

Dear Cllr Evans,

I hope you are well.

I am writing regarding the recent A120 Link Road Feasibility Study.

Having reviewed the report, I am concerned that it appears to omit any reference to the live planning application UTT/25/2814/DOV, despite the fact that this application may have direct relevance to the transport assumptions underpinning the study.

The feasibility report section 2.4 refers to Live Planning applications. Section 2.49 then refers to the Stansted Northside “Interim-Plus” scheme at M11 Junction 8 which would “*involve the widening of the circulatory carriageway to four lanes between the B1256 entry arm and southbound on slip on the southeastern quadrant of the gyratory*” (The section of M11 J8 roundabout between B1256 & M11 Southbound). It further states that although the M11 Junction 8 and Priory Wood Roundabout improvement schemes had not yet been delivered, both were nevertheless incorporated into the A120 corridor model Reference Case scenario for the Local Plan modelling because the Northside application had received planning consent during the Local Plan process.

However, the difficulty is that a live application, UTT/25/2814/DOV, is NOT mentioned in the Feasibility Study, despite the fact that it seeks to vary the Northside Section 106 arrangements in a way that appears to remove a key part of the assumed M11 Junction 8 mitigation, namely the widening of the circulatory carriageway to four lanes between the B1256 entry arm and the southbound on-slip on the south-eastern quadrant of the gyratory. That is the very 4th lane which appears to have been assumed in the modelling basis.

If that application has been overlooked by the report author, then the Feasibility Study may have been prepared on the basis of an assumed future highway layout that is no longer secure, and which may not be delivered in the form assumed. That could plainly affect the robustness of the study’s conclusions.

In light of this, I would be grateful if you could please ask the report author whether UTT/25/2814/DOV was considered at all, and if not, draw it to their attention so they can consider whether it affects their conclusions.

At the very least, it would seem prudent for the author to confirm whether the study’s conclusions remain unchanged if the M11 Junction 8 modelling is tested against the existing 3-lane arrangement, rather than the assumed 4-lane mitigation.