpose and need for the Proposed Bypass Scheme in detail. This demonstrates that there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest in terms of:

- Improvements to the health, safety and environment of the residents of Little Hadham by reducing traffic congestion, associated pollution and reducing flood risk; and
- Supporting economic development by providing an improved transport network to support the East of England region through decreasing journey times and improving time reliability along the A120 between Bishop’s Stortford and the A10.

(2) Regulation 53(9)(a) states: the appropriate authority shall not grant a licence unless they are satisfied “that there is no satisfactory alternative”.

Section 3 of the Arup Planning Statement sets out a full and detailed history of the consideration of alternative options to the Proposed Bypass Scheme and the development of the Preferred Route Option. Several of these potential routes would cause more damage to breeding sites of barbastelle bat and great crested newt than the Proposed Bypass Scheme.

(3) Regulation 53(9)(b) states: the appropriate authority shall not grant a licence unless they are satisfied “that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.”

The Ecology chapter of the Environmental Statement Addendum assesses the potential effects upon individual EPS in the absence of mitigation. Specific mitigation measures are described that would be implemented as part of the Proposed Bypass Scheme in order to avoid any significant adverse effect upon EPS.

The avoidance of a significant adverse effect on these species demonstrates that there would be no detrimental impact to the favourable conservation status of the local populations of these species.

The Natural England Bat Mitigation Guidelines³ assist those involved with decision making regarding land-use planning and development operations where bats are known to occur. They set out guidance for designing bat mitigation in order to comply with the Habitats Regulations. In this document the term ‘mitigation’ is used in a broad sense to refer to all works required to comply with the legislation when developing areas occupied by protected species, including:

- Mitigation - which, in this strict sense, refers to practices which reduce or remove damage (e.g. by changing the layout of a scheme, or altering the timing of the work); and
- Compensation – which refers to works which offset the damage caused by the development (e.g. by the creation of new roosts).

The guidelines are clear that both of these elements should be considered when setting out mitigation for EPS, with the overall aim being to ensure that there will be no detriment to the conservation status.

The description of mitigation within the ES Addendum uses the term in the broad sense as per the guidelines issued by Natural England in their role as the statutory authority on EPS licensing.

- 10.9.3. In addition, the Project may require a licence from Natural England to damage or destroy badger setts, should any be in active use when construction is due to commence. The threshold for obtaining a licence to impact a badger sett is lower than that for an EPS licence, and the rationale set out for the three tests above is sufficient to demonstrate that the Project would be eligible to obtain this licence as required.
- 10.9.4. HCC does not foresee any reason that the environmental licences would not be granted so does not consider that this will be an impediment to the delivery of the Bypass Scheme.
- 10.9.5. As outlined in the Environmental Statement (ES) and ES Addendum, HCC has undertaken a comprehensive package of ecological survey works to ascertain the current ecological baseline, and to inform an assessment of potential impacts that could arise as a result of the Project. A series of measures will be delivered as an integral part of the Project, in order to mitigate significant adverse impacts that could arise. The mitigation proposed has been developed following consultation with key stakeholders, including the HCC Ecologist and the Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT). Natural England were consulted on the planning application and raised no objection.
- 10.9.6. Concerns have however been raised by a statutory objector (Mr Harvey) in relation to the bat mitigation proposed as part of the Project. In this regard, evidence shall be provided that demonstrates the following.
- 10.9.7. Extensive survey work has confirmed the presence of a nationally significant breeding colony of barbastelle bats, which roost in a complex of woodlands in close proximity to the Project. Reference shall be made to the substantial body of survey evidence undertaken at the site, including surveys undertaken to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (as outlined in the ES and ES Addendum), in

addition to updated surveys undertaken following the grant of planning consent (to further inform the detailed design of mitigation measures).

- 10.9.8. The proposals involve the delivery of a new roundabout (Hadham Park), located immediately to the north of part of the barbastelle breeding woodland complex (Little Plantings Wood). New lighting is required in this location, and it is known that barbastelle bats are sensitive to impacts from artificial lighting. Evidence will be presented to demonstrate that, in line with all relevant legislation, guidance and case law (notably the Habitats Directive), it is correct to adopt a precautionary approach and conclude that in the absence of mitigation, the Project is anticipated to result in an adverse impact on the barbastelle breeding site. This would be a result of a reduced use of woodland by barbastelle bats due to lighting impacts.
- 10.9.9. As outlined in the ES Addendum, in order to address anticipated impacts and maintain the favourable conservation status of the barbastelle bat population, the Project incorporates necessary mitigation in respect of lighting impacts. Mitigation is proposed in the form of a bespoke modified lighting scheme for the roundabout, and also the provision of bands of new native tree and shrub planting to the east of the roundabout (north and south of the existing A120).
- 10.9.10. Prior to the grant of planning consent, mitigation planting was modified to take into account concerns raised by HMWT in their consultation response (dated 25 October 2016) regarding the presence of 'parkland' habitat. It is noted that these concerns are similar to those raised by the statutory objector (Mr Harvey). Evidence shall be provided to demonstrate that the detailed design of the mitigation planting is based on the best available scientific information, and that this represents the minimum required to deliver mitigation for barbastelle bats, both in terms of the location and quantity of planting proposed.
- 10.9.11. In conclusion, it shall be demonstrated that the bat mitigation planting, which forms an integral part of the Project, is necessary and proportionate, and is required to ensure that the scheme complies with all relevant legislation, guidance and case law pursuant to wildlife and nature conservation.
- 10.9.12. HCC are in discussion with Natural England in relation to any necessary environment licence, in relation to bats, that may be required for proposed works.

10.10. **Technical Approvals**

- 10.10.1. The Bypass Scheme will be designed to the relevant highways design standards (or any agreed departure from standards). All designs will be subject to design review and certification, including Road Safety Audits.

- 10.10.2. Design of the flood attenuation structures and embankments will be subject to review of the Reservoir Construction Engineer, on behalf of the EA.
- 10.10.3. Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016 No 1154) (the Regulations) a flood risk activity requires an environmental permit. Erecting any structure (temporary or permanent) over a main river is considered a flood risk activity. The construction of the embankments over the River Ash and the Albury Tributary, both built over a main river, requires HCC to have an environmental permit. A permit for erecting any structure designed to contain or divert floodwaters of a main river is required.
- 10.10.4. An impoundment licence will also be required under the Water Resources Act 1991 for the impoundments at the Albury Tributary and the River Ash.
- 10.10.5. Approval for drainage will include discharge consents from the EA, where outfalls discharge into main rivers. HCC, as flood authority, will also review designs and consent to discharge into ordinary watercourses and connections to existing highway drainage, where necessary.
- 10.10.6. A number of utility services will need to be diverted to accommodate the Project. These diversions have been agreed with the utility companies and will, where possible, be completed in advance of the commencement of the main works, subject to agreements being in place. Otherwise, the necessary utility works will be programmed to be completed within the main works.
- 10.10.7. HCC does not foresee that the granting of the required technical approvals will be an impediment to the delivery of the Project.
- 10.10.8. Planning Permission for the Project has been granted, by Decision Notice dated 19 January 2017, subject to 43 conditions. Several planning conditions must be fulfilled before construction can start.

10.11. **Objections Summary**

- 10.11.1. During the objection period, objections were received from the following statutory objectors;
 - No1 Mr Robert Barclay (CPO & SRO)
 - No 2 Rachel & Simon Sporborg (CPO &SRO)
 - No 3 Mr David Harvey (CPO & SRO)
 - No 4 Mr M Tattum & Mr J Bell (CPO)
 - No 7 National Grid (SRO)
- 10.11.2. Objections were received from the following non-statutory objectors;
 - No 5 Mr Mark Westley (SRO), for the East Herts Footpath Society

No 6 Mr John Barnes (SRO)

- 10.11.3. Objection No 7 from National Grid has subsequently been withdrawn.
- 10.11.4. Objection No 6 from John Barnes has subsequently been with
withdrawn.
- 10.11.5. Following receipt of the letters of objection, a letter of
acknowledgement and response to the points of their letters has been
issued.

10.12. Issues arising from objections

10.12.1. The key issues raised by objectors are set out in the following table, with reference made to subsequent clauses for HCCs response.

Where objection letter text is duplicated between objections, reference is made to previous reference to avoid duplication in response.

	Mr Barclay	Refer to Para
(i)	HCC and the EA have failed to demonstrate that there is a compelling case on public interest grounds to justify the bypass and the significant loss of agricultural land.	10.13.2
(ii)	The current congestion and delays experienced along the A120 can be solved in a more economic and practical manner instead of spending £30 million on a scheme which will not sufficient benefit the wider area in the long term.	10.13.3
(iii)	The two projects combined are understood to make the project costs 'efficient and affordable'. This scheme we understand will provide storage areas to help reduce the risk of flooding to the The Ash and The Ford thus reduce the probability of the river flooding to a number of residential houses in Little Hadham. Whilst we acknowledge that this part of the scheme is in the public interest for a number of local residents, we do not think that this alone justifies the scheme in terms of the wider public interest. Furthermore, we do not understand why the flood alleviation works cannot be carried out as a standalone, more cost-effective scheme without the necessity of spending circa £30 million on the bypass.	10.13.4
(iv)	<p>The proposed route crosses mostly agricultural land, which my client has a significant farming interest in. As a direct consequence of the scheme, a large amount of agricultural land is to be taken permanently or severed. In respect of the severed land, there will be a number of fields that, as a result of the scheme, will be rendered unsuitable for farming purposes owing to their size and shape and thus having a significant impact on my client's farming business.</p> <p>We appreciate that the purpose of the objections is not to discuss the compensation elements nor elements that could be mitigated but it worth reiterating that the proposed scheme will take a large amount of agricultural land, across a large area (and not just in our client's interest) which inherently significantly impacts the wider landscape and</p>	10.13.5

	Mr Barclay	Refer to Para
	countrywide views.	
(v)	<p>We consider that the overall design of the scheme has not fully taken into account future proof designing. We do not believe that the scheme has taken into account traffic which will be generated from new development in the area and specifically the development of Bishop's Stortford North. The Statement of Reasons provided by HCC confirm that the case for the bypass scheme has been debated since 1970's. The current route was originally developed in 2006 to 2008 and although the proposal has been refined since this date, we would argue that it does not sufficiently take into account the impact that future development would have on both the main roads network and surrounding road networks.</p>	10.13.6
(vi)	<p>In relation to specific design issues impacting our client's land, the proposed scheme starts form a new roundabout constructed approximately halfway between the crossroads in little Hadham and Albury End Road junction, adjacent to the Lodge for Little Hadham Place. We understand that the roundabout will be predominately constructed off-line, to the north of the existing A120, to minimise the impact on traffic during the works, which is all noted.</p> <p>The main concern that we have is the introduction of a segregated left turn lane for traffic heading eastbound from the A120. We understand that the aim is provide users with an unhindered passage through the junction, however, we feel that this is an unnecessary design element. The proposed slip road will involve a substantial amount of unnecessary land take which could easily be avoided.</p>	10.13.7
(vii)	<p>In terms of alternative options, as part of the Bishop's Stortford North (BSN) development scheme, the transport consultants were commissioned to identify transport solutions to solve the local traffic issues. As part of this work, they identified a plan which involved removing the traffic lights entirely, constructing a mini roundabout at the eastern junction where the A120 meets Albury/Pelham road and a T Junction where the Much Hadham road joins the main road. This suggested model for such a road layout, has been used in other parts of the country and it is, we understand from their studies, an entirely workable solution.</p>	10.13.8

	Mr Barclay	Refer to Para
	They confirm that this would be a workable solution and most likely reduce the travel time to a greater extent than the plans proposed under the Little Hadham Bypass. We appreciate that there are some potential problems with this solution, for example how HGVs from either direction would be able to cross the bridge at the same time. However, the transport consultants were content that there were sufficient measures to minimise these problems, such as through the use of a combination of speed cameras, reduced speed limit, pelican crossing or road hatching or ensuring that HGVs have priority from one direction.	
(viii)	<p>It is interesting to note that if you use the A120 during a time when the traffic lights have failed, the traffic moves freely, although we appreciate that minimising the queues at Little Hadham will have a knock on effect in both directions further along the A120 and that is why we are firmly of the opinion that the Little Hadham Bypass as proposed is not a workable solution.</p> <p>We understand that the alternative transport work has been made available to the acquiring authority throughout our discussions and we are of the opinion that they have not fully considered these options. Overall, we do not consider that there will be sufficient traffic relief provided as a result of the proposed bypass to justify the acquisition of land.</p>	10.13.9
(ix)	<p>The proposed plans for the bypass and namely the Tilekiln roundabout at the western end will adversely affect Tilekiln farmhouse, which is owned by our client and currently occupied by a farm worker.</p> <p>Overall, we consider that the proposed development will cumulatively have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupier of Tilekiln farmhouse and his family, in relation to noise visual impact and loss of outlook.</p> <p>Tilekiln farmhouse is a traditionally constructed detached farm house with single glazed windows and is located on the north side of the existing A120.</p> <p>We appreciate that options have been assessed in terms of the alignment of the proposed bypass and that a result of the landscape appraisal report, it was suggested that the alignment should tie into the existing A120 as far south from</p>	10.13.10

	Mr Barclay	Refer to Para
	<p>Tilekiln Farm as possible (yet within the Option 5 corridor). We understand that the aim of this was to reduce the prominence of the alignment on the higher ground toward Albury.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, we consider that the negative impacts on the residential dwelling will still be substantial, despite the Statement of Reasons stating that much of the land is remote from residential dwellings.</p>	
(x)	<p>Turning first to noise impact, the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) (Defra, 2010), sets out Government noise policy. Government noise policy set three aims, which are to be met within the context of Government policy on sustainable development;</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life</p> <p>To mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; and</p> <p>Where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.</p> <p>In addition, para 123 of the National Planning Framework (NPPF) and policies ENV1, ENV24 and ENV25 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan also relate specifically to noise impact. In our view, the application fails to meet the requirements of these National and Local Policies for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>The new road will inevitably result in an increase in vehicles using this route. The new road's alignment and the introduction of the segregated left-hand turn and roundabout will mean that roads noise will not be limited to the side of the property but will also be prevalent to the front elevations and private amenity spaces.</p> <p>The roundabout will result in an increase in traffic congestion at this location. The segregated left-hand turn will mean that vehicle heading eastbound will decelerate on approach to the roundabout, before speeding up upon reaching the segregated turn, before breaking again before joining the bypass, all of which further result in an increase in noise and disturbance. Vehicles travelling west bound, will exit the roundabout and accelerate on an incline, from an initial low</p>	10.13.10

	Mr Barclay	Refer to Para
	speed before increasing to travel along the road at the appropriate speed limit for the bypass. This we consider will produce excess noise, especially from lorries and large vehicles. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that there will be an increase in noise disturbance to this property.	
(xi)	<p>Furthermore, currently there is no lighting along this stretch of the A120, however we understand that the roundabout will include road lighting which will result in a substantial increase in light pollution over and above that currently experienced.</p> <p>Overall, we consider that the proposed development will cumulatively have a significant adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of Tilekiln farmhouse.</p>	10.13.11

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
(i)	As 1(i) above	
(ii)	As 1(ii) above	
(iii)	<p>We appreciate that HCC are able to work in partnership with the EA to pool resources to incorporate a FAS within the Bypass scheme. Having reviewed the Statement of Reasons provided by the EA, we understand that following a review of the engineering/structural options available to address the flooding issues in the River Ash catchment it was concluded that financial justification for a scheme was insufficient. The statement of reasons even confirm that the options produced 'cost benefit, priority scores and rankings which were too low to attract necessary DEFRA grant aid funding'.</p> <p>This would indicate that such a flood alleviation scheme was not sufficiently economically justified to progress which should also be interpreted as to lacking in public interest grounds to successfully achieve grant funding.</p> <p>If the EA did not consider there to be sufficient cost benefit grounds to successfully obtain grant funding nor include the proposals within their capital proposal, then we would argue that this indicates a lack of public interest in such a scheme.</p> <p>We would encourage the EA to explore again alternative flood storage options/schemes which might be successful in achieving grant funding in the first instance. Therefore, allowing a standalone scheme or mitigation options to be progressed in order to alleviate any flooding issues. We strongly object to the principle of investing significant sums in the A120 bypass road and then using the flood alleviation element of the scheme to help justify the argument that the overall scheme is to be delivered ;' as it is wider public interest'. It is wholly disingenuous.</p> <p>This scheme we understand will provide storage areas to help reduce the risk of flooding to The Ash and The Ford and thus reduce the probability of the river flooding a number of residential houses in Little Hadham. Whilst we acknowledge that this part of the scheme is in the public interest for a number of local residents limited regard has</p>	10.13.12

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
	<p>been given to the flood issues that residents in the Parish of Albury are likely to experience.</p> <p>The original data relied upon for this scheme suggested that there were in the region of 136 properties at risk of at least a 1 in 100 (1%) whereas in fact it is now recognised that there are a maximum of 72 properties. We would question how many properties have actually flooded to date apart from when the sluice gates were not opened as was the case when Little Hadham last flooded. We maintain that the evidence is flawed.</p> <p>To summarise, we do not consider that the benefits of the flood alleviation scheme justify spending at least £30 million on the overall scheme, involving the creation of the new bypass road just because of the benefit in kind supplied through the provision of the embankment. Whilst, we acknowledge the flooding issues experienced in recent years in the village of Little Hadham, this affects only a small number of residents when assessed against the overall scheme and wider area. This does not amount to developing a compelling case in the public interest.</p>	
(iv)	As 1 (vii) above	
(v)	As 1 (viii) above	
(vi)	<p>Likewise, at the roundabout to the west of Bishop's Stortford which crosses the Stansted Road towards Newport, this currently queues excessively at rush hour before the construction of Bishop's Stortford North housing and if traffic flows unrestricted along the A120, it will merely shift the bottleneck.</p> <p>We appreciate that there are some potential problems with this solution, for example how HGVs from either direction would be able to cross the bridge at the same time. However, the transport consultants were content that there were sufficient measures to minimise these problems, such as through the use of a combination of speed cameras, reduced speed limit, pelican crossing or road hatching or ensuring that HGVs have priority from one direction.</p>	10.13.13
(vii)	An alternative would be to remove some housing and widen the road- this would be much better value and have	10.13.14

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
	much less environmental impact.	
(viii)	As 1 (ix) above	
(ix)	<p>Our clients are concerned about the adverse visual landscape impacts of the scheme and in particular in the context of the views from the north of the scheme, in the Parish of Albury. Due to the need to maintain the structural integrity of the embankments, it is understood that planting will only be possible at the base of these structures and therefore screening is likely to be at the very least limited and most likely ineffective from the view point of Albury.</p> <p>Furthermore, the planning addendum proposed the introduction of deer fencing on the top of the Albury Tributary Flood Attenuation embankment which will be a perceptible new feature in close proximity views. It is appreciated that the deer fencing is required for safety reasons and that in this location the fencing will be viewed in the context of the proposed noise barrier.</p> <p>However, the issue at the River Ash embankment, which is perhaps of greater significance to our clients, is that there is no noise barrier proposed and therefore the visible impact of the deer fencing will be significant. The impact will be experienced without the benefit of any other form of mitigation due to the restrictions of planting on flood defence structures.</p> <p>We have noted a number of comments in relation to the proposals and the positive impacts that the scheme will have on Little Hadham. However, we feel that the same considerations has not been given to the negative impacts on the entire parish of Albury, which after all is located a similar distance from the bypass as the village of Little Hadham</p>	10.13.15
(x)	<p>Furthermore, as the design of the new road is looking to incorporate the flood alleviation scheme it is in our opinion that height and prominence of the road has been elevated to accommodate this scheme. Instead of following the natural contours of the land, the bypass will instead be some eight meters high which by anyone's standards will be a visual eyesore. The increase in height of this aspect of the road was not evident in original consultation and plans.</p>	10.13.16

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
	Without the flood alleviation scheme, there would have been an opportunity to significantly limit the visual impact through a reduced height of the embankments and additional planting.	
(xi)	<p>Our clients live at Broom Farm, Upwick Green, Albury which will be severely affected by the creation of the A120 bypass due to the adverse visual and noise impacts the construction of the road will cause and thus object to the order on these grounds.</p> <p>It is understood that requests for low noise road surfacing have been submitted but we are unclear as to whether this request has been considered, accepted or rejected. Furthermore, the noise barriers requested, the Statement of Consultation confirmed have been found to have limited additional benefits and thus not approved as part of the scheme design.</p>	10.13.17
(xii)	The effect of additional noise generated by the bypass on both our client's property as well as the surrounding Upwick Green and the parish of Albury will be significant and in particular in relation to the higher section of road traversing the River Ash dam. This higher section of road will be clearly visible to the surrounding properties and will have permanent significant adverse effect on the rural setting.	10.13.18
(xviii)	The EA Statement of Reasons, para 4.4, acknowledges that lighting will be proposed as part of the scheme, whereas this was previously not made clear. The parish of Albury currently has no light pollution looking towards Little Hadham and as a result of this addition, it will significantly change and alter the rural nature of the landscape.	10.13.19
(xiv)	Furthermore, the original scheme did not provide for a crawler lane and inevitably there will be added noise pollution from vehicles accelerating to overtake. The elevation of this section of road will inherently increase the detrimental impact on those residents.	10.13.20
(xv)	The parish of Albury has recently published a leaflet advertising the various walking routes in the area enjoyed by residents of Albury and Hadham alike, a number of the	10.13.21

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
	paths follow the proposed route of the bypass itself and as a result will be altered.	
(xvi)	<p>It is stated in the EIA submitted alongside the planning application that there will be a major beneficial impact on Little Hadham and a major adverse impact on land upstream of the Albury Tributaries and the River Ash crossings. We are concerned that the flood alleviation has been focused on Little Hadham and little regard has been given to the adverse impacts that the Parish of Albury will experience. Our clients are concerned that significant mitigation measures have not been provided to reduce any increased risk of flooding upstream and suggest that the movement of flood risks from one settlement (Little Hadham) to another settlement will further increase the existing flood risk in the Parish of Albury.</p> <p>Not only does this dramatically alter our client's ability to manage and farm their land and most likely render it unsuitable for its current grazing and haymaking purpose.</p> <p>It is also understood that the scheme threatens to remove their access to their arable land at the Folly, although as yet specific details have not (been) forthcoming and known. It should be noted that our client have no other means of access to this land with agricultural machinery.</p>	10.13.12
(xvi)	<p>Please note that, in the event that the order and scheme are confirmed, we would encourage and propose minor alterations to the flood alleviation aspect of the scheme. Our client's strong preference, if feasible, would be to see alternative alleviation solutions which would involve a smaller area of land, for instance through the creation of a flood storage pond, so that water can be collected to a greater depth. The current proposals will need to acquire interest or rights to a large area of land and any alternative approach to confine the potential flooding to a smaller area would be favoured to enable a reduction in the area of land which is either taken or rendered unsuitable for current purposes. We appreciate that the suggested proposals would be subject to technical work, but our clients would at least welcome the opportunity to discuss these options further with the acquiring authority.</p>	10.13.12

No 2	Rachel & Simon Sporborg	Refer to Para
(xvii)	We maintain that inadequate studies have been commissioned to consider the impact of sending this water upstream; notably we suggest that Albury village hall and both roads leading into Albury will experience additional flooding. In our clients' experience, these roads already tend to flood during heavy rainfall backing all the way up to the post-box at Clapgate.	10.13.12
(xviii)	<p>In addition to those objections highlighted above, we also object to the scheme on the basis of adverse impact during the construction phase for our clients. The noise, visual and landscape impacts during the construction phase of the scheme are going to be significant.</p> <p>Our clients have specific concerns regarding the ability of the surrounding road networks to cope with the inherent traffic intensification that the construction will cause. The surrounding rural roads including Upwick Road, which leads to our client's property are likely to be used during the construction phase for users looking to avoid the works on the A120. If, as is expected, the Bypass does not fully take into account future development and intensification of the road, there is a risk that these minor roads could become more of a rat run and in constant use. These roads are wholly ill-equipped to cope with excess traffic and could pose a safety concern to all users (including drivers, cyclists, walkers and horse riders) and an inconvenience to local residents. The Upwick Lane is already used by more traffic than it is currently capable of accommodating and poses a serious accident risk.</p>	10.13.22

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
(i)	As 1(i) above.	
(ii)	As 1(ii) above	
(iii)	As 1(iii) above	
(iv)	As 1(iv) above	
(v)	As 1(v) above	

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
(vi)	<p>In terms of environmental and wildlife resources, the Statement of Reasons confirms that ‘the loss of existing vegetation and trees would be minimised and compensatory planting and habitat provided.’ Although we agree that planting will be required to mitigate the impacts of the scheme, we strongly object to the location of the BAT mitigation planting for the new woodland to the south of the A120. We acknowledge that an area of woodland is required to compensate for the loss taken as part of the scheme, but we would argue that insufficient data has been provided to support the chosen location.</p> <p>These mitigation works propose planting approximately 2.5 hectares of new woodland in an area of existing parkland. We oppose this on the basis that insufficient survey data has been provided to show that this will have a beneficial impact on the environment and in particular on the Barbastelle bat population. We wholly agree with the comments raised by Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, which are reiterated below for your reference;</p> <p>(Extract from Herts & Middlesex letter) ‘There is no species list or NVC assessment</p> <p>The field’s proximity to other woodland, semi-mature oak parkland character and organic status, means that it is highly likely to make a significant contribution to the local invertebrate population, adding diversity of species and habitat in its current condition. The proposed planting of this area will have consequential negative impacts on this local invertebrate population reducing this vital feeding resource of the barbastelle bat and other bat species.</p> <p>We object strongly to this aspect of the scheme. Having discussed this and reviewed the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust’s representations, we understand that this would not represent a substantial ecological gain. Planting this area of land with trees is not acceptable on ecological grounds and we recommend that alternative solutions are proposed.</p> <p>In considering this aspect of the objection, we would</p>	10.13.23

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>recommend directly reviewing the representation (submitted) by the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>If it is agreed that planting this field with trees is not acceptable on ecological grounds, we recognise that alternative solutions will need to be proposed.</p>	
(vii)	As 1(vi) above	
(viii)	<p>There are specific aspects of the design that we object to, namely the introduction of a new roundabout at the eastern end adjacent to Plantings Cottages. We would prefer to have seen the bypass connect with the existing Tesco's roundabout rather than introduce an additional roundabout in close proximity. We do not think that this makes practical sense.</p>	10.13.24
(ix)	As 1(viii) above	
(x)	As 1(ix) above	
(xi)	<p>The proposed plans for the bypass and namely the roundabout eastern end will adversely affect No 1 and No 2 Plantings Wood Cottages, which are owned by our client. The objection is held in terms of the levels of noise at both 1 & 2, Plantings Wood Cottages and the effect on the quality of life on tenants.</p> <p>Overall, we consider that the proposed development will cumulatively have a significant adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 and 2 Plantings Wood Cottages, in relation to noise and vibration, air quality, visual impact, loss of privacy, loss of outlook and will be overbearing on the whole location.</p> <p>It should be noted that we submitted third party objections to the planning application raising concerns specifically with regard to noise issues and the impact the scheme will have on No 1 and No 2 Plantings Wood Cottages. However, having read through the third party objection list, we can see no reference to any of the concerns raised by us (for which we received automatic confirmation of receipt).</p> <p>We did attend the committee meeting in December 2016 and noted that Councillors spent a significant length of time</p>	10.13.24 & 10.13.25

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>discussing the impact that the proposal would have on a number of existing dwellings, including No 1 and 2, Plantings Wood Cottages, however, there is mention of this in the Minutes. Whilst we appreciate that the Minutes are merely a summary of the discussions, we believe that in the form published they do not properly represent the debate that took place or the acknowledgement confirming that in some locations the new roads would have an adverse impact.</p> <p>Clearly, the misrepresentation of the Minutes and objection list is of concern to us. We raised concerns regarding the quality of the noise impact assessment provided and the impact the scheme will have on No 1 and 2, Plantings Wood Cottages. Therefore, we are reiterating these representations within this objection.</p> <p>Nos 1 and 2, Plantings Wood Cottages are a pair of traditionally constructed 2 bed semi-detached properties with single glazed windows situated on slightly lower ground on the north side of the existing A120.</p> <p>The Planning Statement acknowledges that the preferred option, 'Option 5B', whilst reducing the impact on Hadham Lodge will be closer to and therefore increase potential impact on other properties. Option 5B, the scheme which was submitted, will have, other than Option 5A, the biggest impact upon No 1 and 2, Plantings Wood Cottages out of all the routes considered and proposes the provision of a roundabout and associated slip road, to be known as 'Hadham Park Roundabout', directly to the west of the cottages, less than 50 metres from the residential curtilage boundary. Furthermore, the additional Hadham Park Roundabout proposed in this option requires street lighting which may cause some impact to the neighbouring properties.</p>	
(xii)	<p>Turning first to noise impact, the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) (Defra, 2010), sets out Government noise policy. Government noise policy set three aims, which are to be met within the context of Government policy on sustainable development;</p> <p>To avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life</p>	10.13.26

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>To mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life; and</p> <p>Where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.</p> <p>In addition, para 123 of the National Planning Framework (NPPF) and policies ENV1, ENV24 and ENV25 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan also relate specifically to noise impact. In our view, the application fails to meet the requirements of these National and Local Policies for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>The new road will inevitably result in an increase in vehicles using this route. Currently noise and disturbance associated with the A120 is concentrated along the frontage of the properties. In general this stretch of the road, due to its alignment and distance from both the Little Hadham lights and Bishop's Stortford bypass roundabout, does not suffer from queuing traffic or breaking vehicles. The new road's alignment will mean that road noise will not be limited to the front of the properties but will also be prevalent to the side and rear elevations and private amenity spaces. The roundabout will result in an increase in traffic congestion in this location and will necessitate vehicles to queue, break and speed up, all of which further result in an increase in noise and disturbance. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that there will be an increase in noise disturbance to these properties.</p> <p>The EIA bands about a number of different figures in relation to noise but no attempt has been made to either summarise or explain the findings. In fact, when assessing the effects the only conclusion drawn in relation to individual properties is that 'Taking account of the avoidance measures integrated into the base scheme no dwellings are forecast to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels as defined in Noise Insulation Regulations (HMSO, 1975). The Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 specifically relate to the duty to carry out insulation works or make grants.</p> <p>The EIA does however continue to assess the impact on communities and identifies a number of individual properties where there will be minor, moderate or major adverse impacts including a moderate adverse impact on</p>	

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>an unnamed property at the group of dwellings round Savernake, which is the neighbouring property to Nos 1 & 2, plantings Wood Cottages. It does not quantify what, minor, moderate or major' mean.</p> <p>The only data specifically relating to Plantings Wood Cottages is found in Table 19 of Appendix F: Noise and Vibration information. This suggests that the scheme would in fact reduce the amount of road noise experienced at the properties. No explanation has been made to clarify why this is the case and it is unclear where the figures have been derived from or if they have taken account the increased noise at the roundabout or that road noise will now come from an increased number of directions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the figures quoted in this table do not appear to tally with figures quoted in other tables and are in fact generally much lower than those recorded at the baseline monitoring sites. No explanation has been given as to why these figures differ so greatly and, at the very least, the table is ambiguous and, at worse, misrepresentation.</p> <p>I would therefore suggest that overall the findings are inconsistent and the use of different criteria, jargon and contradictory data to assess impact is confusing. The lack of meaningful coherent information makes it impossible to properly assess the impact the scheme will have in relation to noise and vibration to Plantings Wood Cottages and in this respect the application fails to meet the requirement of both National and Local Planning Policy in relation to noise impact.</p>	
(xiii)	<p>Turning to visual impact, light pollution, and the impact the proposal will have in relation to loss of privacy, Policies ENV1 and ENV23, of the adopted East Herts Local Plan relate specifically to visual impact, light pollution and residential amenity. In our view, the application fails to meet the requirements of these local policies for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Plantings Wood Cottages have been identified in the EIA as being a sensitive residential receptor in relation to visual impact. Currently, there are wide views of the open countryside to the rear and sides of the cottages. The</p>	10.13.29

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>scheme proposes a large earth bund and balancing pond to the west of the properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, the land is to be raised to enable the new A120 to connect up with the existing road which is on significantly higher ground. In the absence of any detailed sections of this part of the scheme and the relationship between the new road and the Cottages, it is difficult to assess the impact that this will have, however, it can be concluded that the height of the earthworks and the proximity of the new road and associated structures will be overbearing upon the cottages and will significantly impact on their current outlook.</p> <p>Indeed the EIA concedes in Chapter 9 that during construction there will be a 'Very Large Adverse effect at 1 & 2 Planting Cottages (R17), where the loss of mature trees within the foreground will allow a clear view of construction works for the new roundabout, including the associated lighting and drainage pond'.</p> <p>Furthermore, it goes on to consider that 'There are judged to be three large adverse (R07, R11 and R17) effects during year one of the operation. R07 and R11 are the same significance of effect as at construction. However at 1 & 2 Plantings Cottages it is considered that the impact will reduce to large as the earthworks are complete. The remaining large effects at all three locations arise as a result of views towards the infrastructure of the proposed scheme and the movement of traffic, together with the bridges, culverts, embankments and cuttings present within a previously rural setting. By year 15 the significance of effect for R07 and R17 reduces due to the establishment of mitigation planting'.</p> <p>It should be noted that the amount of mitigation planting proposed in this part of the scheme is limited to hedgerow and trees and is constrained by the large bund and the need to maintain it and the balancing pond in the future.</p>	
(xiv)	<p>Furthermore, currently there is no lighting along this stretch of the A120, however, the proximity of the cottages to the roundabout which will necessitate a substantial amount of street lighting will result in a significant increase in light pollution over and above that currently experienced.</p>	10.13.28

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>Vehicle headlights will now be directed towards the rear and side of the cottages, whereas currently light from vehicle headlights do not directly point towards the cottages.</p> <p>In addition, the raised position of the new road as it meets the existing A120 will result in traffic travelling towards Bishops Stortford overlooking the rear and side windows and rear garden of No 1 Plantings Wood Cottages where currently there is none.</p> <p>This is compounded by the use of the Cottages access road for the ongoing maintenance of the bund and balancing pond.</p>	
(xv)	<p>With regard to air quality currently the disturbance, including vehicle fumes associated with the A120, is concentrated along the frontage of the properties. In general, this section of the road, due to its alignment and distance from both the Little Hadham lights and Bishops Stortford bypass roundabout, does not suffer traffic congestion and cars are rarely queuing along this stretch of the road.</p> <p>The new road's alignment will mean that pollution from car fumes will not be limited to the front of the properties but will also be prevalent to the side and rear elevations and private amenity spaces.</p> <p>The roundabout will result in an increase in traffic congestion in this location with vehicles queuing, resulting in an increase in traffic fumes and a significant decrease in air quality when compared with the current situation, further impacting upon the living conditions of residents.</p> <p>Again, it is unclear whether the EIA, when assessing air quality, has taken into consideration the specific characteristics of this section of the scheme, including the increased vehicle fumes at the roundabout or the fact that fumes will now be prevalent from two directions.</p> <p>Overall, we consider that the proposed development will cumulatively have a significantly adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 and 2 Plantings Wood Cottages in relation to noise and vibration, air quality, visual impact, loss of privacy, loss of outlook and will be overbearing. Therefore, it fails to meet the</p>	10.13.27

No 3.	Mr Harvey	Refer to Para
	<p>necessary tests of both Local and National Planning Policy in relation to the impacts on these properties and should therefore be refused in its current form.</p> <p>We note in the Statement of Reasons that there is no reference specifically to the impact that the scheme will have on these properties and instead the Statement ‘believes that no residents or business were severely affected by the Bypass Scheme, such as to warrant rehousing or relocation. Much of the land required for the Bypass Scheme is in agricultural use and remote to dwellings’. We believe that this misrepresents the impact that the scheme will have and whilst we appreciate that the bypass will be beneficial to some residents, we feel that it should not be entirely at the detriment of other local residents.</p>	
(xvi)	<p>It should be noted that although our objections are made on the above points, our client wanted to reiterate that should the scheme have proposed a dual carriageway bypass then they would have been able to be more supportive of the scheme, subject to assessing the finer details. This support would be provided despite the fact that a dual carriageway proposal would most likely cause a greater amount of damage and loss of land compared to the current Little Hadham bypass proposal. My client maintains that the long term benefits to the wider community would outweigh the personal losses which they would suffer. Whereas, the Little Hadham Bypass scheme, as proposed, will only serve to solve the localised issues experience through Little Hadham itself and provide a short term solution to what should be considered a long term and ever increasing problem.</p>	10.13.30

No 4	Mr M Tattum and Ms J Bell	Refer to Para
(i)	<p>The reason for the objection is that there are no noise mitigation measures in place adjacent to the new road (Plot 8/8) therefore the noise increase at Hadham Park which is less than 100m away once construction of the road is finished and in use.</p> <p>Without a noise mitigation bund and appropriate planting on the bund, my client's enjoyment of the property especially during winter months when there won't be any leaves on the trees will be severely affected due to the increase in noise levels because of vehicles accelerating away from the roundabout.</p> <p>Because of the probable increase in noise levels, we request that provision is made for the construction of an earth mitigation bund from the new junction of the A120 Hadham Road to the West of Plot 8/8 for a length of approximately 350m heading in a northerly direction beyond the property known as Hadham park House together with appropriate planting on the Bund.</p> <p>We note that an earth bund has been provided to the North of Hadham Hall and see no difference in the circumstances i.e. noise mitigation to the existing properties where the scheme is running at ground level rather than in a cutting or embankment.</p>	10.13.31

No 5	Mr Westley	Refer to Para
(i)	On Site Plan 1, I should prefer the permanent diversion of FP057 to run E to W along the N boundary of the field to terminate on FP021. The destination for members of the public heading south on FP057 will be either FP021 or FP055 across the road. Although your temporary footpath B would terminate opposite FP055, a permanent diversion via FP021 would leave less road walking via the roundabout.	10.13.32
(ii)	On Site Plan 2, I should expect the pedestrian route via the spillway promised in the Autumn 2015 update to be documented as an official replacement for the part of FP057 being extinguished. The new footpath can be created subject to the need to use the spillway for conducting water.	10.13.33
(iii)	On Site Plan 5, the new bridleway A is specified as 4.5m wide with no limitation to make it subject to private vehicular traffic. I do not know whether you intend to provide an overbridge or an underpass. The design of a bridge would depend upon whether it carries vehicular traffic.	10.13.34
(iv)	On Site Plan 6, I presume that the bridge or tunnel on bridleway B will carry private vehicular traffic since the private track has done. There is no mention of a limitation on bridleway B in Schedule 6. Will public users have priority?	10.13.35
(v)	On Site Plan 7, there is depicted new highway A next to the roundabout but no mention of it in Schedule 7. I should want a crossing for FP034 west of the roundabout and the use of the grass verge on the S side of the improved section of road to reach BR010.	10.13.36
(vi)	Where 'dropped crossing points will be provided which include pedestrian refuge island', I should expect the defined new FP to include the route inside the highway boundary fence up to the crossing point and to find a signpost by the roadside at that point. I should also expect to see warning signs for motorists before every crossing point.	10.13.37

No 6	Barnes – objection withdrawn	
No 7	National Grid – objection withdrawn	

10.13. Responses to Objections

- 10.13.1. HCC has set out its position on the issues raised above as follows;
- 10.13.2. HCC considers that the Statement and accompanying documents, including the documents supporting the planning permission, set out the case for the bypass. Planning permission for the scheme was granted in January 2017.
- 10.13.3. The A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Business Case considered at the Hertfordshire Local Transport Body in April 2014, sets out that the total funding required to deliver the scheme. the economic case demonstrates very high value for money with Benefit Cost ration of 9.1. Sensitivity tests of the underlying assumptions show that the scheme is still likely to represent high value for money even if traffic growth and time savings resulting from the bypass are lower than forecast.
- 10.13.4. The benefit of delivering the flood alleviation scheme within the bypass scheme is set out in further detail in the EA's Order and supporting document.
- 10.13.5. It is recognised within the planning documents that the bypass scheme comprises mostly agricultural and. The project will involve the permanent change of use of approximately 40 hectares of agricultural land. It is acknowledged that, inevitably, for an infrastructure project of this size, a degree of severance of retained land interest will occur. The objections do not contend that the degree of severance in this project is disproportionate for a project of this nature, and HCC has been in discussion with landowners to agree measures to mitigate impact on severed land to ensure that severed land can remain in beneficial use following construction, including new accesses, fencing and planting. In addition, where land is required for construction purposes, and not for permanent works, discussions are underway regarding the potential to use land temporarily by agreement rather than acquire it permanently. HCC remains committed to this approach.
- 10.13.6. The A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment report sets out an overview of the baseline traffic flows. HCC considers that the Traffic Assessment and the traffic model (HSGTM) on which it is based, adequately assesses the impact that planned developments an planned infrastructure improvements would have on the road network and that the design of the bypass has taken account of future development.

- 10.13.7. The proposed Tilekiln roundabout could operate without the segregated left turn lane. However, concerns were raised by the HCC Road Safety Team as part of their independent review of the outline design. The Safety team concerns related to low numbers of the new roundabout to exit Little Hadham village. This concern related to low numbers of vehicles predicted to turn right onto the bypass from Little Hadham village. As a result this could lead to an increased risk of travelling eastbound on the A120 not appreciating the need to slow down and 'give way' which, when combined with the downhill approach to the junction, could lead to an increase in risk of vehicle collisions. The segregated left turn changes how traffic interacts, from a 'give way' situation to a 'merge' situation, ensuring that drivers using the A120 are separated from users existing Little Hadham village. This is considered to be a safer solution and has been adopted within the design. Since the publication of the Order, the detailed design of the highway has been developed. This has reduced the extent of the permanent land take in the Tilekiln roundabout area by 0.25 hectares.
- 10.13.8. In 2006, an assessment of the 'long list' of possible options that could address the problem of the A120 at Little Hadham, was reported to Highways & Transport Panel. The assessment included an A120 Appraisal framework which scored options based on Environment, Safety, Economy, Accessibility, Integration, Local and Regional Policy Context, Function/Role and Practicality. An initial screening of the options was completed and the following options discounted with the remaining options taken forward for a more detailed assessment.
- Options A – Local improvements in the centre of the village of Little Hadham were typically lower scoring than other options as they offered limited benefits to the village community.
- Option E2 – A new east-west rail route was not believed to be deliverable, and is unlikely to result in significant traffic relief within Little Hadham.
- Option F – Alternative Transport Solutions were all low scoring, but could be considered in a complimentary role alongside some of the main options.
- 10.13.9. As on-line solutions had previously been discounted, HCC responded that the concept design appended to the Bishop's Stortford North report did not align with the adopted strategy for the A120.
- 10.13.10. Owners of BSN subsequently entered into a section 106 agreement dated April 2015 with HCC, for purposes of the BSN planning permission. That agreement includes provision for payment by the owners of a 'Little Hadham Improvements Contribution' (in the sum of £84,730) towards the costs of the Little Hadham Bypass.

- 10.13.11. Traffic signal alterations were considered as part of the 'long list' options, discounted as it offered limited benefits to the local community.
- 10.13.12. The A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment recognises that the introduction of the bypass would have a detrimental impact on the future operation of the following junctions;
- 120/A10
 - A120/Cambridge Road
 - A120/Station Road
 - A120/Horse Cross; and
 - A120/A1184
- The schedule of conditions to the planning permission sets out:
- 'Within 12 months of the opening and operation of the bypass, the applicants shall carry out post-construction traffic monitoring. Associated studies shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority in order to determine the extent of mitigation measures necessary on the existing route. Should it be determined that significant capacity issues have arisen appropriate interim mitigation measures shall be carried out at appropriate locations within Standon within a timescale to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority'.
- 10.13.13. Tilekiln Farmhouse is located approximately 90 metres north of the existing A120 carriageway. The closest point of the construction works lie approximately 200 metres to the east of the property. HCC considers that the impact on the farmhouse will not be substantial, and moreover beneficial occupation will be able to continue.
- 10.13.14. Subject to other qualifying factors, owner/occupiers may be able to apply for compensation for any reduction in value of their property, as a result of physical factors (including noise), caused by the use of the new or altered road under the Compensation Act 1973.
- 10.13.15. As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, construction and operational noise assessments were conducted based on best practice British Standards methodologies to identify thresholds of changes to noise levels associated with the changing traffic flows predicted along the A120.
- 10.13.16. These assessments were considered sufficient to assess the potential noise impacts and effects for the scheme for planning purposes, and were duly considered through the planning process.
- 10.13.17. HCC is committed to meeting the requirements of the Noise Insulation Regulations (1975, as amended). This involves undertaking further detailed predictions (supported by selected noise measurements if

required) to confirm the dwellings, if any, that are entitled to noise insulation or grant in accordance with the Regulations

- 10.13.18. The granted planning permission conditions that the planning authority has put in place 'to ensure that the lighting is designed to minimise light pollution outside the extent of the road' places requirements on HCC.
- 10.13.19. The design of the roundabout lighting is developing with consideration being given to the use of shorter column height, directional lighting and the use of shields to the rear of the lanterns.
- 10.13.20. Reference should be made to the documents accompanying the EA Order which sets out the EA's requirements for the Flood Alleviation Scheme and other matters relating to the Flood Alleviation Scheme.
- 10.13.21. The potential traffic impact that the bypass may have on the A120 (roundabout) junction with the B1383 Stansted (Mountfitchet) Road (Pines Hill) has been considered. An A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment was undertaken, and formed part of the planning application for the bypass. The extent of the road network study was determined from the results of the Harlow Stansted Gateway Transport Model (HSGTM) runs. The HSGTM did not identify any additional issues with the junction resulting from the bypass works.
- 10.13.22. As set out in 10.14.7 above, Option A solutions, including road widening in the village' were considered as part of the 'long list' options which were discounted as it offered limited benefits to the local community.
- 10.13.23. Chapter 9 of Volume II of the Environmental Statement considers the landscape character and visual impacts of the Proposed Scheme. This identifies key viewpoints towards the scheme, and receptors representative of those who may be affected by the new bypass.
- 10.13.24. Volume III Appendix C contains a detailed Visual Effects Schedule which outlines how significance was attributed within the landscape assessment based on the magnitude of the change, and the sensitivity of the receptor which was designated based on specific criteria.
- 10.13.25. The village of Albury, Albury Road, Albury Lodge and Upwick Green are over 800m from the proposed scheme, and views across undulating farmland towards the proposed A120 bypass will be filtered through existing woodland blocks, hedgerows and mitigation planting, therefore limiting distance views towards the scheme. No significant effects were identified at these locations.
- 10.13.26. Planting cannot be undertaken directly upon the embankments to ensure the structural integrity of the dams during flood events, however planting integrated at the base if the embankment has been

carefully designed to reflect local species and, once established, will offer screening benefits to receptors north of the scheme.

- 10.13.27. The deer fencing on top of the River Ash embankment will consist of vertical posts and horizontal wire fences. This is a feature which will not be discernible or perceptible from the majority of viewpoints identified to the north of the scheme due to the undulating farmland and as views will be filtered through existing woodland blocks, hedgerows and mitigation planting.
- 10.13.28. HCC, with responsibility to maintain the highway, prefers hot rolled asphalt because it has a longer life span and offers a more cost effective solution compared to low noise surfacing options.
- 10.13.29. The noise assessment was carried out assuming a hot rolled asphalt surface. If the results of the assessment had shown that mitigation was required, a low noise surface may have been introduced to sensitive sections of the scheme. Low noise surfacing was not considered necessary as additional mitigation for the scheme, as threshold levels were not exceeded.
- 10.13.30. The Order seeks to secure rights to lay services within land where the Sporborg family holds an ownership interest. The rights are required for the diversion of an electricity supply, which is to be removed from overhead to an underground service. The electricity service will be laid to a depth which should not impact agricultural use.
- 10.13.31. Broom Farm lies just north of Upwick Green Road, to the east of the River Ash, approximately 800m north of the bypass. The noise assessments were considered sufficient to assess the potential noise impacts and effects of the scheme for planning purposes, and were duly considered through the planning process.
- 10.13.32. The Council is committed to meeting the requirements of the Noise Insulation Regulations (1975, as amended). This involves undertaking further detailed predictions to confirm the dwellings, if any, that are entitled to noise insulation or grant in accordance with the Regulations.
- 10.13.33. The scheme is only to be illuminated during construction for the safety of workers. During operation of the bypass after opening, lighting is only proposed at the roundabouts at either end of the scheme, not along the mainline length of the bypass. Provision has however been made within the design at the river culverts at the river Ash and Albury Tributary for maintenance lighting, which would only be used during occasional night works carried out by the EA. Reference should be made to the EA Order documents.
- 10.13.34. The crawler lane formed part of the design considered during the planning process. The noise assessments were considered sufficient to assess the potential noise impacts and effects of the scheme for

planning purposes, and were duly considered through the planning process.

- 10.13.35. The proposed public Rights of Way diversions will maintain connectivity across the bypass for non-motorised users.

It is acknowledged that, inevitably, for an infrastructure project of this size, a degree of disruption to the road and Rights of Way network will occur during the construction works. The impact on the local road network will be monitored and where necessary traffic management measures reviewed to minimise adverse impacts.

- 10.13.36. An A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment was undertaken to inform the planning application which considered the existing and future transport network surrounding the proposed scheme, and provided details of the impacts likely to arise from the scheme.

In relation to concerns about the impacts of the scheme during construction, it is acknowledged that there will be adverse impacts.

The Environmental Statement assesses the impacts to all travellers (including vehicles and non-vehicular users) during the construction and operation of the bypass. It should be noted that much of the construction will occur off-line and vehicular travellers will only be affected during short periods of construction at the tie-ins of the two roundabouts and the tie-in of the new Albury Road Bridge.

- 10.13.37. New woodland planting is proposed as an integral part of the mitigation package for barbastelle bats, and forms a fundamental part of the mitigation strategy for the eastern end of the bypass. Barbastelle bats are a rare species, both in national and local (Hertfordshire) contexts. The species is particularly sensitive to artificial lighting compared to other, more common bat species.

Woodland and dense treelines are known to be of particular importance, as barbastelle bats emerge from their roosts earlier than other bat species, and are therefore reliant on dense vegetation cover until light levels fall following dusk.

New native planting to the east of Hadham Park roundabout is required to mitigate for impact from lighting to the roost woodland complex. Whilst a sensitive design for the lighting scheme is proposed for the roundabout and approach, glare (from the street lighting) could deter use of adjacent areas of Little Plantings Wood. An increase in the area of roost woodland is proposed as mitigation to enable the colony to continue to cross the A120. The location of this planting is therefore important and this mitigation could not be readily delivered elsewhere.

Since the publication of the Order, the planting proposals to the south of the A120 have been further refined, based on additional survey information. The extent of the planting has been restricted to the boundary of the area around Greet Plantings Wood. The refined proposal has been shared with the affected landowner, but remains subject to the discharge of planning condition (No 27), as part of the ecological design strategy to ensure that there is appropriate mitigation for all bat species.

10.13.38. The eastern bypass tie-in was considered in detail following the HCC Cabinet decision (November 2007) which endorsed the provision of a bypass (Option 5), subject to further detailed investigation of the route, to minimise the impact on local farms, Standon and the environment, and to determine the alignment at each end of the route.

10.13.39. The further investigation involved the development of alternative tie-in options (Option 5A and 5B) which were discussed further with affected landowners, including Mr Harvey. These options/alterations involve less land take, less severance of farmland and less overall capital cost with greater environmental benefits/cost ratio. As a result of the investigation and subsequent consultation, it was considered that Option 5B offered the better solution (to Option 5).

Option 5B was presented to Highways and Transport Cabinet Panel (April 2008) and approved at cabinet (June 2008).

Concerns presented by Mr Harvey's agent, Sworders, were discussed at the Development Control Committee (December 2016). The minutes of the meeting provide an overview, setting out the main discussion points and the resolution of the committee. Sworders noted concerns at the issue of the minutes, querying the omission of some details however it is understood that no formal representation was made to the planning process or decision.

10.13.40. Plantings Wood cottages are located approximately 25 metres from the existing A120 carriageway. Due to the proximity of the bypass to the cottages, it is recognised that there will be an adverse impact on the properties. HCC considers that beneficial occupation of the cottages will be able to continue.

The Council is committed to meeting the requirements of the Noise Insulation Regulations, and subject to other qualifying factors, owner-occupiers may be able to apply for compensation for any reduction in value of their property, as a result of physical factors (including noise) caused by the use of the new or altered road under the Land Compensation Act.

10.13.41. The Environment Statement is supported by appendices which details the noise and vibration methodology.

Noise and vibration assessments cover a number of different impact pathways and the effects of noise changes and absolute noise levels are different for different sources, over different durations and at different receptors. Unfortunately this does lead to a fairly complex set of assessments. All assessments are undertaken with reference to standards and best practice guidelines for the industry.

The assessments presented in the Environmental Statement are sufficient to assess the potential noise impacts and effects of the scheme for planning purposes.

HCC accepts that there will be some impact on the amenity of Plantings Cottages, and the Objector may be entitled to claim compensation for injurious affection to retained land and property. Discussions are already in progress between the respective parties' property advisors to assess the appropriate level of compensation.

10.13.42. The air quality assessment considers the impact of changes to traffic across the scheme including increased congestion at the roundabout. Speeds were reduced around the roundabouts to 20kph following guidance provided by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. By reducing speeds to 20kph the impact of additional congestion is incorporated into the model.

10.13.43. The model used for the air quality assessment applies real world meteorological data to take account dispersion of pollutants from all roads around specific receptor locations. The impact at Plantings Wood Cottages was concluded to be negligible.

All residential properties are considered sensitive receptors. Due to the proximity of the scheme to the Plantings Cottages it is inevitable that views to the west will be affected. Details are provided in the Environmental Statement. This states loss of mature trees within the foreground view and clear view towards the proposed retaining wall, roundabout and associated lighting and drainage pond with associated access track. However, mitigation planting will provide screening over time.

10.13.44. In assessing the operation of the proposed scheme (within the Environmental Assessment) the features that are likely to contribute to the determination of landscape and visual effects are described and include 'highway lighting columns at either end of the scheme'. It is acknowledged in the assessment of operation for landscape character that the lighting columns are part of the development that will introduce an urban character to the existing rural landscape.

Specific mitigation measures considered in the design include low level, directional lighting, reducing the visual impact in the day and night. The lighting design that is being developed includes shielding to the lanterns to reduce backwards spill behind the columns.

10.13.45. HCC accepts that there will be some impact on the amenity of Plantings Cottages, and the Objector may be entitled to claim compensation for injurious affection to retained land and property. Discussions are already in progress between the respective parties' property advisors to assess the appropriate level of compensation.

10.13.46. At Highways & Transport Panel (March 2006) the policy context for the A120 options was that 'for all roads new construction will be limited to meeting the needs for the levels of traffic existing at the time when a decision is taken to adopt a preferred route. A capability to cater for future growth except that generated by planned development will not be incorporated into the design, and future demand will be met by promoting alternative modes of travel.

The A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Transport Assessment forms part of the planning application documents, and based on SSGTM, sets out the existing traffic conditions and the base traffic flows for the assessment.

Traffic forecasts suggest that traffic levels are expected to be in the region of 55-65% of the maximum flow associated with a single carriageway. The proposed design of a single carriageway has a capacity of around 27,000 vehicles, modelling indicates a flow along the bypass would remain within capacity in 2034 (15 years after opening) even allowing for the development currently forecast in the local plans for Hertfordshire, Uttlesford and Harlow. The design includes climbing lanes in certain locations for overtaking slow vehicles.

10.13.47. The assessments presented in the Environmental Statement are sufficient to assess the potential noise impacts and effects of the scheme for planning purposes.

As part of the assessment of environmental effects, construction and operational noise assessments were conducted, based on best practice methodologies, to identify the absolute noise levels and changes to noise levels, at noise sensitive receptors, as a result of the new road and changing traffic flows predicted on the A120 and the surrounding road network. In the case of dwellings, in relation to operational noise, the resulting noise levels and noise level changes were categorized in terms of significance taking into account whether the effect was on a single dwelling or on a group of dwellings (deemed a 'community' effect).

Although there is forecast to be a 'minor' noise change at Hadham Park, an adverse effect is not predicted for an individual dwelling at this location (i.e. not a community effect).

It is not usual practice to offer mitigation in the form of bunds or barriers where only one individual property is affected as this is not a sustainable mitigation solution.

- 10.13.48. The proposed pedestrian route was illustrated in the planning application, which was granted approval in January 2017. The planning drawings showed that Little Hadham Footpath FP 057 would continue alongside the proposed bypass however, in the main, the pedestrian route would be set back and segregated by deer fencing from the live carriageway. The pedestrian route (FP 057) would provide a connection to Little Hadham Footpath FP 021 (via the existing verge, to the north side of the A120) and a connection to Little Hadham Footpath FP 055 (via an uncontrolled crossing point) to the south side of the A120.
- 10.13.49. The new pedestrian route crosses the bypass via an uncontrolled crossing point (with central island) at the Albury Tributary embankment. A secondary (alternative) pedestrian route would be provided via a permissive route through the spillway however there may be times, during flood events or for maintenance, when this may need to be closed. Both routes would be signed. The layout was considered during the planning process, with planning permission granted in January 2017.
- The route that crosses the bypass will be accessible for a greater period of time and with more certainty, with the alternative route (through the spillway) available for most of the time to pedestrians not wishing to cross the live carriageway.
- 10.13.50. The design includes for an overbridge (Mill Mound Bridge) to carry the bridleway over the bypass. The bridleway route will also serve as a farm access track for use by the adjacent landowner. The bridleway will coexist with a new private access which includes vehicular rights and the new highway is provided subject to those rights.
- 10.13.51. The design includes for an underpass (Hadham Park underpass) to carry the bridleway under the bypass. The underpass has been designed to accommodate farm vehicular traffic. The route will serve as a farm access track for use by the adjacent landowner. The new bridleway will coexist with a new private access which includes vehicular rights and the new highway is provided subject to those rights.
- 10.13.52. The pedestrian route from Little Hadham Footpath FP034 will cross the bypass at an uncontrolled crossing (with central island), north of the Hadham Park roundabout, where it will continue on a (made) footway along the northern verge of the existing A120 towards Bishop's Stortford. A connection to Bishop's Stortford Bridleway BR010 will be provided via improved steps on the north side of the

A120, which links down to the existing underpass linking Bishop's Stortford Bridleway BR010 and Bishop's Stortford Bridleway BR018. The layout was considered during the planning process, with planning permission granted in January 2017.

10.13.53. The drafted Side Roads Order is based on Department for Transport guidance (Local Authority Circular 1/97), with Rights of Way illustrated up to the classified road boundary (highway boundary). The pedestrian routes within the highway boundary need not be shown on the drafted Side Roads Order plans, however the design includes for appropriate signage to direct users. The design of the pedestrian crossings and associated signage will adhere to the requirements of current design standards or any agreed departure to those standards.

11. Section (xi) details of any views which may have been expressed by a government department about the proposed development

- 11.1. The Hertfordshire Local Transport Body (LTB), a partnership between Hertfordshire County Council, Hertfordshire's Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and the Hertfordshire Local Infrastructure Planning Partnership, prioritised the Project as one of the LTB's major transport schemes.
- 11.2. Following this the Project was promoted as part of the Hertfordshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan bid which secured funding from Government via the Single Local Growth fund in 2014. This bid process required the submission of an outline business case that was reviewed by the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Department of Business Innovation and Skills.
- 11.3. The business case will be subject to reviews at points as the scheme develops and will be subject to approval for funding by the DfT prior to construction commencement.
- 11.4. The scheme now forms part of the Department for Transport Retained Local Major Projects portfolio

12. Section (xii) what steps the authority has taken to negotiate for the acquisition of the land by agreement

- 12.1. The Bypass Scheme affects land in eight land parcels where landowners, tenants and other interests have been identified through the records held at Land Registry or response provided under the service of notice under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.
- 12.2. The Bypass Scheme also affects land where an owner has not been identified, as no record is held in Land Registry. Notice under Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 was erected on site.
- 12.3. The EA has carried out similar investigation to identify land interests through Land Registry records and through the service of notice under Section 5A of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.
- 12.4. HCC are seeking compulsory acquisition powers in order to be able to obtain access to all the land required for the scheme in a timely and efficient manner. These powers would guarantee that all the land required for the scheme can be acquired in a realistic timescale and that no individual landowner can hold up the Project through a refusal to sell their interest. It would also ensure that no adverse interests in land can prevent the Project going ahead. It is extremely unlikely that it would be possible to assemble all the necessary land interests in a reasonable timescale without the use of such powers, and their use would prevent the uncertainty for landowners and tenants and for residents in the area, of HCC seeking to acquire land interests with no guarantee of the scheme being implemented.
- 12.5. Both HCC and the EA have appointed land agents, and together they have been in contact with all the known landowners and tenants affected by the project, as well as other parties who are impacted by the Project though without land being affected.
- 12.6. **Landowners**
 - 12.6.1. The majority of landowners have appointed land agents to represent their interests, and HCC and the EA have provided undertakings in respect of fees incurred in entering into discussions for the early acquisition of land for the Project, to ensure that landowners' interests are fairly and professionally represented.
 - 12.6.2. At least one meeting has been held with each landowner or their agent, and in some cases a series of meetings have taken place over several years.
 - 12.6.3. Heads of Terms setting out the proposed land acquisitions were initially issued in draft form in early November 2016, and since that time discussions have been held about the potential for early land acquisition, and where landowners have expressed concerns about the bypass and the impact that this may have on their property and on their business and farming operations.

- 12.6.4. Where possible, features have been added to the Project design to mitigate the adverse impact the Bypass Scheme may have on farming operations. Mill Mound Bridge, and Hadham Park Underpass have been designed to accommodate (farm) vehicles that service normal farming operations. Where achievable, accesses and new gates will be provided and where necessary, improved. New fencing to new field boundaries is being offered where landowners request it, and provisions for the continuing supply of services has also been included.
- 12.6.5. Following the grant of planning permission in January 2017, further meetings have been held with landowners and their agents, and these discussions are ongoing. Other accommodation works are being considered to mitigate those impacts identified by landowners.

12.7. Tenants

- 12.7.1. The majority of land parcels have been identified as owner-occupied, and in discussions with landowners as available with vacant possession. The number of tenants directly impacted by the Project is currently understood to be limited to one.
- 12.7.2. Discussions have been held with agents acting for these tenants, and HCC will continue to work with them to ensure that any impact on their business is kept to a minimum

12.8. Other Interests

- 12.8.1. Discussions and meetings have also been held with parties who are not proposed to have land interests acquired as part of the scheme but who are impacted by the proximity of the works. Where possible HCC will work with affected parties to mitigate the impact of the Project, or will clearly signpost any statutory rights to compensation those parties may have.

12.9. Compensation

- 12.9.1. HCC is committed to reaching agreement to acquire land in advance of the exercise of statutory powers, and to making early advance payments of compensation to support landowners in planning for any changes in business operations as a result of the Bypass scheme.
- 12.9.2. Where land is included in the Compulsory Purchase Orders as necessary for the carrying out of construction works, but not required for permanent works, HCC will offer landowners the opportunity to grant temporary licences for its occupation of the land, so that the land can be returned to landowners once construction is complete, and the land taken for the Project kept to a minimum.
- 12.9.3. All property owners directly affected by the scheme will be entitled to claim compensation and HCC is committed to paying compensation in accordance with the Compensation Code, which provides for a

consistent approach to the assessment of fair compensation (as may be varied from time to time by law).

- 12.9.4. In addition to compensation being paid for the value of the land taken, permanently or temporarily, compensation would also be payable in respect of any loss in a landowner's retained property caused by it being severed from the land acquired or by the scheme itself.
- 12.9.5. Compensation is also payable in respect of any disturbance losses that result from the construction of the scheme.
- 12.9.6. HCC is hopeful that the total of compensation to be paid will be reached by agreement between the respective parties, but in the event that agreement cannot be reached then fair compensation can be independently determined by the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

13. Section (xiii) any other information which would be of interest to persons affected by the order, e.g. proposals for rehousing displaced residents or for relocation of businesses.

- 13.1. HCC believes that no residents or businesses are severely affected by the Bypass Scheme, such as to warrant rehousing or relocation. Much of the land required for the Bypass Scheme is in agricultural use and remote to dwellings and business premises. An Environmental Statement was produced as part of the Planning Application, which considered the impact of the construction and operation of the Bypass on the environment, including that of noise and vibration on residential properties in the environs of the Scheme, using industry standard methodologies for predicting impact, backed with sample measurements on site
- 13.2. The Environmental Statement concluded that, for the construction period, direct impacts to residential and non-residential properties and to the local community from construction noise were determined not to be significant due to the temporary nature of impacts and the low number of properties affected
- 13.3. Indirect effects of construction noise were also found not to be significant due to the relatively small proportion of construction-related HGVs expected to use the existing A120.
- 13.4. Some potential for minor construction vibration impacts were predicted at residential properties at the eastern end of the Bypass, but again due to the short duration of works and implementation of appropriate construction methods, no significant effect was predicted in the Environmental Statement. Where the potential for major construction vibration impacts was identified at these properties this was deemed avoidable through the use of lower vibration compaction plant and static rollers, in turn incurring no significant effect.
- 13.5. Noise and vibrations will be monitored throughout the construction works and, where possible, measures taken to reduce any impact on adjacent properties.
- 13.6. Once the Bypass is in operation, the Environmental Statement predicts that no individual residential dwellings will experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels defined in Noise Insulation Regulations, and no vibration effects were predicted as a result of the operation of the Bypass.
- 13.7. Although it is predicted that no residential properties will suffer significant adverse impact from noise once the Bypass is open, it is acknowledged that some properties may experience changes in the noise environment.
- 13.8. HCC will produce the appropriate Noise Information and Noise Map to meet its obligations under the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 in due course, and will engage with any landowners who consider their property should have a claim for noise insulation. Any property owners whose land is not needed for the scheme, but who consider that the value of their property has been adversely affected by environmental factors may be able to make a claim under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, and HCC will consider all such claims at the appropriate time.

14. Section (xiv) details of any related order, application or appeal which may require a co-ordinated decision by the confirming minister, E.g. an order made under other powers, a planning appeal/application, road closure, listed building:

- 14.1. The Bypass Scheme will require a Side Road Order to make improvements of the highway, stopping up and construction of new highways, stopping up and provision of new means of access to premises and temporary diversion of highways. If required, HCC would welcome consideration of the Side Roads Order in a similar timeframe to the Order or, if the Secretary of State is minded to do so, call for a joint Inquiry.
- 14.2. As set out in (x) above, the Project is delivered with the support of the EA. The EA will seek to secure any land it requires for the flood attenuation elements of the Project and has made the EA Order to secure necessary land interest required to deliver the Flood Alleviation Scheme, which include rights to flood area north of the Bypass Scheme. The EA Order will also secure necessary land interest to construct the Lloyd Taylor Drain.
- 14.3. HCC would welcome consideration of the HCC and EA Compulsory Purchase Orders collectively to support co-ordination of the Project or, if the Secretary of State is minded to do so, call for a joint inquiry.
- 14.4. In the event that the Order is confirmed, HCC will implement the Hertfordshire County Council (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017 by means of Notices to Treat and Notice to Enter or General Vesting Declaration. Where necessary, easements and private rights over land will be overridden (subject to compensation) in so far as they would otherwise interfere with the construction or operation of the Scheme.
- 14.5. Mortgages and rent charges are to be dealt with in accordance with section 14 to 18 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965.

15. Section (xv) if, in the event of an inquiry, the authority would intend to refer to or put in evidence any documents, including maps and plans, it would be helpful if the authority could provide a list of such documents, or at least a notice to explain that documents may be inspected at a stated time and place.

15.1. The documents in the following paragraph are available for public inspection during normal office hours at:-

East Hertfordshire Council office, Charrington House, Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire CM23 2EN.

15.2. The documents can also be viewed online at <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk>

15.3. The documents referred to in the Statement of Case are:-

1	The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017, including Order maps (3 No) and Schedule
2	The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 (Little Hadham) Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2017, including maps and Schedule
3	The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017 and The Hertfordshire County Council (A120 (Little Hadham) Bypass Classified Road) (Side Roads) Order 2017 Statement of Case
4	The Environment Agency (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Flood Alleviation Scheme) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017, including Order maps and Schedule
5	The Environment Agency (A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Flood Alleviation Scheme) Compulsory Purchase Order 2017 Statement of Reasons
6	The Proposed 3.9km northern bypass of the A120 and Flood Alleviation Scheme, comprising a new 9.3m wide single carriageway road, verges, roundabout junctions (including lighting), bridges, embankments, drainage, landscaping and associated engineering at A120, land north of Little Hadham, Hertfordshire Planning Decision Notice (dated 19 January 2017) – (HCC Application No: 3/2364-15 (CM0960))
6a	Non Material Amendment Approval Notice (dated 15 November 2017)
7	Environmental Statement
7a	Volume I_Environmental Statement_Non Technical Summary
7b	Volume II_Environmental Statement_Environmental Impact Assessment

7c	<p>Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix Volume Cover Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix A_Air Quality Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix B_Geophysical Survey Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix C_Landscape Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D_Cover Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.1_Phase 1 Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.2_Hedgerows Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.3_Amphibian Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.4_Reptiles Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.5 Breeding Bird **CONFIDENTIAL** Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.6_Bat Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.7_Water Vole Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.8_Dormouse Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.9_Badger **CONFIDENTIAL** Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix D.10 _Otter Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix E_Geology Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix F_Noise and Vibration Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix G_Drainage and Water Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix H_WFD Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix I_CEMP Volume III_Environmental Statement_Appendix J_ALC</p>
7d	<p>Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Drawing Volume Cover Volume IV_Environmental Statement_AQ Monitoring locations Volume IV_Environmental Statement_AQ Roads Receptor Locations Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Character Area and Viewpoints Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Designated Nature Sites Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Drainage Layout Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Environmental Mitigation Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Flood Alleviation Scheme GA CS Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Heritage Assets Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Important Ecological Receptors **CONFIDENTIAL** Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Landscape Designations Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Mainline Plan and Profile Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Noise Contours 2019 Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Noise Contours 2034 Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Noise Study Area Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Photomontages Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Scheme Location Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Solid Geology Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Superficial Geology Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Topography</p>

	<p>Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Trial Trenching Plan</p> <p>Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Viewpoints</p> <p>Volume IV_Environmental Statement_Visual Effects</p> <p>Volume IV_Environmental Statement_ZVI</p>
8	Flood Risk Assessment
	<p>Main report</p> <p>Appendix A – Consultation Responses</p> <p>Appendix B – JBA Hydraulic Modelling Report</p> <p>Appendix C – Flood Extent Mapping</p> <p>Appendix D – Cradle End Brook Modelling Report</p> <p>Appendix E – Drainage Design Strategy Report</p>
9	Landscape Strategy
10	Statement of Consultation
11	Transport Assessment
	<p>Main Report</p> <p>Figures</p> <p>Appendix A – Junction Analysis</p> <p>Appendix B – Bishop’s Stortford North Developer Mitigation</p>
12	Arboriculture Report
	<p>Main report</p> <p>Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan</p> <p>Tree Protection Plan</p>
13	Drawings
	<p>Location Plan – overview</p> <p>Location Plan – 1:2500</p> <p>Site Plan</p> <p>Topography Plan</p> <p>General Arrangements – bypass</p> <p>General Arrangement – Lloyd Taylor Drain diversion</p> <p>General Arrangement - River Ash FSA</p> <p>General Arrangement – Albury Tributary FSA</p> <p>Flood Extent Area</p> <p>Drainage</p> <p>Albury Tributary Cross Sections</p> <p>Bypass Cross Sections</p> <p>Lloyd Taylor Drain Diversion Cross Section</p> <p>River Ash Cross Sections</p>

14	Planning Addendum		
a	Planning Addendum		
b	Environmental Statement Addendum		
15	Hertfordshire Infrastructure & Investment Strategy Transport Technical Report (November 2009)		
16	Hertfordshire County Council Inter-Urban Route Strategy Report (16 February 2013)		
17	East Herts District Plan Pre-submission Consultation 2016		
18	HCC Cabinet and Panel Papers		
	a. Development Control Committee (Item 1)	21 Dec 2017	
	b. Environment, Planning and Transport Cabinet Panel (Item 7)	30 June 2016	
	c. Cabinet (Item 10) - Continue statutory process	23 Mar 2015	
	d. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 3) - Recommend to continue statutory process	17 Mar 2015	
	e. Hertfordshire Local Transport Body Board Meeting (Item 6); LTB Priority Schemes	03 Apr 2014	
	f. Cabinet (Item 12) Authorised statutory processes (Planning, SRO & CPO)	24 Mar 2014	
	g. Cabinet (Item 3) Approved alignment of tie-ins	16 Jun 2008	
	h. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 2) Confirmed alignment of tie-ins	29 Apr 2008	
	j. Cabinet (Item 2) - Confirmed option 5, with further work on tie-ins	17 Sep 2007	
	l. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 3) - Preferred route (Option 5). Planning, SRO, CPO	05 Jul 2007	
	m. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 2) - Routes for consultation	13 Nov 2006	
	n. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 2) - Endorsed Strategy, Agreed Objectives	06 Jul 2006	
	o. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 2) - Short list of options	30 Mar 2006	
	p. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 5) - Long list of options	02 Mar 2006	
	r. Highways & Transport Panel (Item 3) - Process for developing options	12 Jan 2006	
	s. Cabinet (Item 3) - Public Questions (Item 9.2) LTP 2006/7-2010/11	19 Jul 2005	
	t. Transport Panel (Item 4) - Objectives, scale and inclusion within LTP2	12 Oct 2004	