

**A27 Arundel Bypass
Elected Representatives' Forum
Meeting Agenda**

Date	26th September 2019
Time	19.00 – 20.30 (tea/coffee at 18.30)
Location	Atherley Hall, The Town Hall, Maltravers Street, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 9AP

Attendance

Chair: [REDACTED] *independent*

Representatives		
Name	Title	Organisation
Paul Dendle	Councillor	Arun District Council
Grant Roberts	Councillor	Arun District Council
Faye Catterson	Councillor	Arun District Council
Wendy Eve	Councillor	Arundel Town Council
Jeremy Johnstone	Councillor	Arundel Town Council
Roger Elkins	Councillor	West Sussex County Council
Gary Markwell	Councillor	West Sussex County Council
Derek Whittington	Councillor	West Sussex County Council
Suzanne Clark	Councillor	Walberton Parish Council
Bob Rogers	Councillor	Walberton Parish Council
Jan Rees	Councillor	Slindon Parish Council
Peter Fenton	Councillor	Slindon Parish Council
Roger Davies	Councillor	Lyminster & Crossbush Parish Council
Matt Ashman	Councillor	Lyminster & Crossbush Parish Council
Alun Alesbury	Elected Member	South Downs National Park Authority

Observers		
[REDACTED]	Nick Herbert's advisor	MP Arundel and South Downs

Guest attendees		
Sarah Sharp	Councillor	Chichester District Council
Juliet Harris	Assistant Town Clerk	Littlehampton Town Council
Colin Humphris	Councillor	Clymping Parish Council
Stephen Haymes	Councillor	Yapton Parish Council
Archie Naughton	Councillor	Warningcamp Parish Council

Highways England		
Jason Hones	Programme Leader	Highways England
██████████	Route Sponsor	Highways England
██████████	Project Director	WSP
██████████	Regional Director	WSP
██████████	Consultation and Engagement	WSP
██████████	Stakeholder Lead	Highways England
██████████	Stakeholder Support	Highways England

Notes

Topics of discussion	Actions
1. Introductions/Apologies	
Apologies received from councilors who were unable to attend. We were informed that the format of the meeting was slightly different to accommodate additional guest councils and for the project team to present a briefing on the further consultation for the route options and answer questions from the elected representatives.	<i>No actions</i>
2. Health, Safety and Wellbeing	
We were reminded of the importance of being respectful to other people's views and respectful both in the meeting and in any actions and correspondence following the meeting.	<i>No actions</i>
3. Briefing presentation on further consultation	
The HE project team provided a briefing on the further consultation process and route options to ensure all attendees were informed of the current status of the scheme and its timings. HE emphasized that they are committed to running a fair, accessible and consistent consultation and encouraged everyone to provide comments and feedback as well as spreading the word to their communities.	<i>No actions</i>

4. General discussion with Q&As

Funding and affordability

The forum discussed the different route options and their affordability. HE explained that the purpose of the further consultation is to present and proceed with viable route options and that all options are to be treated as if they were broadly affordable. Further cost savings and additional funding are being looked at and will be part of future works on the scheme. This includes contractual efficiencies, value engineering and off-setting some elements of the scheme to be funded through designated funds. This will be a competitive bid to the Designated Funds decision committee which will be assessed alongside bids from projects from across Highways England.

HE explained that they are keen to receive feedback on all six options since the cost ranges published within the consultation are early estimates based on work done to date and as such do not represent the final costs for the project. HE emphasized that the design of the options will continue to be developed in a way that seeks to deliver the best possible value for money in line with the needs of the scheme. HE explained that there is no agenda with including the question B1 about 'if only the allocated budget is available ... which option would you chose?' in the questionnaire. HE has been clear and consistent that the allocated scheme budget is £100-250m and that the next question (B2) asks for an opinion on all options but notes that work needs to be done and there is no absolute certainty over the funding.

Options for consultation

HE explained that online options are part of the scope of the scheme since they have been considered at consultation before and have some support locally. It would therefore be wrong to ignore them. Additionally, HE needs to demonstrate to the Planning Inspectorate that all viable options have been looked at when they seek to get authority to proceed.

Afternote: Online options are included in the 'bypass' description since the existing A27 at Arundel was originally called a bypass for the centre of Arundel town.

Cut and cover tunnels

HE gave an update on the cut and cover tunnels. These are not included in the further consultation as there are significant additional costs to construct a cut and cover tunnel, without mitigating the adverse environmental impacts, including impacts on the SDNP, Ancient Woodland and other biodiversity receptors, during construction.

Carbon emissions

The forum discussed the scheme's impact on the environment and reducing carbon emissions. HE explained that assessments on this have been carried out and there could possibly be an initial carbon increase of 1.5% during the operation phase although since this was early modelling, it could well fall in the error margin. HE confirmed that reducing carbon emissions during the construction phase is a priority. Several potential solutions may be used to address each environmental issue for each route; these will be designed in detail during the next stage once a preferred route has been announced. All mitigation measures and compensation would then be developed in consultation with statutory environmental bodies and then submitted, as a part of the DCO submission, to the Planning Inspectorate to consider all aspects of the project against planning regulations and legislation.

No actions

Lyminster Bypass and W&L scheme

The forum also discussed the Lyminster Bypass and Worthing and Lancing schemes and if the Arundel Bypass will still be delivered if these schemes weren't. HE confirmed that this would be the case, the scheme is still viable on its own. HE explained that Lyminster is a West Sussex County Council scheme so any concerns or issues about this scheme needs to be addressed to them.

A member of the forum asked for the possibility to review a model of the junction at Shellbridge Road. HE referred to the flythrough videos and the opportunity to come to one of the consultation events to discuss this in more detail with the project engineers.

Purple route

A member of the forum asked why the 'New Purple route' hasn't been included in the further consultation. HE explained that the route has been re-assessed but it has not been brought forward as it would not provide the necessary capacity and thus doesn't respond to the long-term challenges for the area.

Local traffic and tourism

A guest attendee asked how the scheme would impact local traffic and tourism. HE explained that this wasn't evidence that HE collects. However, uncorroborated evidence from various business stakeholders suggests that by improving the route travel will become easier and journey times shorter. They argue that local tourism will benefit in terms of better accessibility from other parts of the county and country as well as less congestion.

Ancient woodland

A member of the forum asked if there will be any changes in the way 'ancient woodland' is categorized. HE explained that this is in accordance with Natural England's policy on ancient woodland and will not be changed unless their policy changes.

Afternote: There is no distinction between different types of ancient woodland when the impacts are considered against the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS NN).

Environment versus People

A number of members stated that they believe the environment is receiving greater protection than the people that live in the area; that HE cares more for the value of trees than people; and it would be people that would be affected by the route and noise impacts. HE explained that the information presented outlines the compliance with the NPS NN and that the information provided states the impact assessment of the various routes on both people and the environment so that people can make an informed decision on which route(s) they would prefer.

Planning process

A member of the forum raised a question regarding the likelihood for the different routes during the planning process. HE explained that no conclusions have yet been formulated on the planning likelihood for each option. The facts and assessments have been presented in the various documents and it is for people to make their own conclusions. It would not be appropriate for HE to be presenting conclusions at this stage. The formal application for a Development Consent Order will be considered by the Planning Inspectorate and Secretary of State for Transport having followed the normal planning assessment procedure.

5. Date/venue for next meeting

HE will be in touch in the new year with a date for the next meeting and encouraged all attendees to continue to stay in touch and provide feedback until then.

No actions
