

HERTFORDSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY

2 OCTOBER 2014

A120 BYPASS (LITTLE HADHAM) AND A602 IMPROVEMENTS (STEVENAGE TO /FROM WARE):

REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION ON THE SCHEME BUSINESS CASES & CURRENT SCHEME PROGRESS AND STATUS

Authors: Roxanne Glaud, Darren Granger, Richard Boutal (Major Projects Group)

Tel: 01707 281436

LTB Chair: Terry Douris (HCC Executive Members for Highways & Transport)

1 Purpose of report

2.1 The purpose of this report is to

- feedback the outcomes of the Local Transport Body (LTB) consultation on the business cases for the A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) and the A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware) projects, and to seek LTB endorsement of proposed responses. (*sections 2 - 4*)
- confirm the current position of the A602 project in relation to Hertfordshire's Gateway Review Process (*Section 5*)
- to seek a LTB recommendation for funding for both the A120 Bypass and A602 Improvement projects from the LEP Growth Deal from 2015-19 as LTB prioritised projects (*Section 6*)
- to provide a brief update on the next steps in project development for both schemes (*section 7*)

2. Background to Business Case Consultation

2.1 In 2014, the Department of Transport (DfT) announced its intention to devolve funding for local major transport schemes to LTB's. The primary role of a LTB is to decide which investments should be prioritised, to review and approve individual business cases for those investments, and to ensure effective delivery of the programme.

2.2 In line with DfT guidance, a report setting out the business cases for the A120 Bypass and the A602 Improvements were submitted at the April 3rd LTB meeting. The purpose of that report was to present the key findings of the scrutiny of the business case and recommend whether the responses from the scheme promoter are reasonable for:

- The draft scheme business case for the A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) scheme and compliance through to Gateway 3.

- The draft scheme business case for the A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware) scheme
- 2.3 The recommendations agreed at the LTB meeting were:
- The draft A120 Bypass business case and the supplementary documentation are published for consultation purposes as required by the LTB's Assurance Framework.
 - The amended A602 draft business case (updated to reflect the discussion of wider benefits) is published for consultation purposes as required by the LTB's Assurance Framework
- 2.4 **It should be noted that this consultation focused only on the scheme business cases, and their adherence to the technical principles set out in the LTB Assurance Framework (including compliance with DfT criteria for funding major schemes).**
- 2.5 Many of the responses received through this consultation focused on wider issues related to both schemes outside the scope of the business case. These issues will be identified and responded to more fully by the promoter through the next stage of public engagement, and the planning application process.

3. Business Case Consultation -Feedback

3.1 The strategic group and residents who had asked to be kept informed about the scheme were notified of the start of the consultation period. All of the relevant information was available on the LTB webpage: (www.hertsdirect.org/ltb). The consultation ran from 23/05/2014 to 15/08/2014 (12 weeks). Residents were also sent a reminder email when the award of the LEP's Growth Deal bid was announced by the Government on 7th July.

3.2 A120 Bypass

3.2.1 There were nine letters received from the public, of which two letters were supportive of the scheme. The remaining seven letters focused on the following topical areas:

- Route option – concerns over the choice of route 5b as opposed to 5 and the lack of communication of the new route; dual as opposed to single carriageway; A10 to M11 route option; and why not the current A120 route by removing the grade 11 listed buildings; impact on Standon;
- The environmental impact of the route – noise, air and visual;
- Growth in the local area namely - Bishop Stortford North and Stansted airport;
- Scheme costs and appropriateness of funding use; and
- The changes to Little Hadham village after the bypass is built.

A copy of all comments, together with the promoter's proposed response to each is enclosed in appendix A.

3.2.2 None of the comments raised have required any changes to be made to the business case.

3.2.3 Many of the comments related to route options, scheme costs & appropriateness of funding use are effectively questioning the 'strategic case' for the scheme, which is set out in section 2 of the business case. The promoters comments thus refer to this section of the business case and restate the process of considering the policy framework, explaining the option analysis and preferred option development undertaken previously.

3.2.4 To provide clearer recognition of the scheme's contribution in promoting economic growth within the region, the promoter is proposing a minor alteration to the first objective. The previous objective was:

- To decrease the journey time along the A120 between Bishop's Stortford and the A10 by providing a local bypass at Little Hadham in scale with the other sections of the route by 2019.

The amended objective is as follows:

- *To decrease the journey time and improve journey time reliability along the A120 between Bishop's Stortford and the A10, by delivering a local bypass at Little Hadham, to provide an improved transport network to support the East of England Economy.*

The remaining objectives remain as follows:

- *To reduce the risk of fluvial flooding in Little Hadham by working with the Environment Agency to deliver a flood alleviation scheme as part of the delivery of the bypass.*
- *To reduce severance in the centre of Little Hadham by removal of the majority of the through traffic congestion and, as a result, improving the overall well-being of residents in Little Hadham.*

3.3 A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)

3.3.1 There were five letters received from the public which focused on the following areas:

- Hertford Road Roundabout – Questioned the need for the improvements and concerned about increase in traffic speed and the effect on safety.
- Hooks Cross Bypass – Support the provision of a bypass and concerned that it is not included in current phase due to the safety of existing route;
- Anchor Lane Roundabout – Noise concerns;
- Anchor Lane Roundabout – Enquiry regarding extent and duration of works; and
- Westmill Road – Concerns about exiting side roads and increase in traffic speed and the effect on safety.

A copy of these comments together with the promoter's proposed response to each is enclosed in appendix B.

3.3.2 None of these comments have required any changes to be made to the business case.

4 LTB Endorsement of Business case responses

- 4.1 The LTB is requested to endorse the responses to the business case consultation as set out in appendix A and B. These will be published on the LTB website as a formal record of the consultation process and the responses made.

5 Current position of the A602 project in relation to Hertfordshire's Gateway Review Process

- 5.1 HCC has adopted a common series of formal project Stages & Gateways to ensure effective programme management & governance for transport projects which satisfy the needs of both HCC in its different role on different projects (promoter, funding stakeholder, Accountable Body) and of the LEP, supported by the LTB.

- 5.2 The gateway regime was previously reported to the LTB in March of this year. At the April LTB meeting it was noted that the A120 Bypass had passed Gateway 3 and achieved 'Programme Entry' status whilst the A602 Improvement project had yet to achieve the full requirements necessary to pass Gateway 3. The significant criteria not achieved at that time was the securing of approval to seek statutory powers.

- 5.3 At the 18th September 2014 meeting of the Highways and Waste Cabinet Panel, Panel recommended to Cabinet;-

"That Cabinet authorises:-

- (i) the Chief Executive and Director of Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Waste Management, to proceed with statutory processes, including the seeking of planning permission and Side Roads Orders to enable the delivery of the A602 improvements (Stevenage to / from Ware); and*
- (ii) the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Member for Resources and Transformation, to acquire the land interests necessary for delivery of the A602 Improvements (Stevenage to / from Ware) and to make compulsory purchase orders should they be necessary.*

At its meeting on 22nd September 2014, Cabinet authorised these recommendations.

- 5.4 The identification of legal agreements was also noted at the April LTB meeting as a criteria yet to be met for Gateway 3. No additional legal agreements are identified beyond agreements associated with the acquisition of land and in relation to any agreed accommodation works.
- 5.5 Both these items were reported to the A602 Project Board at its meeting on 25th September 2014 where it was agreed that the scheme could now pass through gateway 3.

5.6 The LTB is requested to note the above and endorse that the A602 Improvement scheme now has formal 'programme entry' status

6 LTB recommendation for Funding

- 6.1 At the April 2014 LTB meeting, the LTB Board core members agreed the A120 Bypass as the LTB priority scheme for delivery. With the Hertfordshire LEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), both the A120 Bypass and the A602 Improvement scheme are identified as priority schemes for delivery in the 2015-20 period.
- 6.2 Government announced the 'Growth Deal' for Hertfordshire for 2015/16 to 2020/21 on 7 July 2014. This is Hertfordshire's allocation from the Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF - a national pot that combined numerous Government funding streams) and is provided to the Hertfordshire LEP for delivery a package of projects, in return for delivery of economic growth outputs, as set out in the LEP SEP.
- 6.3 The 'Growth Deal' includes indicative funding for both schemes (A120 and A602) subject to terms and conditions still to be agreed by the LEP and Government, as well as satisfactory completion of local processes, including the LTB and statutory processes.

6.4 Given the completion of the Business Case consultation for both schemes, and the confirmation of 'Programme Entry' status for the A602 scheme as detailed above, the LTB is requested to recommend funding for both the A120 Bypass and A602 Improvement projects from the LEP Growth Deal from 2015-20 as LTB prioritised projects.

7 Next Steps in Project Development

7.1 A120 Bypass (Little Hadham)

- 7.1.1 A number of environmental assessments and meetings have been taking place which have shaped the design to date. Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) and the Environment Agency (EA) will soon be asking local people for their views about the proposed scheme as part of the pre-planning application consultation. This will be an opportunity to share the current findings and gain local insight.
- 7.1.2 There will be three manned public exhibitions of the current proposals and research at Little Hadham Village Hall on 16 October (2.30 to 8pm), 18 October (10am to 3pm) and 20 October (4 to 8pm).
- 7.1.3 The exhibition will include details of decision making so far, an initial indication of environmental effects and mitigation and the scheme design that is proposed to be submitted with the planning application. It is an opportunity to discuss the emerging design and impact on landowners, communities and the environment. Residents will be able to ask questions and will have the opportunity to express their views and leave comments.

7.1.4 Views and comments will be taken into account and will help shape the planning application. The current intention is to submit a planning application in spring 2015. As part of the planning application process there will be a further public consultation on the plans, including aspects such as the route.

7.2 *A602 Improvements (Stevenage to/from Ware)*

7.2.1 As with the A120, a number of environmental assessments and meetings have been taking place which continue to shape the design of the proposed interventions along the A602 route.. Once these designs have been refined HCC will be asking local people for their views about the proposed scheme as part of the pre-planning application consultation in early 2015. This will be an opportunity to share the current findings and gain local insight.

7.2.2 It is anticipated that there will be a manned public exhibition of the current proposals and research, at a single location. The exact details are still to be confirmed as part of our planning and consultation plan. The nature of the A602 scheme is that many of the scheme elements are 'on line' improvements where a wider impact is not anticipated to be significant.

7.2.3 The exhibition will include details of decision making so far, an initial indication of environmental effects and mitigation and the scheme design that is proposed to be submitted with the planning application. It will provide an opportunity to discuss the emerging design and impact on road users, local communities and the environment. Interested stakeholders will be able to ask questions and will have the opportunity to express their views and leave comments.

7.2.4 Views and comments will be taken into account and will help shape the planning application. The current intention is to submit a planning application in spring/summer 2015. As part of the planning application process there will be a further public consultation on the plans.

Appendix A
A120 Little Hadham Bypass – Comments from the public

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Member, Hertfordshire County Council	<p>I must strongly recommend that funding be made available for the A120 bypass project. This East West route across the county is a vital link for both private and commercial traffic. That it is limited by one way working traffic lights is anachronistic in this modern age.</p> <p>If Stansted Airport is to develop to its next capacity band of 35M Passengers per year it is essential that an East West route operates efficiently.</p>	<p>We note your comments and acknowledge your support for the scheme.</p>	<p>No</p>
Resident, Little Hadham	<p>Following recent information that has come to light to the residents of Little Hadham, I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the adverse affects that the shortening of the A120 bypass will have on the village of Little Hadham.</p> <p>After consultation with several relevant parties, including the villagers of Little Hadham, In July 2007 the Highways and Transport Cabinet Panel agreed on what became known as Route 5 to have the planned A120 village bypass run equidistant between ourselves and Albury village. This route was chosen as it would have the least visual and audible effect on the village. For the residents of the village this was acceptable, though in no way ideal as there was to be no slip road access to the A120 for vehicles coming from Albury and beyond, meaning that all of the cars during the rush-hour and school-run and (most importantly) the large articulated lorries coming from the villages to the north would still have to drive through Little Hadham, negating many of the benefits that residents hoped the bypass would bring.</p> <p>It has now come to light that, without any consultation and without notifying the villagers, that the bypass has</p>	<p>An early stage study on measures to resolve traffic congestion identified that a local bypass would be the preferred solution. Hertfordshire County Council undertook an analysis of the situation and developed a series of local bypass options. In 2007 we carried out consultation with local people to understand any local preferences or issues with the six suggested routes. The response to this consultation was considered alongside other key objectives for transport, including economic and environmental assessments.</p> <p>In 2007, based on consultation responses and environmental and engineering assessments, the Council's Cabinet concluded that option 5 (the longest, northern route) was to be the preferred route. However, Cabinet also asked for further localised analysis and consultation to determine the optimum arrangements for the 'tie-ins', given issues raised by directly affected land-owners and others at the consultation event.</p> <p>Further work was carried out between September 2007 and April 2008 to consider two options for the</p>	<p>No</p>

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>been shortened at both ends by 650m. To try and circumvent further investigation the plan has been called Route 5b but is in reality very similar to Route 2 which was rejected by all of the relevant parties in 2007 as it would <i>'cause unacceptable disruption to the houses to the west of Albury Road'</i> i.e. almost the entire northern half of the village. The western edge of the bypass now starts within the boundary of the village (and next to a conservation area) and is barely 100m from the houses, at an elevation of 3m, bringing all of the increased noise pollution that was deemed unacceptable only a short while ago. The shortening appears to have been because of the objections of a small number of people outside of the village, yet a much larger number of people inside the village are now adversely affected.</p> <p>To use the colloquial term, I am not a Nimby. I accept that there are very good reasons for a bypass but it should be done in such a way as to limit the adverse effects on the largest number of residents. i.e. The council should revert back to the original Route 5, or at least revert back to the Route 5 plan for the western edge of the village and add a slip road for access to vehicles from Albury and the villages beyond.</p>	<p>western tie-in and three for the eastern tie. The assessment of these options considered the landscape and visual impact, a more detailed fauna and habitats assessment, agricultural land classification, landownership boundaries and input from the landowners who were directly affected by the preferred route 5.</p> <p>In June 2008, the Council's Cabinet approved the amended route 5b as the preferred route on the grounds that it resulted in less land take; less severance of farmland; lower overall cost and provided greater environmental benefits (both in terms of landscape/visual and ecology) than the original route 5.</p> <p>We are currently undertaking further design and assessment work to identify and where possible mitigate the impact of the scheme. The proposed scheme between the western roundabout and Albury Road is in cutting (below existing ground level) where possible. It is however on embankment for a short section where it crosses the Albury Tributary, and the earthworks of the road are proposed to provide flood water retention to reduce flooding within the village. We are currently undertaking a detailed assessment of the visual and noise benefits of an environmental bund (as indicated on the Business Case drawings).</p> <p>As you have noted, the current scheme does not include direct access from Albury Road. As part of our current work we have undertaken new traffic surveys to provide up to date information on the traffic flows in the area. The provision of a junction with Albury Road will be reviewed, taking into consideration the traffic flows alongside the other environmental impacts,</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
		access issues for all road users and landowners and safety.	
Resident, Little Hadham	<p>It is very clear to me that the proposed scheme to build a Little Hadham by-pass has sound strategic, financial and economic drivers.</p> <p>The 2 major routes to and from London which go through this area (M11 and A10) are linked by the A120 at Bishop's Stortford and Puckeridge. Little Hadham is a well-known bottle neck where traffic volumes over the years has dramatically increased, particularly with the growth of Stansted Airport and the strength of the Capital City and outlying towns. These dynamics will not change and growth will continue, putting further strain on the weakest link in the local road network i.e. the Little Hadham traffic lights.</p> <p>This will be further impacted by the planned development of North Bishop's Stortford which will bring larger volumes of traffic onto the A120 which cannot cope well with current traffic levels. Simply put, the road network cannot cope with the planned growth and development in this area (Housing and Airport) without a Little Hadham by-pass being built.</p> <p>The traffic lights have been upgraded recently, but this and any further upgrades are not capable of dealing with the core problem namely, the junction cannot cope effectively with current traffic volumes and further growth in volume in future will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>The school in Little Hadham is dramatically and adversely affected by the current status of the A120, with speeding cars trying to catch a green light, concerns over the safety of children struggling to cross a very busy road at peak times in the morning with no pedestrian</p>	We note your comments and acknowledge your support for the scheme.	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>crossing (Standon does have the benefit of a pedestrian crossing). Also, health and safety issues with the school children being subjected to what must be high levels of pollution generated by large volumes of stationary traffic every day outside the school.</p> <p>As a local resident (living in Little Hadham) I am fully supportive of a little Hadham bypass being built.</p>		
Resident, Little Hadham	<p>I would agree with recent correspondents that the Little Hadham junction is a nightmare and I share the view that this is a poorly thought out scheme. I am convinced that it is the wrong road in the wrong place.</p> <p>That said I do have sympathy for those who live adjacent to the junction and those who have to travel the route daily. They will understandably be very keen for the proposed Little Hadham Bypass (LHB) to go ahead.</p> <p>The A120 west of Bishop's Stortford has been a busy road all my lifetime and it has recently become a real impediment to those trying to get west or east. That it will get worse as the economy recovers and traffic flows increase is unarguable.</p> <p>That said building the LHB will cost an inordinate amount of taxpayer's money- as much as £30m- and the damage to the countryside will be permanent and significant. If there was a workable alternative shouldn't we look at that also?</p> <p>I should make it clear that before going any further that I have a stake in the building of this road. The roundabout at the eastern end of the LHB is on land that I farm and much would be rendered practically unfarmable as the tiny, triangle shaped fields that would result are not suitable for modern machinery.</p>	<p>The early stages of the scheme assessment included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This considered both works to the existing road, bypasses, and new completely offline (greenfield) routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or east-west route across the County) and other considerations. The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p> <p>The options to improve the existing A120 on the line of the existing road, potentially through removing listed buildings, was considered as part of the improvement works to the existing carriageway. This assessment showed the online improvement option did not perform as well as a bypass across the Government's key objectives for transport of</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>Of course my family will not be the only ones to lose out. That wildlife and those who like to walk, ride or simply enjoy the views would be negatively impacted goes without saying.</p> <p>I am not however a stick in the mud 'don't develop at any cost' type of person. Far from it but I absolutely resent a plan that gains so little for so much cost.</p> <p>The idea that Little Hadham should have a bypass has a long history which many readers will be aware of. Prior to the current plans for a northern bypass there was, once, a plan to build a dual carriageway road somewhere further to the north which would have solved the problem completely by linking the M11 to the A10 and beyond. This plan, part of a defunct Euroroute and long since abandoned, would actually improve the capacity of the A120 in a way that the LHB never will do. It would free traffic flows up in the same way that the new A10 between Puckeridge and Ware did and enable business and private travel to be much improved. By comparison the LHB will only serve to solve a relatively local problem at some considerable cost to the environment and taxpayer and would only serve as a short term solution to what is most definitely a long term and increasing problem.</p> <p>If the plan were for a dual carriage way- quite possibly through the middle of our farm- I would cease my objections as I believe that the greater good would be served by so doing despite the fact that such a road would likely cause far more damage to our farm than even the LHB would but I believe that the long term benefits to all would outweigh any personal losses that my family and the local people who value this part of the</p>	<p>Economy, Safety, Accessibility and Integration. In terms of the environmental objective the assessment identified that a bypass performed better in terms of noise and air quality (typically urban issues), and the online scheme performed better in terms of ecology and landscape (typically rural issues). Therefore the overall environmental performance of the two options was considered similar. The bypass was also assessed to be better in terms of the other objectives outlined above.</p> <p>In relation to the Flood Alleviation Scheme, whilst it would be feasible to construct without the bypass, it would not be able to meet the Environment Agency's requirements for funding. This is because we would still need to construct embankments to hold back the water instead of using the proposed road structure, increasing the costs of a stand-alone scheme. The number of properties protected is relatively low, and the increased costs would mean that a stand-alone scheme would require a significant amount of further external funding. By working in partnership, Hertfordshire County Council and the Environment Agency can pool their resources to ensure a dual purpose bypass and flood alleviation scheme is cost efficient.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>countryside would suffer.</p> <p>A few years ago when the LHB was mooted or rather resurrected by the Council I took a party of councillors and council officers along the proposed route. It was clear to me that they were looking simply to solve the bottleneck problem at Little Hadham. Indeed they made it abundantly plain that the scheme would not be intended increase the capacity of the road by a single vehicle movement. This, they said, was important as increased capacity would necessarily be followed by increased demand for development which they were trying to prevent. I found this then as I do now a bewildering argument- if this argument had been used historically we would still be using dirt tracks.</p> <p>There are at least two workable alternatives however and using a combination of both could be a good solution.</p> <p>During the planning process for Bishop's Stortford North (BSN) the scheme's transport consultants WSP came up with a novel and very imaginative plan to reconfigure the junction at Little Hadham which could work.</p> <p>WSP's plan would involve removing the lights entirely, constructing a mini roundabout at the eastern junction where the A120 meets the Albury/Pelham road and a T junction where the Much Hadham road joins the main road. This is precedent for such road layouts in other parts of the country and it is, they say from their studies, an entirely workable solution.</p> <p>If you happen to travel the A120 when there is a lights failure you will see that the traffic moves without any appreciable delay- even at rush hour. The WSP idea</p>		

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>which incidentally would most likely reduce the travel time even compared with the LHB solution -as it is shorter and the two roundabouts would not have to be negotiated. There are a number of potential problems with this idea however: In the first place what happens when HGVs from either direction want to cross the bridge at the same time? How would pedestrians cross the road safely ? Is there a danger that vehicles approaching the junction speeds might increase to unsafe levels and would the traffic coming from the south (Much Hadham) have unacceptable delays?</p> <p>WSP tell me that there are a number of things that can be done to minimise these problems. A combination of speed cameras or digital readout machines, reduced speed limits, a pelican crossing, road hatching or painting at the Much Hadham junction, a box grid or signs that give HGV priority from one direction and other measures could be used. It should be remembered that when the lights fail things seem to work well.</p> <p>Of course it is worth reiterating that reducing queues at Little Hadham will have a knock on effect in both directions. There are regularly queues on the A120 approaching the roundabout to the North of Stortford and at the Puckeridge roundabout with the A10. No queues at Little Hadham will mean longer ones to the East and West and will I suspect, with the result of little or no appreciable reduction in journey time from Stortford to Puckeridge.</p> <p>Once the junction has been remodelled and if it is judged to still be insufficient the only sensible solution is surely is the construction of a new dual carriageway. Clearly a new duelled road which went from the M11 to Hertford and beyond would solve the Little Hadham</p>		

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>problem completely. Whilst it would undoubtedly cost a great deal and be long in the planning and construction it would provide a real benefit to East Hertfordshire and the region and have the increased capacity that the LHB never will. I suspect that in few years time the need for such a road may make its construction essential in any case.</p> <p>Of course there is no reason why the WSP scheme couldn't be trialled at little cost pending the planning, design and funding of a new duelled road or even, if there is a lack of funds or the WSP solution works sufficiently well, continued as a long term solution.</p> <p>Incidentally, I happen to think that the proposed flood relief plan is not reliant on the LHB. Whilst such a plan could be worked into the proposed new road it could, I am sure, be completed much more cheaply and no less efficiently were it to be treated as a separate project.</p> <p>If the LHB is built in the way it was proposed I think it is a monstrous waste of money and will fail to solve the problem that are so obvious to everyone who lives in the area namely that the A120 between Bishop's Stortford and Puckeridge does not have sufficient capacity to take current and particularly future traffic needs. A modern dual carriageway of the type found on the A10 from Puckeridge south to Ware is an infinitely preferable option.</p> <p>I would summarise my points as follows:</p> <p>The Little Hadham Bypass will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No increased capacity. • No increase in traffic speeds/reduction in journey time. 		

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost. • Permanent loss of countryside, wildlife habitats and farmland. • The proposed flood relief plan is a complete red herring- flood mitigation could happen without the road being built. • It is the wrong road in the wrong place. • There is a workable alternative at a fraction of the cost which could be trialled. • A dual carriageway is the only sensible long term solution. <p>You will find the WSP solution at: http://www.bishopsstortfordnorth.com/downloads/docs/transport-assessment/TA_Appendix_C.pdf</p>		
Albury, Resident	<p>I enclose a letter sent by my father to the local paper and a letter sent by me to Oliver Heald, MP.</p> <p>We agree that there should be investment in infrastructure and something should be done to reduce the queues at Little Hadham. However to spend over £30 million and destroy some beautiful countryside to provide a small bypass for one village that does not address the bigger problems, shifts the issues further down the road and can be achieved much more cheaply by widening the road is a disastrous decision.</p> <p>It may have been the right decision 25 years ago but it is certainly not a good investment to solve this minor problem for the next 25 years.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Yesterday's solution for tomorrow's problem</p> <p>I read Nick Bickel's letter (1st May 2014) and agreed with</p>	<p>1) The traffic model uses defined growth factors for different regions and areas to make provision for forecast traffic growth on the A120 and other roads. Where there are specific developments in close proximity to the scheme, or developments that are considered to lie outside of these growth factors, they will be included within the traffic model. The traffic model for the scheme currently shows there is an economic benefit of constructing the bypass and the proposed single carriageway will operate within its capacity.</p> <p>2) The scheme will be subject to a formal Transport Assessment that will utilise up-to-date traffic modelling to predict the impact/effect on other junctions such as those between the A120 and A1250 at Bishop Stortford and the A10 at Standon.</p> <p>3 and 4) The early stages of the scheme assessment process included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This process considered both</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>his overriding view that the Little Hadham bypass will not be fit for purpose when it is built let alone a decade later.</p> <p>We all agree that something should be done to alleviate the pressure on rush hour at the Little Hadham lights and most feel that there should be investment in transport infrastructure. However when tens of millions of pounds of taxpayers' precious money is being spent it should be invested wisely.</p> <p>Here are ten questions that the Council, the Ministry of Transport, the Treasury and, most important of all, the residents of Hertfordshire should consider before we sleepwalk into a diabolical decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will this really solve the problem given the increased transport that will be required as thousands more houses are built in the area, Stansted continues to grow and our use of cars rises? 2. Is this actually just transferring queuing from Little Hadham to Bishops Stortford and Standon? 3. Purchasing approximately four properties to the south side of the A120 in Little Hadham (most of which are regularly for sale) would widen the road there and create a much better flow of traffic. Why has this option not been properly considered given it would be a fraction of the cost and not destroy the countryside? 4. Why is a proper dual carriageway from the M11 to the A1 not being seriously considered? 5. The Little Hadham residents are understandably keen on a dual carriageway although they will still experience a great deal of traffic from the North and South. Are they prepared 6. Is this small bypass a good use of over £30 million when there are so many other demands on taxpayers' money for Hertfordshire? 	<p>improvement works to the existing road, bypasses, and completely new routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single carriageway or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or East-west route across the County) and other considerations.</p> <p>The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p> <p>The options to improve the existing A120 on the line of the existing road, potentially through removing listed buildings, was considered as part of the improvement works to the existing carriageway. This assessment showed the online improvement option did not perform as well as a bypass across the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Accessibility and Integration. In terms of the environmental objective the assessment identified that a bypass performed better in terms of noise and air quality (typically urban issues), and the online scheme performed better in terms of ecology and landscape (typically rural issues). Therefore the overall environmental performance of the two options was considered similar. The bypass was also</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>7. The A602 from Watton at Stone to Ware is in similar need of investment but that road is much more dangerous, should that be prioritised for safety reasons as well as improved transport?</p> <p>8. Is Graham McAndrew, County Council representative for Little Hadham, conflicted in being involved in this decision making process?</p> <p>9. This plan seems a good vote winner and a popular decision by ticking the box of investment, pleasing all drivers on the A120 and delighting Little Hadham residents but does the Local Authority believe it to be the right decision?</p> <p>10. Do the residents of Little Hadham realise that once this beautiful part of countryside has been desecrated, the land between them and the bypass is likely to be developed in due course creating a small town?</p> <p>Finally flood defences are now talked about as a key part of pressing ahead with this massive investment. These can be done for a small amount of money whether the bypass goes ahead or not.</p> <p>One of my grandchildren was in Harlow hospital at the weekend. The consultant said that they were permanently overstretched due to an increase of over 30% in admissions but the same amount of resource. Is saving ten minutes queuing a peak times the best use of over £30 million when there are more urgent medical and education needs in the area. I will probably not be around to see the bypass (should the poor decision ever be made to do it). I am just concerned that investments should have great returns and not destroy the countryside needlessly.</p> <p>I look forward to the answers and urge the Council to look more closely at an alternative of widening the A120</p>	<p>assessed to be better in terms of the other objectives outlined above.</p> <p>5) We have undertaken various consultation events with Little Hadham residents, and although there are some concerns about the route of the bypass there is general support for the overall case of providing a bypass. Little Hadham Parish Council are also supportive of a bypass.</p> <p>6) The economic assessment for the scheme has been undertaken in accordance with Government guidance and best practice. This has been outlined in the Business Case and shows a benefit to cost ration of 9.1 which based on the Department for Transport guidelines represents very high value for money.</p> <p>7) Work is on-going to design and secure funding for improvements to the A602. It is hoped that both schemes can go ahead simultaneously. Both projects feature on the LTB's Priority List of Schemes which are deliverable before 2019.</p> <p>8) The decision on the scheme funding is done by the Local Transport Board (LTB) and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). County Cllr McAndrews is not on the board of either of these bodies, therefore there should be no conflict of interest.</p> <p>9) The Business Case outlines the reasons for delivering and the associated value for money of the scheme. The Local Authority therefore does believe it the right decision to deliver the scheme, reducing congestion on the A120, improving the environment within Little Hadham through both removing through traffic and the proposed flood alleviation scheme, and therefore supporting local economic growth.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>in Little Hadham that will vastly improve the traffic flow and save tens of millions of pounds.</p> <p>--</p> <p>We wanted to write to you concerning the Little Hadham traffic lights. Certainly action needs to be taken and we are fully supportive of investment in infrastructure and transport to aid the economy but we have a number of serious concerns with the course of action that we believe you are proposing.</p> <p>We believe no decision should be taken on a bypass until the plans for a major airport are finalised and the development of Bishops Stortford is signed off. To spend an eight figure sum, destroy a large part of unspoilt countryside and ruin the tranquillity of Upwick and Albury whilst only developing a small stretch of road around Little Hadham would be madness. As those two projects develop then a proper dual carriageway to link the M11 and A10 may be required.</p> <p>Whilst I have sympathy for the residents of Little Hadham they all bought their houses knowing that there was a road running through it. Indeed on the south of the A120 at Little Hadham the houses always seem to be for sale which raises the question what can be done that is effective, cost efficient and saves a beautiful part of the countryside. An ideal scenario would be a tunnel underneath Little Hadham but appreciate that this is probably not cost effective. An alternative may be to buy three or four houses on the South side so the road can be widened to ensure that there does not need to be any traffic lights enabling a free flow of traffic with a 30mph speed limit obviously. We believe that this should be properly looked at as it is far cheaper and preserves the</p>	<p>10) The East Hertfordshire Local Plan has recently undergone consultation. The consultation document categorised Little Hadham as a group 1 village. The plan stated that 'In these villages' limited small-scale development and infill development for housing, employment and leisure, recreation and community facilities may be permitted.' It is anticipated that 13 additional houses would be built in Little Hadham throughout the plan period (2016-2031), with a further 11 in Hadham Ford.</p> <p>In relation to the Flood Alleviation Scheme, whilst it would be feasible to construct without the bypass, it would not be able to meet the Environment Agency's requirements for funding. This is because we would still need to construct embankments to hold back the water instead of using the proposed road structure, increasing the costs of a stand-alone scheme. The number of properties protected is relatively low, and the increased costs would mean that a stand-alone scheme would require a significant amount of further external funding. By working in partnership, Hertfordshire County Council and the Environment Agency can pool their resources to ensure a dual purpose bypass and flood alleviation scheme is cost efficient.</p> <p>As part of the Government's 'Growth Deals', LEP funding will go towards providing support for local businesses to train young people, create thousands of new jobs, build thousands of new homes and start hundreds of infrastructure projects; including transport improvements and superfast broadband networks.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>countryside.</p> <p>I know your plan seems an easy win but ticking the box of investment, pleasing all drivers on the A120 and delighting Little Hadham residents may be popular but does not mean that it is the right decision. As we reflect on the death of Lady Thatcher we all admired her long term views and ability to make decisions that were the best ones rather than the most popular ones. Let's not take the popular decision as it could be short term, very expensive and detrimental to the countryside so is actually wrong on most fronts.</p>	<p>Were the money not to be spent on the project, the funding would either be used for an alternative project within Hertfordshire or not used at all and be available to central Government to allocate elsewhere.</p>	
<p>Albury Resident</p>	<p>Having read through the Hertfordshire County Council A120 Bypass (Little Hadham) Business Case 1.0 Issue 3 27 February 2014 there are points I would like to raise. Although well produced - with many details well thought out and comprehensively researched - it is a sales pitch for a new road to be built rather than something being called for by businesses so the title is misleading. This comes across in the way statistics are cherry-picked in favour of the development while other important details ignored. There are obvious positive aspects to the bypass so I have focused on the areas that could perhaps been addressed better for business but were not - so apologies if appears like a negative approach. Aim is to question and hold to account. The bypass will have a big impact on the lives of the community in which I live.</p> <p>Traffic flow</p> <p>* The traffic flow has shown a steady decrease since 2006. Figures show that from 16,923 in 2006 it has fallen to 15,197 in 2012. No figures have been supplied for 2013. There is no reason given for this. What the report fails to point out is that this is a fall of more than</p>	<p><i>Q: Why has 10 per cent fall in traffic been discounted? Why no 2013 Figures?</i></p> <p>It is acknowledged in the report that traffic has been decreasing. This is in line with general trends in Hertfordshire and may be linked at least in part to the recession. Despite the drop in traffic, queues and delays continue to be experienced at the Little Hadham junction.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>10 per cent in the amount of traffic passing through the A120 junction over the period. From a statistical point of view this means there is less of a need for a bypass now than there was when the traffic figures peaked in 2006. Indeed, it may even be used as a case not to build the bypass as if people managed when the road was more busy why spend millions of pounds to build one now? Figures are provided for one day in 2013 - May, Thursday 9th - no other. Without full research and like-for-like comparison there is a lack of objectivity or analysis. How is this explained? '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 get worse with future development growth in the area.' More detail is required to substantiate this statement. Developments around Bishop's Stortford will primarily surely use the existing Bishop's Stortford network and have minor impact on surrounding villages. An unsupported statement requiring details.</p> <p><i>Q: Why has 10 per cent fall in traffic been discounted? Why no 2013 Figures?</i></p> <p>Cost</p> <p>* £29.86m quote initially provided. Further on in the same report a total estimated construction cost of £26.39m is given with an additional 'Optimism Bias (30 per cent) of £7.92m to give a total of £34.32m. Later the Optimism Bias is explained: 'allows for a reduction from the recommended uplift of 44 per cent dependent on the stage of development, quality of risk assessment and extent to which optimism bias has been mitigated.' Appears to be deflated to 2010 prices. We live in today's prices and this is how an economic case claiming</p>	<p>The future forecasts used in the business case have been prepared based on 2012/2013 figures (as summarised in Section 3.5). Figures for the whole of 2013, as shown in Table 2, were not available when the Business Case was prepared in late 2013. The limited 2013 data that was available is summarised in Section 3.4.1.</p> <p>Future year forecasts have been made, using base 2012/13 data, in line with Department for Transport guidance which uses the National Transport Model growth forecasts adjusted to take account of local growth in Hertfordshire.</p> <p><i>Q: What is actual cost? Why have correct figures not been made clear?</i></p> <p>£29.86 million is the total cost including inflation from 2013 to when the costs will actually be incurred between 2017 and 2019 (see Tables 25 and 26 in the Business Case). £26.39 million is the cost in 2013 prices.</p> <p>It is standard government practice and advice to include Optimism Bias in the cost estimate used in the economic appraisal to assess the value for money of the scheme. It however is not part of the budget of the scheme for funding purposes. The Department for Transport's guidance gives a recommended Optimism Bias uplift of 44% for road projects at the Programme Entry stage, however the guidance also</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>to offer value for money for the taxpayer must be measured. Perhaps my translation of corporate speak is not correct but interpret this Optimism Bias as being over optimistic and that it should actually be 44 per cent - which would come to give a total of £11.61m extra and therefore total costs of £38m. This means the final cost is getting on for £40m and not less than £30m. The taxpayer is footing the bill and should be given clear and honest guidance on the estimate costs. Perhaps even more accurate the projected costs up to 2019 when work projected. Why has this not been clearly provided? Gives impression of being economical with the truth. Lack of transparency with costs indicates expecting to be higher than the projections that have been given.</p> <p><i>Q: What is actual cost? Why have correct figures not been made clear?</i></p> <p>Value for money</p> <p>* Value for Money Statement. 'The vast majority of the benefits of the project come from time saving benefits, with smaller benefits from reductions in vehicle operating costs and carbon dioxide emissions.' The report claims an average delay of between five and seven minutes caused without the bypass. Journey times between 10am and 4pm are told they will enjoy savings of between 35 seconds and 1 minute 11 seconds. Even at peak times you save only between five and seven minutes. The council justification is looking</p>	<p>allows for a lower Optimism Bias uplift to be used where it can be justified and as scheme development progresses. Appendix C sets out the justification for using Optimism Bias of 30%.</p> <p>The Economic Case chapter of the Business Case refers to values in 2010 prices as this is the Department for Transport's current base year to allow comparison of economic performance between different projects, all cost benefit analysis is carried out in 2010 prices.</p> <p><i>Q: Why is quality of life for local residents not included in value for money?</i></p> <p>The Business Case expresses value for money in terms of the BCR in accordance with the guidance to illustrate the economic justification for the scheme. The Business Case also includes an overall Appraisal Summary Table for the scheme in Section 3.7. This includes an assessment against a much wider range of topics including landscape and heritage of historic resources, both of which are assessed as having some degree of adverse impact. Whilst these are not monetised as part of the BCR, they form part of the overall appraisal of the scheme.</p> <p><i>Q: Why has increase in traffic and levels of pollution not been considered in the calculation?</i></p> <p>As part of the delivery of the scheme, and to support the required Planning Application, further modelling will be undertaken as part of a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment. This will undertake further assessments of the impacts of the</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>at '260,000 vehicle hours' saved in 2019. This is a statistic that might look impressive but means nothing to the individual motorist. It is hard to justify spending so much money on what at most could often be five minutes. People have not been forced to live in the area but chosen to do so. As a local businessman I am more than prepared to put up with the minor inconvenience of traffic lights because of the tranquillity and beauty of the local countryside where I live - and value as an environment as a business. The bypass will be detrimental to this. Fuel calculations are also misleading. Putting in a bypass is designed to attract more motorists - it does in the calculations provided in the report - not less. This increases vehicle costs and carbon dioxide emissions and means levels of pollution will go up. Using factors such as 'save the current cost of the police resources being used to monitor the junction' are weak arguments for a major investment. The junction has not been a place for accidents and has worked well as a traffic calming measure.</p> <p><i>Q: Why is quality of life for local residents not included in value for money?</i></p> <p><i>Q: Why has increase in traffic and levels of pollution not been considered in the calculation?</i></p> <p>Negative impacts</p> <p>* There are only two sentences that I could find throughout the lengthy report that acknowledge not everything about building a major road through the countryside is entirely positive. 'There are some negative impacts on the scheme as a result of building a bypass through agricultural land and the resulting landscape</p>	<p>scheme against a wide range of environmental topics, including noise and air quality.</p> <p><i>Q: Why are negative impacts not specifically studied? Can you provide them?</i></p> <p>As above, there is a summary of some negative impacts in the Appraisal Summary Table, with more details of these provided in the Environmental Appraisal Report in Appendix D. In particular Section 5.4.4 of this appendix sets out the impacts of the scheme on the landscape and character of the area.</p> <p>Both negative (adverse) and positive (beneficial) environmental impacts are considered and reported in the environmental appraisal. A clear summary of</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>and severance issues. There may also be some severance impacts on side roads along the A120 outside of Little Hadham due to the change in the traffic profile passing the road resulting from the removal of the lights and queuing.' Why such scant regard for any negative impacts in such an area that makes Hertfordshire an attractive location for areas such as this people like to live in - and accept commuting inconvenience. By adding a new road you are taking some appeal away.</p> <p><i>Q: Why are negative impacts not specifically studied? Can you provide them?</i></p> <p>Stakeholders</p> <p>* There is a list of stakeholders. The area of Albury will directly be affected by additional noise pollution, eye-soar and inconvenience. Why have residents not been consulted? I have been informed Albury Parish Council has not been consulted at any point on plans to build a road that will impact their lives. No engagement or publicity regarding Steering Group for Albury communities.</p> <p><i>Q: Why have affected communities around Albury not been consulted?</i></p>	<p>these impacts in provided in the supporting worksheets in Section 4 of the Appraisal.</p> <p><i>Q: Why have affected communities around Albury not been consulted?</i></p> <p>Residents and land owners in Albury and Clapgate were included in the consultation process the council carried out in 2007. Public consultation events at the time were publicised in the local press.</p> <p>A newsletter was also published in June 2008 describing the latest developments to the scheme, which was distributed to residents within Albury Parish adjacent to the scheme. Meetings were also held with landowners on the Albury side of the scheme at the time.</p> <p>Going forward, we will consult on the scheme design and the emerging findings from the Environmental Impact Assessment in October this year. During October we will present our proposals at local exhibitions and they will also be available to view on our web site.</p> <p>Following the October consultation there will be a feedback period where we will be seeking views from local residents and other important stakeholders on the project.</p> <p>The project team will then review all the feedback received and this will be taken account of in the development of our scheme design and to inform mitigation measures to address impacts on the local environment.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>Embankment</p> <p>* The 'East of Albury Road the bypass would rise above the River Ash flood plain on an embankment that forms part of the proposed flood alleviation scheme.' This means the bypass and related noise pollution will affect local communities. On an Environmental Appraisal given on 11 December 2013 Hertfordshire County Council admitted 'An increase in average traffic speeds along the A120 in the 'do something' scenario influences the noise exposure level attributing to the increase seen in the tables in Section 4.1.' No figures but looking at the pictures more than double. Why is this not written down? Also the graphics limit how much is seen in the 'do something' scenario so that the widening extent of the noise pollution has been hidden. Why? Speeds are also given as increasing from 'not provided' to 84kph at certain junctions and 18kph to 68kph. Why it does not provide mph is odd but 84kph is 52mph. Above 50mph limit. The report admits on 'potential mitigation and conclusions' that 'Due to the nature of the</p>	<p><i>Q: Why no details on noise pollution increase? Why is noise graphic cropped?</i></p> <p>The numeric data regarding predicted noise levels and results of the assessment are provided in tables in Section 4.1 of the Environmental Appraisal which is appended to the business case.</p> <p>Figures 1 to 4 are provided in full, there appears to be a graphic error resulting in one of these figure repeating and appearing cropped. This cropped image is therefore not part of the appraisal.</p> <p><i>Q: Could you provide specific details of embankment size and views affected?</i></p> <p><i>The design of the scheme is still being developed and finalised in conjunction with the environmental assessment. Indicative information about the level of the bypass has been provided recently as part of updates to our Frequently Asked Questions.</i></p> <p>As part of the delivery of the scheme, and to support the required Planning Application, further modelling will be undertaken as part of a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment. This will undertake further assessments of the impacts of the scheme against a wide range of environmental topics, including noise and visual impact. The outcome of this assessment and details of the design will be presented our exhibitions in October.</p> <p><i>Q: Why no commitment to noise mitigation</i></p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>bypass, substantial traffic flows still remain along the A120 and therefore noise exposure to dwellings along this route remains similar with and without the scheme. It is on this basis that a net gain has not been achieved in the 'do something' scenario.' The corporate speak is admitting the bypass adds noise pollution. Why not provide the estimates?</p> <p><i>Q: Why no details on noise pollution increase? Why is noise graphic cropped?</i></p> <p><i>Q: Could you provide specific details of embankment size and views affected?</i></p> <p>Noise mitigation</p> <p>* 'The assessed scheme did not contain any noise mitigation measures. The requirements for noise mitigation measure may be considered in later design stages.' Unacceptable. Noise mitigation measures must be considered - even if later nothing is done. Indicates disregard for residents who live in the area or lack of professional planning. There should be no room allowed for the council to escape such obligations to its taxpayers. The surrounding countryside network is lined with trees and earthwork banks to alleviate noise pollution. Raised road will stand out as blot on landscape. Details of height, length, location and structure of elevated road should be provided. Must be addressed at road planning stage when design put forward for authorisation.</p>	<p><i>measures? What could be done?</i></p> <p>The Environmental Appraisal prepared for the business case follows guidance for projects at an early stage of development. At that stage the potential impact of the unmitigated scheme is assessed. A full Environmental Impact Assessment for the scheme is being carried out on the further developed design. That impact assessment will assess potential noise impacts and recommend mitigation measures to be incorporated into the scheme where deemed appropriate.</p> <p><i>Q: Why Standon bypass not considered if offers taxpayers value for money?</i></p> <p>The decision was taken in 2006 to focus on two separate local bypasses and Little Hadham was prioritised first. A commitment was made to look at the options for Standon once the Little Hadham bypass had been delivered.</p> <p><i>Q: Why has economic case not taken into account traffic statistics and trend?</i></p> <p>The economic case follows Department for Transport guidance in terms of applying traffic growth, whilst the sensitivity test indicates that there is still a strong economic case for the scheme even in a more pessimistic no growth scenario. Whilst traffic has</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p><i>Q: Why no commitment to noise mitigation measures? What could be done?</i></p> <p>Standon</p> <p>* Bypass of Standon village not considered at present time. Why? From a practical and economic point of view it makes economical sense. A short-term view will not only be detrimental for the environment of the local community but may also cost the taxpayer who is paying for the road work extra money.</p> <p><i>Q: Why Standon bypass not considered if offers taxpayers value for money?</i></p> <p>Economic case</p> <p>* The economic case demonstrates very high value for money with a Benefit Cost Ratio of 9.1. It seems a rather subjective way of coming up with an objective figure. Noticed that it appears to include projections of traffic growth - and if there were no growth then it would be Benefit Cost Ratio of 7.4. The reality at the moment has been a 10 per cent fall in recent years. This is not even factored into the calculations and this seems to be a fundamental flaw. There was a 'worst case' calculation of 2.9 - also not including traffic falls. From this one can assume if the traffic levels were lower it would be less.</p> <p><i>Q: Why has economic case not taken into account traffic statistics and trend?</i></p>	<p>declined on the A120 in recent years, it is not considered likely that this will continue given planned growth at Stansted Airport and development at Bishop's Stortford North.</p> <p>In relation to your points about the 'worst case', the results combine the three other sensitivity tests undertaken, of which reduced journey time savings had the largest impact.</p> <p><i>Q: What is the point of the vision? How have the details of it been considered?</i></p> <p>The Council's visions set an overall direction for the council. Specific proposals are likely to stronger align with certain elements, in the case of the bypass supporting thriving and prosperous communities. The Business Case outlines the reasons for delivering and the associated value for money of the scheme. The Local Authority therefore does believe it is the right decision to deliver the scheme, reducing congestion on the A120, improving the environment within Little Hadham through both removing through traffic and the proposed flood alleviation scheme, and therefore supporting local economic growth.</p> <p><i>Q: How will old traffic junction change? How would work without traffic lights?</i></p> <p>It has not yet been determined whether the traffic lights will remain at the junction when the bypass is open. It is still an option at this stage that the lights will be retained with adjusted signal timings.</p> <p><i>Q: Has purchase of old houses at junction been</i></p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>Council vision</p> <p>* The council vision states: We want Hertfordshire to remain a county where people have the opportunity to live healthy, fulfilling lives in thriving, prosperous communities.' If it is to stand by this 'vision' it must take the points it makes to support the statement seriously. Among the main ones a 'common purpose' to see 'Citizens who enjoy life and are healthy' and enjoy 'a high quality environment'. A loss of unspoilt countryside and more traffic contradicts this objective. I chose to live here not because of a possibility of more roads being built but due to the appeal of living in a county where people have the opportunity to live healthy in the existing community environment.</p> <p><i>Q: What is the point of the vision? How have the details of it been considered?</i></p> <p>Traffic lights</p> <p>Plans indicate local traffic will still use Little Hadham junction and the noise pollution for local residents only marginally alleviated. There is an indication that the traffic lights will be removed. How will old junction work without lights?</p> <p><i>Q: How will old traffic junction change? How would work without traffic lights?</i></p> <p>Alternatives</p> <p>* A lack of imagination in the report. Two obvious points not considered. Firstly, offering to purchase the handful</p>	<p><i>considered - and if not why?</i></p> <p>The early stages of the scheme assessment included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This considered both works to the existing road, bypasses, and new completely offline (greenfield) routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or east-west route across the County) and other considerations. The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p> <p>The options to improve the existing A120 on the line of the existing road, potentially through removing listed buildings, was considered as part of the improvement works to the existing carriageway. This assessment showed the online improvement option did not perform as well as a bypass across the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Accessibility and Integration. In terms of the environmental objective the assessment identified that a bypass performed better in terms of noise and air quality (typically urban issues), and the online scheme performed better in terms of ecology and landscape (typically rural issues). Therefore the</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>of properties around the traffic lights bottleneck. Properties in this area are often put up for sale - as they are now. Making a purchase of them and widening roads and installing roundabout would provide a practical solution at a fraction of the cost - proving true value for money for the taxpayer. If a business case really was being put forward then surely it would be this idea. Secondly, the business case appears to be made from an era that is no longer relevant. Part of the reason traffic levels have fallen is the internet having in increasingly important role in business - supported by more homeworking and flexible hours avoiding rush hour traffic. It is not roads that need to be built but an internet superhighway for the area.</p> <p><i>Q: Has purchase of old houses at junction been considered - and if not why?</i></p> <p><i>Q: Any consideration of changing business demands for 21st Century? Could you provide details?</i></p>	<p>overall environmental performance of the two options was considered similar. The bypass was also assessed to be better in terms of the other objectives outlined above.</p> <p><i>Q: Any consideration of changing business demands for 21st Century? Could you provide details</i> The growth forecasts are based on the Department of Transport's forecasts which will take account of changing methods of working and times of travel.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Albury Resident	<p>I have inspected your business case and have met with members of the Council dealing with the route and infrastructure related to the A120 bypass scheme. I am bound to say that in my view there is not a sound strategic, financial or economic case for the project. As I have said before it is yesterday's answer to tomorrow's problem.</p> <p>Whatever route is selected for the A120 bypass, and I believe there are two or three possible routes being the northern route which is favoured, the southern route which is not and a new suggestion for widening the A120 at Little Hadham, removing the traffic lights, moving various properties, and putting in a roundabout and a pedestrian walkway.</p> <p>All of these proposals are at best 1970 answers to a project which should run from 2020 for at least thirty years. On the economic front the northern route is most expensive at £30m, the southern route is costed at £10m. The widening of the road at Little Hadham has not been costed but would probably cost less than £5m. In other words you have selected the most expensive route which will create a road which will be completely out of date when it is completed in 2020 or thereafter and which takes absolutely no account of the increase in traffic expected during the period and all the additional traffic which is generated by Bishop's Stortford North, Gilston new town and the increased housing at Great Dunmow.</p> <p>If you are planning for the future the only answer is to turn the A120 into a dual carriageway bypassing all the towns and considerably improving the road. Essex County Council has already started the process by putting in a dual carriageway from the M11 bypassing Takeley, Great Dunmow and Little Dunmow and continuing to Braintree. In due course it is hoped that they will continue with their dual carriageway from the A131 bypassing Coggeshall and Marks Tey and joining up with the A12.</p>	<p>The early stages of the scheme assessment included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This considered both works to the existing road, bypasses, and new completely offline (greenfield) routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or east-west route across the County) and other considerations. The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p> <p>The options to improve the existing A120 on the line of the existing road, potentially through removing listed buildings, was considered as part of the improvement works to the existing carriageway. This assessment showed the online improvement option did not perform as well as a bypass across the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Accessibility and Integration. In terms of the environmental objective the assessment identified that a bypass performed better in terms of noise and air quality (typically urban issues), and the online scheme performed better in terms of ecology and landscape (typically rural issues). Therefore the overall environmental performance of the two options was considered similar. The bypass was also</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>East Herts should put in a dual carriageway from the M11 bypassing Bishop's Stortford, Little Hadham and Standon and joining up with the A10 between Standon and Puckeridge and in due course continuing between Baldock and Stevenage to the A1 and probably eventually from the A1 to the M1. That would be a serious new dual carriageway which would be able to handle the much increased traffic on the A120.</p> <p>Oliver Heald mentioned the work he has achieved on dual carriaging the A10 which now goes from the M25 to Buntingford and needs to be continued to Royston and various parts between Royston and Cambridge. That will then also be a proper road.</p> <p>I remember the days when the A10 went through Ware and Broxbourne so we are being consistent in trying to upgrade major trunk roads. As I have said the muddle about the A120 in East Herts is not planning for the future and is a considerable waste of funds and the Hertfordshire Local Transport Body should start to plan for the 2020s and beyond and not live in the past designing roads which are barely suitable for the 1970s.</p> <p>I am sending a copy of this letter to Oliver Heald.</p>	<p>assessed to be better in terms of the other objectives outlined above.</p>	
Albury Resident	<p>It should be a matter of relief and satisfaction to us all that our Council has the A120 congestion problem at Little Hadham so sharply in focus. Moreover, it is reassuring to hear that our sitting Member, Sir Oliver Heald (until recently Solicitor General), has been successful in lobbying support from the Treasury for the project, which would otherwise be well beyond our local means to fund.</p> <p>With some interruptions, I have lived in Albury for more than 50 years and can well appreciate the handicap</p>	<p>The early stages of the scheme assessment included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This considered both works to the existing road, bypasses, and new completely offline routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>caused by this bottleneck. Over the years, developments such as that at Thorley have not had sufficient benefit from additional new routes now so plainly needed. These have inevitably added to Little Hadham congestion; indeed the problem of traffic congestion in East Hertfordshire as a whole is severe.</p> <p>I venture to suggest that we need a lateral connection (parallel with the M25) between the M11, A10 and M1, replacing or widening the A414 and having a new 7A junction to the M11. I am afraid that even £30m expenditure on a bypass for Little Hadham, would not satisfy traffic needs for very long, as they stem from wider problems in the County.</p> <p>Construction of a fast Little Hadham bypass would also lead to some deeply regrettable consequences. Firstly, as any visitor from the A120 to Standon must experience, turning in or out of that village is only possible now because of breaks in the current A120 traffic flow, which the proposed scheme is intended to cure! Construct a bypass at Little Hadham and the T-junction into Standon could become a serious accident spot.</p> <p>It may be argued that even if a new major lateral route were to be constructed, so heading off the otherwise inevitable and substantial increase in A120 traffic, congestion at Little Hadham would still be a problem. Accordingly, something to relieve this bottleneck could still be necessary. Improvements should not require a bypass to be cut through our lovely countryside, when some relatively minor revisions to this ancient and well sited Roman Road would, with through traffic diverted to a new Trunk-Route, meet our needs.</p>	<p>assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or East-west route across the County) and other considerations. The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward for further consideration.</p> <p>New traffic modelling to assess the impact of the bypass is being undertaken. This will provide predictions of traffic flows in Standon once the bypass has opened. These flows will then be used to test the ease with which vehicles are able to leave side roads and join the A120.</p> <p>The options to improve the existing A120 on the line of the existing road, potentially through removing listed buildings, was considered as part of the improvement works to the existing carriageway. Upon assessment this option did not perform as well as a bypass across all the Government's key objectives for transport, except the environmental objective where it had a similar performance.</p> <p>As part of the localism agenda, funding for a number of sectors, including transport, has been devolved out to Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The local transport body (LTB) act as the awarding authority for transport funding on behalf of the LEP. The LTB went through a prioritisation process to determine which were deliverable within the Department for Transport's (DfT) 2015-1019 funding window, with a final priority list submitted to the DfT in July 2013.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>Houses on either side of Little Hadham crossroads, the siting of which presently rule out improvements to traffic flow, date from "Coaching Inn" days not Roman times like the A120. Perhaps the purchase of two or more of these houses, to make way for a roundabout, could be justified in the circumstances. It certainly would not cost £30m.</p> <p><i>The plans for a bypass have stirred emotions:</i></p> <p>So we read that the Council favours construction of a Little Hadham bypass. We have been 'here' quite often before. Whether or not the news pleases all rate payers, or causes dismay, ask yourself this question: "given £28.5m by the rest of the Country's tax payers, is this the priority ranking above all else"?</p> <p>Of course, numerous pleas to the Treasury for similar sums could, if laid end to end, stretch many times around Westminster! We had therefore better be really serious about our request for funding help.</p> <p>Will the Council equally prioritize other County needs? For example, I am thinking of Herts & Essex Hospital; the County's Schools budget; J8/M11 congestion, not to mention the slaughter on its approaches; the neglect of our minor roads, verges and traffic control in our villages; substandard water supplies (our water reaches us via a mile of asbestos private line) and the absence of main drainage services in our hamlets; lack of parking in town, particularly for London commuters; overstretched medical services (three weeks to get a non-urgent doctor's appointment); no County Air Ambulance.</p> <p>And, with completion of the project, when traffic has been enjoying its short-lived spell of freedom across the</p>	<p>The A120 featured as one of three schemes on the final priority list for Hertfordshire. Based on this DfT awarded Hertfordshire LEP £200m which will be allocated to projects dependant on the outcome of this consultation process, along with other considerations.</p> <p>The Government 'Growth Deals' funding will go towards providing support for local businesses to train young people, create thousands of new jobs, build thousands of new homes and start hundreds of infrastructure projects; including transport improvements and superfast broadband networks.</p>	

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
	<p>"RAPED" Albury countryside, what will the response be to complaints of new congestion and danger at Standon: a fresh set of lights?</p> <p>In the fullness of time, the Highways Agency will grasp the need for a major East-West route. Faced with the inadequacy of a £30m bypass to solve the East Hertfordshire congestion, a new trunk-route will be constructed. We are told that this prospect is too far distant at present and some near-term palliative is demanded now. What is distant? Five or even Ten years This project has been under intermittent consideration for most of my 50 year stay in Albury, for the obvious reason that its superficial desirability does not stand up to scrutiny.</p>		
Resident, Little Hadham	<p>I own a company in Spellbrook employing 35 people and running a large number of commercial vehicles, it must have been obvious for years that business desperately needs an improved East / West A120 route.</p> <p>Your current proposal is wrong, the Little Hadham bypass should be route 5 not 5b and furthermore it should start at the Hadham Road roundabout (Tesco) and terminate at a new roundabout adjacent to the Albury End road. It should also be dual carriageway and have access on and off for the Albury Road. This should be followed immediately by a Standon bypass connecting to the A10. At the same time or just after (due to BS North) the - A120 from Tesco to the M11 should be up-graded to dual carriageway. You need to take into account everything that has happened in the last 30 years and plan accordingly don't just pussyfoot around!</p>	<p>The early stages of the scheme assessment included a wide range of options for improving the A120. This considered both works to the existing road, bypasses, and new completely offline routes. It also considered whether the improvements should result in a single or dual carriageway road.</p> <p>The appraisal of the different options was undertaken against the Government's key objectives for transport of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. These objectives were also supported by assessment of the options against local and regional issues, function/role (i.e. local village relief, interurban route or East-west route across the County) and other considerations. The outcome of this assessment, which was endorsed by Highways and Transport Panel in 2006, was that local single carriageway bypasses of Little Hadham and Standon were the best performing options and should be taken forward</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
		<p>for further consideration.</p> <p>The changes between route 5 and route 5b considered the landscape and visual impact, a more detailed fauna and habitats assessment, agricultural land classification, landownership boundaries and input from the landowners who were directly affected by the route 5. In June 2008, the Council's Cabinet approved the amended route 5b as the preferred route on the grounds that it resulted in less land take; less severance of farmland; lower overall cost and provided greater environmental benefits (both in terms of landscape/visual and ecology) than the original route 5.</p>	

Appendix B
A602 Improvements – Consultation comments

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Resident, Bragbury End	<p>I don't understand why there is necessity to widen the road at the proposed points. The only filter road that sees congestion is from Hertford Road down to the roundabout to join the A602. The A602 roads run freely. Maybe a little slower but of no major significance.</p> <p>My major concern if the road is widened at other proposed junctions will mean that traffic will inevitably move faster. As it stands a large number of motorists exceed the 40 mph speed restriction as there is the perception that immediately past the roundabout it moves to national speed limit, of which it doesn't. I have witnessed a number of accidents and many more near misses due to the speed of traffic, more specifically at rush hour.</p> <p>I have also had an incident when crossing the road and nearly have a child with me knocked over by a motorbike. This is at the point where the road begins to widen and occasionally cars decide to overtake if a vehicle is turning into Aston Lane.</p> <p>I work locally and each day use the road at rush hour. Generally anytime between 8 and 8.30 in the morning and between 5-6 in the evening. I travel from home to Gunnels Wood Park, Stevenage.</p> <p>I rarely experience delay. The only problem I ever face is actually getting out of Aston Lane and pulling onto the A602 due to the speed of traffic.</p>	<p>The design of the scheme is derived from the need and objectives. The need for the scheme has been driven by several factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern within Hertfordshire County Council that the A602 is sub-standard for a primary route; • Pressure from the public and commercial interests in respect of congestion; • Substantial planned growth in residential and commercial development in the county and beyond; and • Impact on economic performance due to uncertainty of journey times. <p>The objective is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve overall journey times and increase journey time reliability on the A602 route between Stevenage and Ware by increasing the capacity of specific junctions and reducing the curvature of specific bends on the A602 to meet current standards. <p>Successful delivery of the objective will result in improvements to the standard of the route with more sections meeting current design standards, improvements in journey time and journey time reliability.</p> <p>During the design process, all scheme elements will be subject independent Safety Audits.</p> <p>Traffic surveys were carried out on 15 May 2014 at all proposed locations along the route. These surveys are used in the detailed design process to validate the existing situation and model the junctions for future capacity.</p> <p>Traffic and video surveys for the existing Hertford Road junction showed queuing on the northbound approach during the PM peak to be a minimum of 800 metres. The maximum queue length surveyed was 1200 metres and was experienced at 17:45. Further surveys will be carried out during the design process as required.</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Aston Parish Council	<p>Thank you for the chance to comment. It is the policy of Aston Parish Council that there should be a bypass of Hooks Cross on the A602. The current proposals for the A602 coming from Ware stop at Watton. This is a great shame. Hooks Cross is the only place on the A602 between Stevenage and Ware with houses on both sides of the road and it is very dangerous trying to cross the road. Despite being the only settlement, it is the only section not to be proposed to be improved. Given that the local landowner is more than willing to help, we feel it a great shame this opportunity is being missed and feel for the resident - who now cannot get newspapers delivered since the paperboy was killed crossing the road.</p>	<p>As part of the overall strategy for the A602 there is an aspiration for an off-line bypass of Hooks Cross, however due to the time constraints on the current round of funding it has not been possible to include this element at the present time.</p> <p>The current business case covers Phase 1 of up to three phases, with potential future phases comprising a bypass around Hooks Cross (Phase 2), and dualling or an alternative off-line route as a longer term option (possibly Phase 3).</p> <p>The proposed scheme can be delivered in the short term and will provide improvements to the operation of the road and junctions, extending the effective operational 'life' of the road as an interim solution ahead of future long term improvements.</p> <p>The future phases will be considered as part of a potential major strategic upgrade of the route that may be taken forward in the next funding round to build on the more localised improvements to be delivered in this phase.</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Resident, Westmill	<p>I own a property next where you are looking to carry out these improvements. The rerouting of the A602 40 years ago destroyed the setting of this property and has been a negative ever since especially noise.</p> <p>I have been trying to move the property away from its current position (noise being the main reason) which the Planning authorities do not seem to appreciate with you moving the road closer and faster this makes the problem increase.</p> <p>I would very much appreciate a personal response to this email as it affects me personally, also that you agree that it would make practical sense to move the property (which is beyond financial/practical repair) away from the road further whilst I have a opportunity and a logical reason.</p>	<p>The proposed improvements will be undertaken using permitted development rights held by HCC as the statutory undertaker for highways. As a result there is no specific requirement to undertake environmental assessments (including noise).</p> <p>If noise assessment were required, levels would be predicted using the methods detailed in the Department for Transport technical memorandum – ‘Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) 1988’ as required by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>The method requires a road to be assessed in terms of the absolute noise level it may generate as well as the change in noise level resulting from the road. The road improvements are expected to improve the flow of traffic at the Anchor Lane roundabout location but are not expected to increase the number or the speed of vehicles at this location by a degree that would be considered significant under this standard assessment methodology. This means that the improvements are expected to have minimal impact on noise in this location.</p> <p>Matters such as moving houses are not within the scope of this highways project. Decisions on residential development rest with East Herts Council as the local planning authority.</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Resident, Anchor Lane	I live at the Wellhouse, which is situated on the Anchor Lane, Wadesmill Road Roundabout. Which according to your proposed plans is going to be extended. Could you please let me know how far you intend, or propose to come up to my boundary, and also would it affect my entrance, as I have a concern over this. How long would the proposed work take to complete nearest to my property.	<p>The design process is still at an early stage and we are currently considering a number of options at this location.</p> <p>At present, it is not anticipated that the roundabout widening improvements will come any closer to Wellhouse, and we are considering enlarging the roundabout towards Anchor Lane, on the eastern side of the A602.</p> <p>Any widening works will commence on the opposite side of the sub-station adjacent to your property and it is therefore highly unlikely that the entrance to your property will be affected. At present all of the works are to remain within the existing Highway Boundary.</p> <p>In relation to the construction duration, this cannot be fully determined as the design has not been finalised.</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council will engage with the public in terms of the detail of the scheme, and in particular the design and impact on both landowners, communities and the environment. Public exhibitions are planned for early 2015 to gather feedback and comments from local people.</p>	No

Location	Comments	Promoter Response	Changes to the business case
Business, Westmill Farm	<p>We are a large retailer based on the very busy Westmill Farm site with its only access in or out, directly on to the ever busy A602. At present it is virtually impossible to turn right out of the site at busy times (8.00am to 9.30am and 4.30pm to 6.00om). Most regulars turn left and then swing round in the Biffa yard. Less familiar users get impatient and end up pulling out dangerously in front of fast moving traffic.</p> <p>As the site has grown the problem gets ever worse. Improving traffic flow on the A602 will only make this worse still as traffic increases and so does speed.</p> <p>With or without road changes, the site needs a mini roundabout or traffic signals to allow safe exit. Please note that one of the busiest businesses is a play barn, so there are many women with young children trying to get out onto the fast moving traffic stream.</p> <p>Some improvements to the junction are essential before a serious or fatal accident occurs.</p>	<p>Hertfordshire County Council will engage with the public in terms of the detail of the scheme, and in particular the design and impact on both landowners, communities and the environment. Public exhibitions are planned for early 2015 to gather feedback and comments from local residents and businesses.</p> <p>Where appropriate, we will make changes and refinements in response to the feedback we receive from consultation as well as incorporate mitigation and design changes to respond to the findings of the environmental assessment work.</p> <p>We would welcome comment via our project email address: a602improvements@hertfordshire.gov.uk (although we may not be able to respond to every comment) we would be happy to add you to a mailing list to keep you informed about the latest updates, and you will be able to monitor the website as we update the status of the scheme.</p>	No