

Dear Mr Crayston,

Many thanks for your reply to my questions and I appreciate the time you have taken to make the reply. I would just like to point out one inconsistency between your BCRs and those BCRs prepared by the Highways Agency in 2006 for the 9 route option estimates .

The Benefit Cost Ratios you mention appear to be on a completely different basis to those used by the Highways England and referred to in my questions to you. Your Benefits seem to be based on the Benefit to the local economy whereas the HE Benefit is a discounted change in user costs over 60 years taking recognition of changes in travel time, accidents, noise, vehicle operating costs etc .

It is good to hear that if another route is selected by HE when they do the next feasibility study, then you would contribute to the costs if it allowed your development to proceed.

Once again, thank you for your reply.

Dear

Re: Gateway 120 question.

Thank you for taking the time to send your question to us. One of the reasons for the presentation was to open up communication channels with local people so we are grateful for your question.

Firstly may I confirm our position. Gateway 120 has always factored in a significant contribution to infrastructure both in terms of the A120 dualling and other community benefits in and around the new settlements. Our suggested route, which we have been advocating for some time, proposes an on-line/off-line route with the existing A120. As you would expect, we have spent a great deal of time stress testing our proposed route. Our first step was to instruct a highways consultant to draw up a proposed route, incorporating appropriate costings, on the detail required at that stage. This exercise was undertaken after consultation with the Highways Agency and the outcome, when shared with the Highways Agency confirmed that the route is feasible.

Following this conclusion, we then asked three regional and national infrastructure companies, whose core business is road building, to estimate likely construction costs on our proposed route. We received encouraging responses from each company in relation to construction costings. Accordingly, although we cannot confirm exact levels of our contribution at this stage, we believe G120 can make a contribution to the cost of the road that will significantly improve the Government's ROI on the improved A120. Such a figure may well encourage the Highways Agency to prioritise a solution to the A120 – an outcome that would be welcomed by almost everyone living in north Essex. As we have said before, the scheme we are proposing supports a contribution in excess of £100 million.

Your letter does mention the figures released in 2007, which saw the previous proposal cancelled because the cost of that route ballooned from approximately £250m in 2005 to the figure you mention of £500m in 2007. If you apply the 2007 figure to the £1.3 billion, which was published in the Haven Gateway report 2014 as an indication of the benefit generated from completing the A120 from Braintree to Harwich, the cost benefit would be around 2.6 to 1. Although I believe the original cost benefit on the 2007 figures, taken from the Atkins report, was only 1.7 to 1 at that time. As

already mentioned, although we cannot confirm exact figures, we can say that the cost of our route is significantly lower than the 2005 preferred route and as our contribution reduces the required input needed from the public purse it is likely that it could help to generate a Benefit Cost Ratio in the region of 8 to 1. Also on this point, we have made some initial enquiries on whether our route would have a higher benefit to the local economy as it incorporates a grade separated junction at Coggeshall rather than going straight through to the A12 and the transport consultants view confirmed that our route would most likely improve the ratio.

Finally, you have asked if we would contribute if another route is chosen. The simple answer is yes, if it is part of a joined up approach which allows our project to come forward providing a solution to the three interconnected problems facing our area, namely Infrastructure, Jobs and Homes. The route proposed by Gateway 120 brings, in our view, benefits that go beyond the financial cost/benefit analyses conducted by Haven Gateway. This is because of its unique contribution to meeting local housing needs, which are in a desperate state at present. By delivering new homes in a large and well co-ordinated way, Gateway 120 would also avoid an undesirable situation in which housing needs are met by bolting dozens of new houses on to every town or village in North Essex. The Highways Agency's theoretical modelling may provide the best route in technical terms, but we believe any new route should be considered in the round, including the broader benefits of sustainable homes and cost efficiency for the public purse. If the Agency's preferred route, or any alternative, can be shown to bring a package of benefits as well as a technically better road solution, we would happily support that. However, we believe the solution designed by Gateway 120 and its team of specialists is the best option because it combines all of these qualities.

I hope that goes some way to answering your questions but please feel free to contact us again if need be.

Regards.

Hugh Crayston.  
Robert Dewar Associates.

#### Question

At the Marks Tey Parish Council meeting last night a representative from Gateway 120 stated that Gateway 120 would contribute about 50% of the A120 dualling costs between Braintree and Marks Tey. Bearing in mind the Highways Agency published 2005 costs for the dualling of about £500m , could you confirm what your contribution in £ would actually be. Could you also let me know if you would be making any contribution to the A120 dualling if another route was chosen bearing in mind the 2005 Highways Agency preferred route was going South of Coggeshall and had a much higher Benefit Cost Ratio than your preferred route of the Coggeshall ByPass”

Many thanks