

Duty to Cooperate Position Statement on strategic highways issues associated with the Maldon District Local Development Plan

This Position Statement has been produced in collaboration with:

- 1) Chelmsford City Council (CCC)
- 2) Essex County Council (ECC)
- 3) Maldon District Council (MDC)

1. Purpose and background

Paragraph 26 of the Inspectors Key Concerns (document reference IED06) referred to DOC 95 being associated with Eves Corner / Well Lane at Danbury, and paragraph 31 of IED06 requested further information on any highways works that will ultimately be necessary at Eves Corner. This Position Statement therefore provides clarity on the relevance of DOC 95 to Eves Corner, and provides an update to the information included within the Maldon District Local Development Plan (LDP) Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance in relation to Eves Corner.

The LDP Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance (document reference SD06) outlines how Maldon District Council has managed the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. The Statement of Compliance provides further details on the cooperative work which has been undertaken throughout the production of the LDP, and outlines how the Council has responded to any key strategic and cross boundary issues identified. Sections 4 and 5 of the Statement of Compliance refer specifically to the strategic highways issues identified by Braintree District Council (BDC), Essex County Council (ECC), and Chelmsford City Council (CCC).

2. DOC 95 and the status of a Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground between CCC, ECC and MDC

As outlined in paragraph 5.5 of the Statement of Compliance (SD06), MDC has sought to produce Statements of Common Ground on strategic highways issues identified through the Duty to Cooperate. A Statement of Common Ground between BDC, ECC and MDC has been completed, and was submitted to the Inspector alongside the LDP with the document reference DOC 95. Therefore, DOC 95 only relates to strategic highways issues identified by BDC and ECC related to the B1019 / B1137 junction at Hatfield Peverel, and is not associated with Eves Corner.

A Statement of Common Ground between CCC, ECC, and MDC has not been completed. As outlined in paragraph 5.8 of the Statement of Compliance, CCC has requested the following before a Statement of Common Ground can be agreed¹:

- Further modelling to be undertaken in relation to Eves Corner and Well Lane in Danbury, and further modelling to consider the implications on 'rat running' in the area;
- More information on the impacts of pre-signals at Eves Corner in general, and more specifically on 'rat running' in the local area, pedestrian flows across the junction, how bus prioritisation would work, and the overall potential traffic generation from future growth in Maldon allocated in the LDP;

¹ See Chelmsford City Council's Pre-Submission LDP consultation representation, document references 0145-5273, 0145-5274, 0145-5275, and 0145-5276.

- The publication of further modelling data to clearly show the impact of residents from Maldon District commuting to use the new North Chelmsford Rail Station; and
- The inclusion of any agreed works at Danbury within a pooled Section 106 contribution from sites S2(a) and S2(d) rather than being funded through CIL.

The information set out below outlines ongoing work on these issues being undertaken between CCC, ECC, and MDC. The completion of a Statement of Common Ground between CCC, ECC, and MDC will therefore be sought following the progression of this further work to the satisfaction of all parties.

3. Work previously undertaken in relation to Eves Corner, Danbury

The Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance (SD06) outlined in detail all meetings and assessments undertaken in relation to Eves Corner, Danbury, up to April 2014. This included:

- Sub-regional Duty to Cooperate meeting (March 2013)
- ECC Highways Modelling Workshop (May 2013)
- LDP highways improvements meeting with ECC (August 2013)
- Duty to Cooperate County-wide workshop (October 2013)
- LDP highways impact Duty to Cooperate meetings with ECC and CCC (October 2013 and December 2013)
- Essex Highways Technical Note – Impact of proposed development sites in Heybridge and South Maldon on the Wider Highway Network, December 2013 (document reference EB004B)

4. Work currently being undertaken in relation to Eves Corner, Danbury

4a) Duty to Cooperate meetings with CCC, MDC, and ECC

Since the submission of the LDP in April, two meetings have been undertaken between CCC, MDC, and ECC, to seek to address the strategic highways concerns raised. Notes of both meetings are provided within Appendix 1 and 2. The meeting in May 2014 agreed the submission of additional highways modelling and explanatory highways based information to CCC, the circulation of additional highways modelling being produced by developers associated with the South Maldon Garden Suburb, and the inclusion of Eves Corner within the May 2014 Infrastructure Delivery Plan Regulation 123 List.

A further meeting in July 2014 provided the opportunity to update all parties on the progress of ongoing work associated with Eves Corner. The meeting considered the results of a highways assessment for Eves Corner undertaken by the developers associated with the South Maldon Garden Suburb, the draft conclusions emerging from a highways assessment being undertaken by Roland Bilisland Traffic Planning on behalf of CCC, additional highways funding potentially available through the Local Growth Fund, options for undertaking further modelling at Eves Corner, and the need for a Position Statement on Eves Corner to assist the LDP Inspector.

4b) Assessment of modelling undertaken by ECC and further modelling of key junctions on the A414 in Danbury by Roland Bilsland Traffic Planning on behalf of CCC

CCC has commissioned Roland Bilsland Traffic Planning to undertake a review of ECC highways modelling assessments, to undertake spot check site visits at key junctions on the A414 in Danbury, including Eves Corner, during peak traffic periods in Spring 2014, a formal queue length survey of the A414 East in June, and an assessment of pre-signals options at Eves Corner using LINSIG. The report is expected to be completed by late August 2014, and is scheduled to be presented to CCC's Development Policy Committee on 25 September 2014.

Initial conclusions from the draft report are as follows:

- Findings indicate that there would be a significant increase in queuing at Eves Corner over and above the existing situation with the proposed LDP strategic development and pre-signals in place.
- Concerns are raised regarding the A414/Well Lane mini-roundabout, based on traffic queuing that has been observed at this junction particularly in the PM peak period.
- The full signalisation of Eves Corner could enable the least queuing with the proposed LDP strategic developments in place. However, CCC consider this option too urban and inappropriate to the village character of Danbury and the Conservation Area.

4c) The identification of funding for future mitigation works on the A414

The South East Local Economic Partnership (SELEP) has prioritised £2m from the Local Growth Fund, matched by a contribution of £2m from ECC, for a package of measures to reduce congestion and improve journey times between Maldon and Chelmsford to deliver economic growth and new homes in Maldon and Heybridge. This could include works at Eves Corner in Danbury. Funding is subject to the approval of a satisfactory business case.

5. Proposed future work in relation to Eves Corner, Danbury

At the July 2014 meeting between CCC, MDC, and ECC, and based on emerging draft conclusions from the report being produced by Roland Bilsland Traffic Planning, it was agreed that S-Paramics modelling² for both Eves Corner and Well Lane in Danbury would be the preferred approach to further consider mitigation at Eves Corner.

This approach would provide more robust information on the workings of pre-signals and other mitigation options at Eves Corner, to allow the best solution to be agreed by all parties. S-Paramics modelling could also be used to undertake sensitivity testing of 'rat running' routes in the Danbury and Little Baddow area in relation to congestion levels on the A414.

² S-Paramics is a traffic microsimulation modelling software package. Its advantage over most other modelling tools is that it gives a visual demonstration of traffic behaviour. A model consists of a series of nodes and links which are constructed with the use of an Ordnance Survey overlay map of the model area. It is particularly useful for assessing vehicle interaction and can show graphically the impact of a new road layout compared to existing conditions. Output data is normally in the form of vehicle throughput, journey times and queue lengths.

Additional traffic counts have been commissioned by ECC at the Well Lane junction in Danbury to enable S-Paramics modelling to be undertaken. However, this cannot be completed until September 2014. In the interim period, ECC will review the conclusions of the highways report produced by Roland Bilisland Traffic Planning on behalf of CCC, including the LinSig³ assessment of the pre-signals option at Eves Corner undertaken as part of this work. Based on this review, ECC will consider whether S-Paramics modelling is still necessary in addition to the LinSig assessment.

³ *LinSig is a software tool which allows traffic engineers to model traffic signals and their effect on traffic capacities and queuing. As well as modelling the effects of traffic signals LinSig also optimises signal timings to reduce delay or increase capacity at a junction or group of interlinked junctions. It was considered preferable to model Eves Corner using S-Paramics rather than LinSig as the latter is designed to optimise vehicle throughput and the proposed pre-signals arrangement is a method of delaying vehicle access.*

APPENDIX 1**Maldon District Local Development Plan****Duty to Cooperate meeting note****1st May 2014****Attendance:**

Maldon District Council: David Coleman, Tim Parton, Derek Lawrence

Essex County Council: Kevin Fraser, Matthew Bradley, Brendan Johnson, Mark Robinson

Chelmsford City Council: Claire Stuckey, Derek Stebbing

1. Local Development Plan (LDP) update and background to the Duty to Cooperate process

TP provided background on the highways studies undertaken by Essex County Council (ECC), and the relevant Duty to Cooperate meetings. This included reference to the following:

- Sub-regional Duty to Cooperate meeting held in March 2013 identified concerns regarding the impact of LDP growth proposed in Maldon District on the A414 in Danbury and the possible level of demand that growth allocated in the LDP could have on the proposed North Chelmsford Rail Station.
- ECC Highways Modelling Workshop was undertaken in May 2013, which considered highways modelling being undertaken by Essex Highways.
- Duty to Cooperate highways meeting in August 2013 considered further modelling work being undertaken by Essex Highways.
- Essex Highways produced the 'Technical Note – Impact of Proposed Development Sites in Heybridge and South Maldon on Wider Highway Network', which outlined mitigation options at Eves Corner in Danbury on the A414, and the impact which growth allocated in the LDP could have on commuter trips from Maldon District to the proposed North Heybridge Rail Station.
- Duty to Cooperate meeting in December 2013 considered the outcomes of the Essex Highways Technical Note, and considered a draft Statement of Common Ground between MDC, ECC, and Chelmsford CC.
- Reports on the draft Statement of Common Ground were presented to the relevant committees at MDC and Chelmsford CC in March 2014.
- Chelmsford CC provided MDC with a formal position on the Statement of Common Ground, raising a number of concerns which will be considered in this meeting.
- Chelmsford CC submitted a consultation representation to the LDP Pre-Submission consultation raising concerns outlined in the formal position statement, which will also be considered in this meeting.

MDC submitted the LDP to PINS on 25th April 2014. A report to the Planning and Licensing Committee on the 16th April presented the minor modifications which were submitted alongside the LDP.

- DS noted that he was pleased with the inclusion of minor modification reference no.12 and 13.

It was noted that Chelmsford CC's LDP representation has been published in recent newspaper articles. DS acknowledged that this was unfortunate, and confirmed that there had been no external publicity of this issue which has been produced by the Council.

2. Providing further background information

a) Traffic survey information

- Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC raised concerns regarding the ability to access and review traffic survey data.
- ECC outlined that all data is available upon request. BJ stated that the Council would be able to provide spreadsheets with all relevant data on.
- Chelmsford CC noted that when this information has been provided, it will be shared with their highway consultant Rowland Bilisland Traffic Planning.

b) Comparison data

- Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC requested that data is provided to allow a comparison to be made between traffic flows with and without proposed growth in the LDP.
- ECC outlined that this data is available upon request. BJ stated that this information will be provided as part of the traffic survey data. This will be provided through the spreadsheet model, which has already been provided to other interested parties.

c) Detailed information on assumptions regarding the North East Chelmsford Rail Station

- Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC requested that further detailed information is provided on the assumptions made in the Essex Highways Technical Note regarding the North East Chelmsford Rail Station.
- ECC noted that this information is provided within the report in section 5.2, where the total number of expected trips is stated. ECC is comfortable that a robust assessment has been undertaken in the Technical Note on this issue.
- DS raised concerns that there could be a significant increase in commuters from Maldon District using the A414 to access North East Chelmsford Rail Station. In particular, the total number of 7 additional trips is considered to be too low.
- ECC outlined that the impact of commuting on the A414 and towards Hatfield Peverel has been factored into the assessment within the Technical Note. ECC feel that it is unlikely that the new station will significantly change commuting routes. There is not a large number of rail users from Maldon District, currently around 8% of Maldon District residents commute by rail. Therefore, if there was an increase in the percentage of rail users this would still only relate to a very small number of total trips.
 - It was agreed ECC would provide an explanatory paragraph on these conclusions, to clarify that there would be a small total number of total trips in relation to the North East Chelmsford Rail Station.
 - It was also noted that the data regarding these assumptions will be provided alongside the other required data.

3. Options for mitigation at Eves Corner, Danbury

a) Plans for mitigation options considered

- Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC requested that detailed plans for all mitigation options are included within the Technical Note.

- A detailed plan of the pre-signal option was included within the Technical Note. Detailed plans have not been produced for other options that were not considered feasible on transport grounds, as this was considered unnecessary.

b) Demonstrating the impact of mitigation options for Eves Corner

- Chelmsford CC stated that it would be helpful to receive further explanation of why mitigation options for Eves Corner were discounted or preferred by ECC.
- It was agreed that in relation to the staggered priority junction and signalised crossroads options, ECC would provide an additional explanatory paragraph which builds on the information provided in the last paragraphs of pages 12 and 13 of the Technical Note.
- Chelmsford CC noted that a further 'layman's' explanation on the benefits of the pre-signal option would be helpful.
- It was agreed that an explanatory paragraph on the impacts of the pre-signal option will be provided by ECC.
 - ECC noted that there are lots of examples of pre-signals in use across Essex. Chelmsford CC would welcome further information on the success of other examples from ECC in particular those which are comparable to the proposed scheme in Danbury
 - Chelmsford CC emphasised that additional information being provided by ECC needs to provide the Council with more confidence that the pre-signal arrangement is the best and most workable option.
- Developers associated with the South Maldon Garden Suburb are undertaking modelling in relation to use of pre-signals at the Eves Corner junction. MDC will clarify with the developers their timescales for undertaking this work. It was agreed that Chelmsford CC would participate in a meeting to consider the outcomes of this work, and will also have the opportunity to review any reports produced.
 - ECC noted that their modelling software is not appropriate for assessing pre-signals. This would require a micro-simulation tool, which is available to the developers associated with the South Maldon Garden Suburb.

d) Consideration of pedestrian flows and public transport within proposed mitigation options

- Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC raised concerns regarding pedestrian flows and public transport routes in relation to the use of the pre-signals at Eves Corner.
- ECC confirmed that there would be no changes to pedestrian access through the pre-signal arrangement. This option would create minimal changes to the existing layout of the junction, and no changes to the A414.
- Chelmsford CC questioned how bus prioritisation could be provided within the pre-signal arrangement. MB outlined that mechanisms could be put in place to allow the bus driver to change the signals when approaching the junction. Further information on these options will be sought from ITS colleagues at ECC. It was agreed that a statement further explaining this will be provided.

4. Concerns regarding the Well Lane junction

The highways consultant supporting Chelmsford CC raised concerns regarding the Well Lane junction in Danbury. This junction has not been assessed by ECC within previous reports.

Chelmsford CC raised concerns regarding the impact of rat running at the Well Lane junction where traffic seeks to bypass Danbury from the Oak Corner junction. ECC highlighted that mitigation at

Eves Corner could also benefit the Well Lane junction by reducing rat running in the Danbury area, where the Eves Corner improvements would make the A414 the quickest and easiest route.

5. Concerns regarding rat running in the Danbury area

Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC requested that a rat running study is undertaken in the Danbury area, in particular to consider the impact of additional traffic generated from proposed growth in the LDP.

ECC stated that a rat running study is very difficult to undertake, as it would require assessments over a large area. It would therefore be difficult to identify exactly which areas a study would consider. BJ highlighted that logistically a study could be undertaken, but it is unclear what would be done with this information when the amount of rat running has been identified. BJ also highlighted that preferred mitigation options at Eves Corner would reduce rat running in the Danbury area.

It was agreed that a rat running study would not be instigated at this time.

6. Delivery / funding of highway mitigation in the Danbury area

Through the formal statement on the Statement of Common Ground and the LDP consultation representation Chelmsford CC stated that the LDP should be more robust and provide certainty about the delivery of mitigation options, and stated that mitigation options should be required through S106 contribution rather than through CIL.

Chelmsford CC raised concerns about MDC progressing and completing a CIL Charging Schedule. TP outlined that MDC have completed the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation, and are expecting to undertake the CIL Draft Charging Schedule consultation within the next few months. MDC is therefore advancing well on the production of a CIL Charging Schedule.

Chelmsford CC noted that highways mitigation at Eves Corner was not included in the Regulation 123 list in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation, and highlighted that its inclusion as a S106 contribution would provide greater certainty of delivery. Chelmsford CC noted that through the minor modification reference no.12 submitted to PINs alongside the LDP, they are more comfortable with text in the LDP. However, Chelmsford CC would prefer to have mitigation at Eves Corner specifically listed as a required project within the policy box for LDP Policy S4.

TP stated that mitigation at Eves Corner will be included in the Regulation 123 list as part of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule. TP raised concerns about the ability to require funding through S106 contributions as the requirement for the mitigation works cannot be directly related to specific sites in Maldon and Heybridge, which would therefore not be in accordance with CIL Regulation 122.

It was agreed that the Regulation 123 list will include mitigation at Eves Corner as a key project, and the Statement of Common Ground will clearly state that this will be a project which MDC will prioritise for funding through CIL.

7. AOB

Following the inclusion of negative newspaper articles in the Maldon and Burnham Standard referring to Chelmsford CC's LDP consultation representation, DC requested Chelmsford CC to consider the publication of a positive statement generally supporting the aims and objectives of the LDP.

DS agreed to consider what Chelmsford CC could provide.

8. Key conclusions and actions

It was agreed that a follow up meeting would be arranged in June to review progress on identified actions. Chelmsford CC have a committee meeting on the 3rd July which could provide the opportunity to present further information to Members.

It was agreed that the next steps are as follows:

- 1) ECC to provide additional information as requested and listed below
- 2) The results of further modelling undertaken on the pre-signal option at Eves Corner is shared by MDC for comment and review to ECC and Chelmsford CC
- 3) MDC to review and redraft the Statement of Common Ground between all parties.

Key actions

1. ECC to provide CCC with the background modelling data which informed the production of the Essex Highways Technical Note on the wider impacts of growth allocated in the LDP. This includes all available data on the options considered, and data showing the existing situation for comparison purposes.
 - a) CCC will then provide this data to Roland Bilslund Traffic Planning for further consideration.
2. ECC to provide an explanatory paragraph on the conclusions made regarding the North East Chelmsford Rail Station, and to outline that there could be a small increase in commuters using the A414 to access the new station, however this would have a small overall impact on the highway network.
3. ECC to provide an explanatory paragraph to outline the reasons why the staggered priority junction and signalised crossroads options were not preferred. This should build upon the information provided in the last paragraphs of pages 12 and 13 of the Essex Highways report.
4. ECC to provide a simple explanatory paragraph on the how pre-signals at Eves Corner would work, and what the advantages and disadvantages would be. This should also include comments from ITS colleagues in ECC in relation to how bus prioritisation could be provided at Eves Corner. This should also provide information on where pre-signals have been successfully implemented in other areas of Essex.
5. MDC to contact developers associated with the South Maldon Garden Suburb regarding progress on modelling pre-signal options at Eves Corner.
 - When provided, MDC will share this work with ECC and CCC for review and comment
 - CCC will share this work with Roland Bilslund Traffic Planning for consideration
6. MDC to include Eves Corner within the next version of the CIL Regulation 123 list, to be published in an update to the Maldon District Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
7. CCC to consider the publication of a positive statement generally supporting the aims and objectives of the LDP.

APPENDIX 2**Duty to Cooperate update meeting with Chelmsford CC, Maldon DC, and Essex CC
10am, 30th July, Chelmsford City Council Offices**LDP update

- MDC submitted the LDP to the Secretary of State on the 25th April 2014.
- The Inspector has identified key concerns regarding the LDP, which relate to the identification of objectively assessed need, the amount and rate of housing delivery, the deliverability of strategic sites, the use of reserve sites, clarification on windfall sites, infrastructure delivery and viability concerns, works at Hatfield Peverel, the viability of strategic sites based on infrastructure phasing, the LDP Traveller policy, and concerns regarding employment and retail evidence.
- An Exploratory Meeting was held on the 3rd July. At this meeting the Council presented a work plan to address the Inspectors Key Concerns.
- MDC will be submitting additional housing related evidence to the Inspector on the 22nd August, to allow housing related LDP Examination hearings to be undertaken in late October / early November.
- Further evidence will be submitted at the end of September to allow hearings on all other matters to be undertaken in November / December.

It was highlighted that paragraph 26 of the Inspectors Key Concerns (document reference IED06) referred to Eves Corner, where the Inspector was confused between the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) agreed between Maldon DC, Braintree DC, and Essex CC, and any SoCG with Chelmsford CC regarding Eves Corner.

In relation to the LDP Traveller Policy, Chelmsford CC recommended that MDC review the Travellers policy set out within policy DC34 of the Adopted Core Strategy and a Position Statement on page 35 of the Core Strategy Focused Review. Policy DC34 states that further sites will be allocated in subsequent DPDs. NCAAP went on to allocate a site as part of a strategic new allocation in NE Chelmsford (however an alternative site outside the growth area is now being explored instead). No sites were allocated in the SADPD.

Brookbanks review of options at Eves Corner

- Following the submission of the attached document from Brookbanks, MDC and ECC requested further information from Brookbanks on the options tested, on the review undertaken of pre-signals, and more information on how the signalised junction would work particularly in relation to accessing existing properties adjacent to the junction.
- BJ noted that the signalised junction proposed by Brookbanks heavily favours the A414 at the expense of Little Baddow Road, which would not be satisfactory.
- Chelmsford CC confirmed that a signalised junction would not be preferred at Eves Corner, as this would not be in character with the area.
- It was agreed that the work produced by Brookbanks so far has not been satisfactory, and all parties would be more comfortable with ECC leading on the assessment of options at the junction.
- ECC would prefer Paramics modelling to be undertaken at Eves Corner. This would provide the most conclusive assessment of options at Eves Corner. The work could be completed in house, with costs shared between MDC and ECC.

Update on highways assessment being undertaken by Roland Bilisland Traffic Planning on behalf of Chelmsford CC

- Chelmsford CC has re-commissioned Roland Bilisland Traffic Planning to produce a further assessment of the Eves Corner and Well Lane junctions. This work has assessed all the latest data provided by ECC, completed spot check site visits, completed formal queue length site visits, and completed a Linsig assessment of pre-signal at Eves Corner to provide an indication of issues.
- The report is still at a draft stage. Early results suggest that pre-signals at Eves Corner would have a benefit and improve the existing situation without LDP growth. With LDP growth included in 2026, there would be a significant increase in congestion at Eves Corner even with pre-signals in place.
- The draft report also raises concerns with the Well Lane junction, which is currently nearly at capacity. BJ noted that congestion at Well Lane can be attributed to rat running, which would be alleviated with improvements at Eves Corner. However, it was noted that if the conclusions of the draft report for Eves Corner are correct, congestion at Eves Corner, and rat running, will persist.
 - ECC has no base counts for Well Lane. Chelmsford CC has a basic count from the report.

For the progression of the SoCG it was agreed that Well Lane should not be a showstopper. However, there should be a commitment to review it further.

Update on potential funding options for modelling and works at Eves Corner

- Paramics is a visual tool, which shows the movement of cars. It can be used to review both options of a signalised junction and pre-signals.
- To fund modelling at Eves Corner, there should be some funding available within ECC's Maldon based budget, and ECC may also be able to use LEP funding for modelling.
- LEP funding has been provided to ECC, which could be used to support works on the A414 corridor. It was agreed that where funding could be provided by ECC rather than CIL as proposed by MDC, this would remove the objection from Chelmsford CC regarding the need to guarantee funding for highways works at Eves Corner.
- ECC are currently reviewing potential projects for LEP funding, and therefore a business case will need to be produced to obtain funding for the A414 corridor.
- It is possible that Paramics modelling could be extended to review Well Lane. Chelmsford CC would be supportive of this approach. ECC will review this further, on the basis that the two junctions are intrinsically linked.

Production of a position statement to assist with the LDP Examination Inspectors concerns

- All agreed that a position statement would be helpful for the Inspector. This would not provide any new information, and would set out the work that has been undertaken, is currently being undertaken, and planned to be undertaken over the coming months.

Options for taking the work forward and next steps

- Option 1: Further engagement with Brookbanks to request that they undertake Paramics modelling of the Eves Corner junction. This is not preferred, as work produced by Brookbanks to date has not been satisfactory, the authorities would have less control over the work, and further issues such as Well Lane will not be considered.
- Option 2: Essex Highways undertake Paramics modelling in house, part funded by ECC and MDC, or through LEP funding. It was agreed that MDC and Chelmsford CC would be more

comfortable with ECC undertaking this work. ECC would also like to undertake this work, as they may require the results to support their position during the LDP Examination.

- Chelmsford CC still have concerns regarding rat running. There would not be time to do any assessment work on this in advance of the LDP Examination, however a sensitivity test could be produced as part of the Paramics modelling.
- KF will investigate if LEP funding could be made available to fund Paramics modelling of Eves Corner and Well Lane, and when this could be undertaken. ECC would prefer to undertake the study of both junctions at the same time, but this would create a delay as a traffic count would be required for Well Lane to be undertaken during term time.
- TP to produce a position statement on Eves Corner for submission to the Inspector on the 22nd August. A draft will be circulated to ECC and Chelmsford CC shortly.