

Report to Cabinet

March 2022

National Highways' consultation on A27 Arundel Bypass: approval of WSCC consultation response

Report by Matt Davey, Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Electoral division(s): Fontwell, Arundel & Courtwick

Summary

In 2020, National Highways (formerly Highways England) announced the preferred route for the A27 Arundel Bypass, which would replace the existing, largely single carriageway road with approximately 8km of dual two-lane carriageway starting at Crossbush in the east and reconnecting in the west near the A27/A29 Fontwell (east) roundabout. Following construction of the bypass, approximately 6.6km of the existing A27 would be 'detrunked' and converted to a local road as part of the proposed scheme.

The scheme is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) requiring a Development Consent Order (DCO) from the Secretary of State (rather than planning permission from the local planning authority). The County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process, and it has specific responsibilities as a 'host' authority.

In advance of an application for consent being submitted, National Highways is undertaking formal consultation from 11 January to 8 March 2022 on the proposed scheme and a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which identifies the likely significant impacts and any required mitigation.

A detailed analysis of the PEIR has been undertaken, with consideration being given to likely significant impacts (both direct and indirect) and whether those impacts are considered to be positive, negative, or neutral (taking into account any proposed mitigation measures). Consideration has also been given to whether further work could be undertaken by National Highways, including mitigation measures, to address issues identified as being significantly negative.

In summary, although the County Council gives 'in principle' support to the current scheme for an A27 Arundel Bypass, there are a number of matters of concern that need to be satisfactorily addressed by National Highways in advance of submission of the DCO application. These include: the requirement for key transport-related technical documents; potential adverse impacts resulting from the re-distribution of traffic on local roads; clarity about elements of the construction phase; the de-trunking strategy and opportunities to provide mitigation and wider enhancement

measures; understanding how local people and supply chains can benefit and the potential impact on local businesses and potential mitigation; impacts relating to noise and air quality; consultation on a number of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodologies; the scope for enhancement measures over and above those required to mitigate impacts; mitigation options to reduce the impact on the national carbon budget; measures for climate change adaptation and resilience; and the adequacy of funding to mitigate the adverse impacts of the scheme.

Recommendation

That Cabinet:

- (a) approves the comments in paragraphs 2.36-2.108 of the report and the detailed comments on the PEIR in Appendix C of the report as the County Council's formal response to the consultation on the A27 Arundel Bypass;
- (b) authorises the Assistant Director of Highways, Transport, and Planning to respond to any further stages of pre-submission consultation, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change - in support of the formal response approved under (a);
- (c) if an application for a Development Consent Order is submitted, authorises the Assistant Director of Highways, Transport, and Planning to:
 - (i) approve the County Council's 'adequacy of consultation' response;
 - (ii) prepare and submit the County Council's written representation and Local Impact Report; to negotiate with the applicant on the DCO requirements, any S106 Agreement, and the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground; and to comment on the written representations of third parties – all in support of the formal response approved under (a);
 - (iii) attend the examination hearings and answer the Examining Authority's questions in support of the County Council's position; and
- (d) if a Development Consent Order is made, approves 'in principle' the County Council becoming a relevant authority for the discharge of requirements.

Proposal

1 Background and context

- 1.1 In 2012, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) became the agency responsible for operating the planning process for nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIP). NSIPs are usually large-scale developments such as new harbours, power generating stations, and electricity transmission lines, that require 'development consent' from the relevant Secretary of State under the Development Consent Order (DCO) process, rather than planning permission from the relevant planning authority.
- 1.2 Any developer wishing to construct an NSIP must submit an application for consent. Following submission, PINS examines the application and makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State, who will make the decision on whether to grant or to refuse development consent. Once made, a DCO provides all the approvals (for example, planning permission, compulsory purchase) required for a development to proceed.
- 1.3 National Highways proposes to replace and detrunk the existing, largely single carriageway, A27 at Arundel with a dual carriageway bypass linking together

the two existing dual carriageway sections of the road to the east and west. The scheme is a NSIP (and requires development consent) because it would be a new road that forms part of the national strategic road network (motorways and trunk roads) operated by National Highways. Given that the scheme is in West Sussex, the County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process.

- 1.4 The [National Policy Statement for National Networks](#) (NPS) sets out the need for the development of NSIPs on the national road and rail networks in England and Government policy relating to the delivery of such schemes. In due course, the Secretary of State will use the NPS as the primary basis to make the decision on the Arundel Bypass scheme.
- 1.5 In advance of an application for consent being submitted, National Highways is undertaking formal consultation from 11 January to 8 March 2022 on the proposed scheme and a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which identifies the likely significant impacts of the scheme and any required mitigation. In addition to consultation on technical matters, it also involves consultation with the public in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), a formal document that sets out how National Highways proposes to consult the community.
- 1.6 This report outlines the scheme and the key areas for consideration by the County Council in making a formal response to the consultation.

2 Proposal details

Background

- 2.1 Improving the A27 at Arundel, Chichester, and Worthing & Lancing is the County Council's highest priority for transport (as identified in the statutory West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026). The improvements are needed to increase capacity, to improve reliability and safety, to help increase the competitiveness of local businesses, and to attract investment.
- 2.2 In March 2015, the Government published its first Roads Investment Strategy (RIS1), which included a commitment to improve the A27 at Arundel towards the end of Roads Period 1 (2015-20).
- 2.3 Regarding the development of the current scheme, Highways England (National Highways' predecessor) undertook public consultation in 2017 on three options, one partial online route (Option 1) and two routes for an offline bypass (Options 3 and 5A).
- 2.4 In responding to the consultation, the County Council concluded that the environmental impacts of Option 5A, if appropriately mitigated, were likely to be significantly outweighed by the substantial economic benefits over the longer term. Therefore, provided that a detailed and high-quality package of environmental mitigation measures was identified and delivered as part of the scheme, Option 5A was the County Council's preferred option because it represented the best fit with the strategic outcomes that the Authority was seeking for the A27.
- 2.5 In May 2018, Highways England announced the selection of a modified version of Option 5A as the preferred route for the bypass, after which it undertook work to develop the design for the scheme. This included consideration of

alternative options to minimise the impact of the scheme on protected ancient woodland and biodiversity at the western end.

- 2.6 Following further technical work and a review of alternatives, further consultation by Highways England was undertaken in 2019 on six options, two partial online routes (Cyan and Beige) and four routes for an offline bypass (Crimson, Magenta, Amber, and Grey).
- 2.7 In responding to the consultation, the County Council concluded that the environmental impacts of the Magenta route (Option 4/5AV1), if appropriately mitigated, were likely to be significantly outweighed by the substantial transport, economic and social benefits over the longer term. Therefore, provided that a detailed and high-quality package of environmental mitigation measures was delivered as part of the scheme, the Magenta route was the County Council's preferred option for an Arundel Bypass because it was the best performing option, and it represented the best fit with the strategic outcomes that the Authority was seeking for the A27.
- 2.8 In March 2020, the second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2) was published, including a commitment by the Government to deliver a dual-carriageway Arundel Bypass in Roads Period 2 (2020-2025). Subsequently, in October 2020, the Grey route (Option 5BV1) was announced by Highways England as the preferred route for the bypass.
- 2.9 In responding to the consultation on options by Highways England in 2019, the County Council concluded that the Grey route did not provide the best balance between the impacts on the economy, the environment, and communities.

A27 Arundel Bypass

- 2.10 Since the announcement of the selection of the grey option as the preferred route, Highways England (and subsequently, National Highways) has developed the design of the new bypass, approximately 8km of dual two-lane carriageway to the south of the existing A27 (see Appendix A: Location Plan).
- 2.11 Starting at the existing A27 at Crossbush to the east, the route would reconnect with the A27 in the west near the A27/A29 Fontwell (east) roundabout (see Appendix B: Preliminary Landscape and Environmental Masterplan). Key features of the scheme include the following works:
- a junction at Crossbush with access to and from the A27 in both directions;
 - a new viaduct spanning the River Arun and a bridge over the Arun Valley Railway;
 - new bridges over the Binsted and Tortington Rifes;
 - a new junction with the existing A27 at Tye Lane to the north of Walberton (with the A27 continuing via an underpass) enabling westbound access onto the A27 and eastbound access from the A27;
 - the closure to vehicular traffic of Tye Lane south of the new route; and
 - the closure of the junction at Arundel Road and the left-turn access from the A27 onto Arundel Road (west);
 - a new link road joining the two sections of Arundel Road;
 - new road and public rights of way crossing facilities;

- three temporary construction compounds; and
 - a package of environmental mitigation measures.
- 2.12 Subject to consultation with the County Council (as local highway authority), approximately 6.6km of the existing A27 between the junctions with Tye Lane and Mill Road and the Crossbush junction would be 'detrunked' and converted to a local road as part of the proposed scheme. It would then become part of the local highway network to be managed and maintained by the County Council in perpetuity.
- 2.13 National Highways considers that the bypass would help to: make journeys faster, safer and more reliable; create new jobs; and have a positive effect on existing businesses locally and across the region. National Highways' objectives for the scheme are to:
- reduce congestion, reduce travel time, and improve journey time reliability along the A27;
 - improve capacity of the A27 whilst supporting local planning authorities to manage the impact of planned economic growth;
 - deliver a scheme that minimises environmental impact and seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment through its high-quality design;
 - improve the safety of people travelling along the A27 and, consequently, the wider local road network;
 - improve accessibility for all users to local services and facilities;
 - ensure that customers and communities are fully considered throughout the design and delivery stages; and
 - respect the South Downs National Park and its special qualities in decision-making.
- 2.14 The broad timetable for the scheme is submission of the DCO application in late summer/early autumn 2022, followed by examination through to summer 2023 and a decision by the end of 2023; more information on the DCO process is set out in paragraphs 2.16-2.24.
- 2.15 If consent is awarded, construction of the bypass would not start until 2024 with the new road completed in 2027, followed by detrunking of the existing A27 (as outlined in paragraph 2.12 above).

DCO Process

- 2.16 There are six stages in the DCO process.

Pre-application

- 2.17 Before submitting an application for consent, potential applicants have a statutory duty to carry out consultation on their proposals; this is the current stage for the scheme. The consultation provides the best opportunity for consultees, such as the County Council, and third parties to try to influence the project, whether they agree with it, disagree with it, or believe that it could be improved.

Acceptance

- 2.18 The Acceptance stage begins when an applicant submits an application for development consent to PINS. Key documents submitted by the applicant will include the draft order, which will include a number of legislative clauses (relating to matters such as statutory nuisance, tree protection orders, and stopping-up of public rights of way) and 'requirements', which are akin to the conditions attached to planning permissions. Documents relating to mitigation of the scheme may also be submitted, for example, a Code of Construction Practice, Environmental Management Plans, S106 Planning Agreement, and topic-specific strategies.
- 2.19 There follows a period of up to 28 days (excluding the date of receipt of the application) for PINS, on behalf of the Secretary of State, to decide whether the application meets the standards required to be accepted for examination. This includes consideration of the adequacy of the applicant's consultation prior to submission.

Pre-examination

- 2.20 At this stage, the public will be able to register with PINS to become an 'Interested Party' by making a Relevant Representation, which is a written summary of a person's views on an application. As a statutory consultee, the County Council is automatically 'registered' as being an Interested Party. An Examining Authority is appointed at the pre-examination stage, and all Interested Parties will be invited to attend a Preliminary Meeting, run and chaired by the Examining Authority (i.e. a panel of inspectors).
- 2.21 Although there is no statutory timescale for this stage of the process, it usually takes approximately three months from the applicant's formal notification and publicity of an accepted application.

Examination

- 2.22 PINS has up to six months to carry out the examination. During this stage, Interested Parties are invited to provide more details of their views in writing. Careful consideration is given by the Examining Authority to all the important and relevant matters, including: compliance with all relevant policies (including the NPS); written representations; key documents; supporting evidence submitted by Interested Parties; and answers provided by them to the Examining Authority's questions (set out in writing or posed at hearing sessions).

Recommendation and Decision

- 2.23 PINS must prepare a report on the application to the relevant Secretary of State, including a recommendation, within three months of the close of the six-month Examination stage. The relevant Secretary of State then has a further three months to decide whether to grant or refuse development consent.

Post decision

- 2.24 Once a decision has been issued by the relevant Secretary of State, there is a six-week period in which the decision may be challenged in the High Court. This process of legal challenge is known as Judicial Review.

Role of the County Council

Pre-Application

- 2.25 In March 2021, PINS asked the County Council, as a statutory consultee, to comment on a scoping request by National Highways, the purpose of which was to identify the information to be provided in the Environmental Statement (ES), which will be part of the DCO submission); officers made detailed technical comments in response. In April 2021, PINS issued a Scoping Opinion, which is binding on National Highways.
- 2.26 In advance of an application for consent being submitted, National Highways is undertaking formal consultation on the proposed scheme and the PEIR, which identifies the likely significant impacts of the scheme and any required mitigation. The [Non-Technical Summary \(NTS\)](#) of the PEIR is on National Highways' consultation [website](#). As identified above, this is a key stage in the process and the County Council's suggested response, for which approval is sought, is set out in paragraphs 2.36-2.108 below.
- 2.27 It should be noted that, as a statutory consultee in the DCO process, the County Council is required to consider the proposed scheme and the PEIR on their merits regardless of the views that the Authority has expressed in response to previous consultations by Highways England on options to improve the A27 at Arundel (summarised in paragraphs 2.1-2.9 of this report).

Submission

- 2.28 If an application is submitted, the County Council, as a statutory consultee, will be expected to engage in the post-submission stages of the process.
- 2.29 As part of the acceptance process, the County Council will be asked to comment whether the pre-submission consultation undertaken by National Highways accords with their SoCC. In addition to any concerns that the County Council may have, it must also consider the views of any third parties that consider the consultation to be inadequate. Accordingly, delegated authority is sought for officers to approve the County Council's 'adequacy of consultation' response.

Examination

- 2.30 If the submission is accepted by PINS, the County Council will be invited to submit a written representation and a Local Impact Report (LIR - see paragraph 2.31). It will also be expected to negotiate with National Highways on the DCO requirements, any S106 Agreement, and the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG - see paragraph 2.32).
- 2.31 In deciding whether to grant or to refuse development consent, the Secretary of State is required to have regard to LIR submitted by local authorities. An LIR is a technical document defined as "*a report in writing giving details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area (or any part of that area)*". Provided that it fits within this definition, the structure and content of an LIR is a matter for each local authority.
- 2.32 It is also anticipated that a SoCG will be submitted by the applicant. The SoCG will identify issues where it is considered that the signatories agree with the applicant about the impacts of the proposed development. The contents of the final SoCG can only be agreed by the County Council following the conclusion of discussions with the applicant about the key issues and the finalising of the Authority's LIR.

2.33 Accordingly, delegated authority is sought for officers to prepare and submit the necessary responses and documents and to negotiate with the applicant in support of the County Council's formal consultation response. Delegated authority is also sought for officers to attend the examination hearings and to answer the Examining Authority's questions in support of the County Council's position.

Post-Decision

2.34 Although the County Council will not be responsible for determining the application for consent, it can play a formal role in the post-decision approvals process by becoming a 'relevant authority' for the discharge requirements in the DCO (if it is granted). The legislation allows there to be more than one relevant authority and the final decision rests with the Secretary of State but, if requested to do so by National Highways, it would help to give the County Council some control over implementation of the scheme.

2.35 Therefore, 'in principle' approval is sought for the County Council becoming a relevant authority for the discharge of requirements for the scheme (if an order is made). This matter will need to be the subject of pre-decision discussions with National Highways about the work that will need to be undertaken by the County Council and the recovery of costs associated with that work.

Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR)

2.36 Officers have undertaken a detailed analysis of the PEIR, considering likely significant impacts (both direct and indirect) and whether those impacts are considered to be positive, negative, or neutral (taking into account any proposed mitigation measures). Consideration has also been given to whether further work could be undertaken by National Highways, including mitigation measures, to address issues identified as being significantly negative.

2.37 The following paragraphs address the key issues in relation to the proposals presented at this formal consultation stage. Following some general, overarching comments (including about technical and community engagement), key issues on a topic-by-topic basis are identified.

2.38 Approval is sought for the comments in paragraphs 2.36-2.108 and the detailed technical comments on the PEIR in Appendix C to be submitted as the County Council's response to the formal consultation.

General Comments

2.39 The County Council acknowledges that the objectives of the A27 Arundel Bypass scheme closely align with the priorities in the Authority's Corporate Plan ('Our Council Plan 2021-2025'), West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026, and Economy Plan 2020-2024. Nevertheless, any proposals for highway improvements on the scale proposed must be carefully and sensitively designed with particular attention being paid to significant impacts on the economy, local communities, and the environment.

2.40 Arundel, and the wider area around the town, is a sensitive location with a long-standing history of difficulty in securing improvements to the strategic road network. Therefore, the County Council considers that proposals for a scheme in this location should include not only the highest standard of exemplar design

and mitigation but also the opportunity to enhance the surrounding environment and leave a positive legacy for the future.

- 2.41 The proposed scheme would lead to both beneficial and adverse impacts to a range of communities and environmental receptors surrounding the proposals. Therefore, the merits need to be judged by taking careful account of all considerations, particularly the significant economic, social, and environmental impacts.
- 2.42 The County Council considers that National Highways must provide a more robust and transparent evidence base across a number of topic areas, including the necessary traffic modelling, so that the likely significant environmental effects of the proposals can be better understood by stakeholders and local communities. This needs to be presented for there to be confidence that the design of the proposed scheme and the package of mitigation and enhancement measures has been influenced by the assessment work undertaken. At present, the material presented as part of statutory consultation does not allow for this to be understood in full.
- 2.43 Therefore, although the County Council gives 'in principle' support to the current scheme for an A27 Arundel Bypass, there are a number of matters of concern that need to be satisfactorily addressed by National Highways in advance of submission of the DCO application. These include:
- the requirement for transport-related technical documents, including: a Transport Assessment (TA); a design audit; a local model validation report; a traffic forecasting report; and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP);
 - further engagement about concerns of adverse impacts resulting from the re-distribution of traffic on local roads during the operational phase;
 - clarity about elements of the construction phase, including: compounds; laydown and materials storage locations and layout; haul routes; the requirement for a concrete batching plant; and the construction programme;
 - the de-trunking strategy and its role in providing mitigation and wider enhancement measures (including biodiversity, recreation, and landscape/visual);
 - understanding how local people and supply chains can benefit from the construction, including through new employment and training opportunities, and more detailed consideration of the potential impact on local businesses and potential mitigation of any adverse impacts;
 - further analysis and scrutiny of adverse impacts on local communities relating to noise and air quality from both construction and operational phases;
 - consultation on a number of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodologies, including: a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA); a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA); a historic environment baseline assessment; a baseline settings assessment; ecological surveys; an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA); a Health Impact Assessment (HIA); a Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment Report (WCHAR); and a Public Rights of Way Strategy (PRoWS);

- the scope for enhancement measures, including to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and to ecological habitats through a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) approach, over and above those required to mitigate impacts;
- further detail about the mitigation options being considered to reduce the impact on the national carbon budget and measures for climate change adaptation and resilience;
- the adequacy of funding to mitigate the adverse impacts of the scheme, including on the local road network; and
- responses to the technical queries raised in Appendix C.

2.44 Therefore, the County Council will continue to engage with National Highways, particularly in the post-consultation/pre-submission period, to seek to influence the design and to avoid and mitigate any adverse impacts. This dialogue will also aim to maximise opportunities and enable the best possible outcomes for the local communities and other sensitive receptors that would be most affected by the construction and operational impacts of the scheme.

Technical Engagement

2.45 The County Council notes that Government guidance on the pre-application stage of the DCO process emphasises the benefits that the early involvement of local authorities (and communities and statutory consultees) can bring. Therefore, although it was requested a number of times, it is concerned that insufficient technical information was provided by National Highways in advance of publication of the PEIR and that there has been insufficient time for officers to challenge and scrutinise the technical documentation that has now been presented. Furthermore, it is disappointing that a more comprehensive evidence base has not been provided through the publication of the PEIR to enable stakeholders (including the County Council) to fully consider and comment on the proposals at this stage.

Community Engagement

2.46 As a statutory consultee, the County Council had the opportunity to comment on the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) in November 2021. Although the range of consultation methods proposed was welcomed, the County Council is disappointed National Highways has not produced more engaging consultation material for the public and key user groups to respond to it at this stage. Apart from the video flyover, there is a lack of detailed visualisations, viewpoint specific photomontages, and illustrative sections to communicate benefits and potential impacts to a wider audience.

2.47 Local concerns raised with the County Council during the consultation period about the methods of engagement (as documented in the published SoCC) will be considered as evidence for inclusion in the County Council's post-submission 'adequacy of consultation' response (see paragraph 2.29).

Assessment of Alternatives

2.48 The PEIR lacks sufficient detail about how environmental criteria have influenced the decision-making process, specifically with regard to the development of the Grey Route. In 2019, the County Council raised concerns that the Grey Route (option 5BV1) did not offer the best balance between traffic, economic and social benefits and environmental impacts. Although the

PEIR states that "*Environmental effects have been considered during this appraisal process*", a much clearer narrative is needed to explain how the environment has influenced the design process.

- 2.49 In responding, the County Council requested that consideration be given to all consultation responses before the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) was made. Therefore, it expected to see a much more transparent presentation and detailed analysis of feedback within the PEIR, including how the responses had influenced the design. This must be included within the Consultation Report that will be submitted as part of the DCO application.

Proposed Scheme

- 2.50 In addition to key issues summarised on a topic-by-topic basis in the following sections, the following paragraphs address some key aspects relating to the design of the scheme.
- 2.51 The PEIR gives very little detail on the construction phase of the scheme, including information relating to haul routes, access for construction vehicles, layout, and the rationale for the location of construction compounds/laydown areas. Also, although the PEIR highlights the potential need for a concrete batching plant, no further details are given. Construction phase information is needed to give stakeholders confidence that potential impacts, which may be in place for the duration of the works (estimated from 2024 to 2027) have been appropriately assessed and mitigated.
- 2.52 The County Council wants to see a greater emphasis on the de-trunking strategy as a key element of the scheme; to date, it has not been presented in any detail to stakeholders. This could provide many opportunities to mitigate adverse impacts experienced elsewhere in the scheme and provide enhancements to the area. Not only is there potential for biodiversity benefits, but there is also an ideal opportunity for benefits to be realised for the local community, such as to Non-Motorised Users (NMU), and there should be strong engagement on the future use of the detrunked section of the existing A27.
- 2.53 The County Council is pleased to see the inclusion of a viaduct in the proposals, instead of a potential embankment crossing the floodplain. However, there are still concerns about the design and placement of the structure, and future work needs to involve specialist design input, as well as that of stakeholders, to ensure the viaduct is both sensitively designed and informed by the EIA.
- 2.54 The County Council welcomes the embedded mitigation proposed through the design process, including the introduction of a 50mph speed limit that, with a tighter road geometry, will allow a reduction in land take and overall environmental impact at the eastern extent of the scheme. However, the County Council wants to see more detail provided on the key crossing points and how the scheme can be further sensitively designed to reduce impacts upon those communities that live and work in close proximity to the proposals.
- 2.55 Overall, the County Council expects the highest standard of design, which must incorporate a clear design narrative for each element. The design must outline to stakeholders and the community how the assessment work undertaken will mitigate adverse impacts and communicate benefits through wide-ranging enhancement measures that go above and beyond those required to mitigate the scheme.

Traffic and Transport

- 2.56 The information published in the PEIR enables a very limited understanding of the impacts of the scheme on the transport network. There is insufficient information about the impacts of the scheme on the transport network to confirm whether the proposed scheme is acceptable to the County Council from a transport perspective.
- 2.57 To determine whether it is acceptable from a transport perspective, the County Council requests that, as a minimum, the following evidence base and further information is provided:
- a Transport Assessment (TA) detailing the impacts of the scheme (including cumulative impacts with other planned network changes and planned development) on the transport network and, if necessary, identifying the mitigation measures that will be needed as part of the proposals to ameliorate any severe impacts on the transport network, together with arrangements for ongoing monitoring after the scheme has opened;
 - a design audit detailing the standards that have been applied to different aspects of the scheme and, if necessary, specifying any departures from standards;
 - a local model validation report detailing the process for building the transport model and the scheme's performance against all relevant validation criteria;
 - a traffic forecasting report detailing the process for building the forecast demand matrices, key assumptions, and outputs; and
 - a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).
- 2.58 Based on the traffic flow change diagram presented in the Consultation Brochure, it is clear that there are positive and negative effects from a traffic perspective. The increase in traffic flow on The Street and Eastergate Lane, Walberton is one of the unwelcome effects of the scheme and must be adequately assessed. The impact of the scheme on the A29 Fontwell Avenue and areas to the east of the scheme are unclear and require further investigation. In order to understand the issues and the extent to which they can be mitigated, the information requested should include diagrams detailing link flow changes and models (or other suitable technical information) showing the performance of the following junctions in each assessment year:
- A27/A284 'Crossbush' junction (including any assumptions about interactions with the Crossbush service station);
 - A27/A29 'Fontwell' junctions (east and west);
 - A27/B2233 Crockerhill junction;
 - A284/A259 'Lyminster Bypass/Fitzalan Rd' junction;
 - A29/A259 junctions;
 - A27/A280 'Patching' junction;
 - A24/A280 'Findon' junction; and
 - A259/A2032 'Goring Crossways' junction.
- 2.59 Based on the information presented in the Consultation Brochure, it is apparent that the performance of the A27 Fontwell junctions is one of the reasons for some of the undesirable traffic effects of the proposed scheme. The

improvements at A27/A29 'Fontwell West' junction that are being delivered as part of planned development, were not designed to cater for a scenario that included an A27 Arundel Bypass. Poor performance of these junctions has the potential to degrade the benefits of the project and lead to rat-runs through adjacent communities. Therefore, the County Council requests that National Highways prioritises the identification of improvements at the A27 Fontwell junctions and inclusion of suitable measures in a suitable investment programme as soon as is practically possible.

- 2.60 There continues to be significant local interest in the addition of a junction between Ford Road and the proposed scheme to facilitate future planned development (that is, both permitted development and allocated sites) in this part of Arun District. There is also concern that the traffic forecasts may not accurately represent the level and distribution of development that is planned in the adopted Arun Local Plan; therefore, the transport assessment needs to take account of all planned development through the use of appropriate sensitivity tests. Although it is recognised that it is not the role of the scheme to mitigate potential future (unplanned) development, the design should not preclude the addition of a junction at some point in the future, if sufficient development comes forward to justify a new junction. Therefore, National Highways should ensure the design, particularly of the viaduct and Tortington Lane overbridge, allows the addition of a new junction with Ford Road (with south facing slip-roads) without the need to substantially modify the scheme.

Socio-Economics

- 2.61 Strategic improvements to the A27 at Arundel are an economic priority for the County Council because increased capacity and improved reliability and safety on the strategic road network will help to increase the competitiveness of local businesses as they recover and grow and help local people access well-paid employment. Improved connectivity within the County and with adjoining economic areas along the coast will also help to create the right conditions for inward investment, enterprise, and innovation in West Sussex.
- 2.62 Therefore, the County Council wants to see a wider analysis of the economic impacts of the proposed scheme and the extent to which it will address challenges around the competitiveness of the coastal economy including: productivity; access to customer and labour markets; attractiveness of the area for business growth and entrepreneurship; access for visitors to the coast and the South Downs National Park; and the regeneration of coastal towns.
- 2.63 The Council also expects to see a plan to ensure that local people and supply chains benefit from the construction, including through new employment and training opportunities (including a plan to encourage apprenticeships, work experience and internships). More detailed consideration of the impacts on local businesses and potential mitigation of any adverse impacts is also required.

Air Quality

- 2.64 The PEIR states that there "*is a risk of temporary adverse impacts from dust emissions during the construction works at residential properties and designated habitats located close to the scheme*". However, it also states that it is unlikely that these impacts will be significant, given that "*control measures will be implemented throughout the construction phase in accordance with the*

EMP [Environmental Management Plan]". Therefore, it is disappointing that National Highways has not produced a first draft EMP to outline these measures and to allow stakeholders to scrutinise the detail at this stage.

- 2.65 Further assessment of impacts to air quality, including taking account of traffic re-routing patterns due to construction phase traffic management and Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements, has not been undertaken as details of the construction phase have not been presented. Therefore, the County Council is concerned that there remains a risk there could be changes that could worsen air quality; this requires an evaluation of whether predicted effects are potentially significant.
- 2.66 The scheme would result in reduced traffic flows through Arundel and Storrington due to traffic travelling on the bypass and relieving pressure on some other roads. Therefore, residential properties within these areas are likely to experience an improvement in local air quality. However, some detrimental air quality impacts are expected near to the scheme and along the wider A27 corridor as a result of the expected increase in traffic flows, including around the Crossbush Junction, in some areas of Walberton, in Worthing (east of the scheme), and between Avisford and Chichester (west of the scheme). Until the evidence base and further assessment has been provided and scrutinised by the County Council (including the required TA), likely levels of impacts cannot be predicted with certainty and required mitigation packages cannot be identified.

Cultural Heritage

- 2.67 The County Council is concerned that the scheme could result in adverse effects to a number of designated heritage assets, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas. It will also affect archaeological features, historic landscapes, and (as-yet) unidentified heritage assets (including deposits of geoarchaeological and paleoenvironmental interest).
- 2.68 The intention of close cooperation between the LVIA and heritage is welcomed and the identification of viewpoints from selected heritage assets is also positive. However, there is a lack of clarity with regard to the remits and methodologies of the LVIA and heritage settings, and the methodology by which the heritage assets included for viewpoints were selected. This issue is compounded by the fact that the heritage settings assessment baseline work has not yet been undertaken/issued. The contribution made by setting, and therefore by existing views, to the significance of any given heritage asset is not yet understood. It has not been agreed by the County Council that these represent the final selection and additional viewpoints may be required once further details are known.
- 2.69 National Highways is undertaking a suite of surveys and investigations (for example, geoarchaeological monitoring, trial trench evaluation, and geophysical survey) prior to the DCO application; this early survey work is welcomed. The County Council had expected the preliminary results of some of these surveys to be included, even in draft form, within the PEIR baseline. Likewise, neither the historic environment baseline assessment nor the baseline settings assessment work appear to have been undertaken to date. These baselines could have been undertaken in draft format based on the existing information held in the West Sussex Historic Environment Record (WSHER) and other readily available sources, especially in the case of baseline settings assessment

for designated heritage assets. Undertaking these initial stages of assessment could have allowed further refinement and more accurate predictions of likely significant effects within the PEIR chapter.

- 2.70 Assessing the significance of higher-value likely sensitive receptors would have allowed a more accurate gauge of likely effects; for example, the current assessment of the impact on Arundel Castle is simply "*Permanent adverse effects associated with the visibility of the Scheme within the landscape setting of the asset*". The opportunity has been missed to further understand and quantify the likely effects on this and other key sensitive receptors, for example, an assessment of the precise contribution made by views to and from Arundel Castle across the Arun Valley floodplain, and the sensitivity of this aspect of the Castle's setting.
- 2.71 The PEIR identifies the heritage assets likely to suffer significant adverse effects arising from the scheme (accepting that a much wider selection of assets will suffer adverse effects at a level below this threshold). However, in the absence of the baseline assessments, it is not possible for the County Council to agree the completeness of the list of heritage assets nor the accuracy of the assigned values. Some key assets located in close proximity to the route are not included on the list, for example, Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Areas and (at present) unidentified archaeological features identified by ongoing trial trench evaluation. The County Council expects to see the detailed assessment of heritage assets included within the ES, including indirect effects resulting from, for example, through traffic and noise.
- 2.72 Although it is not located within the redline boundary for the scheme, Blacksmiths' Corner Roman Villa is identified as a heritage asset likely to suffer 'permanent loss or truncation of remains during construction of the scheme'. This is of great concern and the loss of the villa and/or any directly associated remains is not acceptable.
- 2.73 The current historic environment baseline assessment of the route corridor and Study Area is extremely light touch. It is disappointing that the submitted baseline does not include predictions of the archaeological potential of the various sections of the route, especially given that the preliminary results of the ongoing trial trenching are available to inform this (as well as the Archaeological Notification Areas available within the WSHER data). Further fleshing out of the baseline might have allowed more accurate assessments of likely significance of effects.
- 2.74 There are a number of areas of the design that will require continued discussion and assessment, as identified in more detail in Appendix C. The main areas of concern include adverse change to the settings of a number of high value heritage assets (including conservation areas) with the construction of the scheme, the close proximity of the scheme to the Church of St Mary's (at Binsted), and the potential for adverse effects on this Grade II* heritage asset. The location of the Yapton Lane compound would result in the total or partial loss of archaeological heritage assets identified during the recent geophysical survey and ongoing trial trenching. Although the character, date, and significance of the assets has not yet been fully assessed, they are likely to be of prehistoric date and of at least local to regional significance. The necessity of the loss of these archaeological features, purely for the siting of a temporary construction compound, has not been demonstrated to the County Council and alternative locations for this compound should be explored.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)

- 2.75 The County Council has not yet agreed to the LVIA methodology proposed, contrary to the statement within the PEIR, which states that *"the methodology has been discussed and agreed with various stakeholders during the environment focus groups for the Scheme and National Highways Landscape Policy Advisors"*. In particular, the County Council has not commented on the criteria defined by National Highways for ascribing value and susceptibility to change to individual landscape and visual receptors.
- 2.76 The LVIA does not address the pre-consultation, technical comments made by the County Council regarding the selection of Local Landscape Character Areas (LCA). Noting that analysis of the landscape context should be used as an important driver for the design, it will be important for stakeholders to see the technical work to verify that the 'parent' LCA studies have not been misrepresented.
- 2.77 The PEIR does not make clear which individual elements that contribute to landscape character will be examined in the LVIA. This needs to include changes to surface landform, loss of vegetation, severance of the Green Infrastructure network, loss of ecosystems services, severance of the PRow network, changes to features that have endured through time (which would affect indicators of Historic Landscape Character), changes to the experiential qualities of the landscape, including tranquility, and key/valued views.
- 2.78 As noted in the County Council's Scoping Response (March 2021), the criteria for determining landscape value has not been clearly outlined and should follow those set out in the Landscape Institute's Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment version 3. The effects of severance and diversion of PRow (including the erosion of access, loss of public amenity, and change to the experiential qualities of the landscape) should also be considered.
- 2.79 The County Council has been engaging with National Highways to agree the locations of the viewpoints and visualisations and continues to pursue agreement on such with a view to examining potential effects. The PEIR does not examine the threshold for a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA), and the County Council expect this to be discussed in due course with stakeholders. Consideration also needs to be given to the effect of light reflecting from windscreens. A night-time assessment should also be undertaken to consider light spill from fixed lighting and also from vehicle headlights.
- 2.80 The County Council wants to see a more holistic approach taken to the design of the scheme where it is led by an understanding of the landscape and its sensitivities. The PEIR fails to demonstrate how the design is informed by the local landscape character or to *"develop a clear and engaging design narrative ... which captures the vision of the scheme, [and] demonstrates how its component parts come together as a whole – including structures, landscape, ecology, connectivity – and illustrates how different user groups will engage with the scheme"* as recommended by the Design Council (in a letter dated 09/07/21). The County Council recommends that National Highways reviews the Design Council's comments and seeks to address the many valid points that it made.

Arboriculture

- 2.81 The County Council is concerned about potential habitat loss as a direct result of the scheme. Losses will be permanent and irreplaceable in the case of high quality, veteran, and ancient trees. Any restored or replacement habitat can take many decades to provide similar levels of ecosystem functioning as that which was lost. The assessment presented within the PEIR is only indicative, as surveys are currently being undertaken and no draft Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is available.
- 2.82 Although, it is appreciated that surveys are continuing and full details of the impacts are unknown (especially for cumulative and in-combination effects), the imprecise language including '*as far as is practicable*' gives considerable leeway for loss and damage of habitat.
- 2.83 Given that the cumulative zone of influence for biodiversity is very extensive, mitigation and enhancement should be at a landscape scale, beyond the Order Limits, to restore and create habitat connectivity. Engaging with existing initiatives along the route and beyond (for example, the 'Weald to Waves' project) could strengthen and connect these, providing 'additionality'.
- 2.84 It is critical that long-term future maintenance and management of assets is factored into the overall scheme, especially all of the proposed mitigation for habitat loss, which must be properly resourced and robustly monitored. Funding such mitigation must not be reliant on other mechanisms and must be secured through the DCO.

Biodiversity

- 2.85 The aspiration of a landscape and environment-led approach with disciplines considered together in an integrated Landscape and Environmental Masterplan is welcomed. However, permanent and harmful habitat severance, with impacts on a range of species including bats, hazel dormice, and water voles, is of major concern to the County Council.
- 2.86 Until the detailed baseline ecological data has been presented, it is difficult to assess impacts, proposed mitigation, and enhancement measures at this stage. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey of all habitats within 100m of the centreline of the scheme was undertaken in 2020/21. However, concern is raised about the narrow corridor included, given that the survey will need to inform mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures both during the construction and operational phases.
- 2.87 The mitigation measures currently designed into the scheme are lacking in detail and need to be developed going forward. Post-construction ecological monitoring and long-term habitat management will be key to the success of any package of mitigation, compensation, and enhancement measures.
- 2.88 The PEIR and associated documents lack detail on the design of the two green bridges, the two bat underpasses, the viaduct crossing of the River Arun and Arun floodplain (Arun Valley Viaduct), and landscaping plans. Therefore, it is difficult to envisage how each will function and integrate into the landscape. These aspects will need to be addressed in much more depth since they are fundamental elements of the biodiversity mitigation package.
- 2.89 The area is of national importance to bats and habitat severance is of major concern. Therefore, the design and location of the green bridges and underpasses must seek to maximise habitat connectivity for bats, both for

commuting and foraging. The current plans for the green bridges do not give confidence and evidence that this will be achieved. Concern is raised that the green bridges are attempting to be too multi-functional, serving as vehicle crossings and footbridges, in addition to green bridges; this could compromise their essential purpose as wildlife corridors. The County Council wants to see evidence of where this type of approach has been successful elsewhere in the UK.

- 2.90 Land has been identified for replacement flood storage to compensate for the loss of floodplain due to new structures, such as the viaduct piers and the embankment approaches to the bridges. The potential for designing and managing the replacement flood storage areas to maximise biodiversity is an area that needs more assessment and design, and discussions with stakeholders.
- 2.91 The de-trunking of the existing A27 should provide mitigation to help compensate for habitat severance. Re-connecting habitats, notably woodland, would provide wildlife corridors for the movement of bats, dormice, birds, and other fauna, for example at Binsted Wood and Rewell Wood. Without such measures, the proposals would make Binsted Wood very isolated from the surrounding landscape. De-trunking will also present opportunities for biodiversity enhancements, over and above those required to mitigate the impacts, which should be explored as part of the overall package.

Noise and Vibration

- 2.92 A quantitative assessment of noise and vibration impacts during construction has not been undertaken within the PEIR, due to the lack of construction phase information at this stage. Therefore, only a qualitative assessment has been carried, based on professional judgment and experience of other nationally significant road schemes. This makes scrutiny of the likely significant effects of the scheme, and requirements for mitigation, difficult to determine at this stage.
- 2.93 The County Council is concerned that the results of this qualitative assessment highlight that properties at risk of adverse effects include residential properties between Tye Lane and Yapton Lane, as well as properties close to the overbridges at Tye Lane, Yapton Lane, Binsted Lane and Tortington Lane. A quantitative assessment of noise and vibration impacts arising from construction works should be undertaken and the County Council would expect further consultation on the findings and required levels of mitigation for surrounding communities.
- 2.94 When the scheme is operational, the PEIR states that the largest potential increases in traffic noise are expected to be at properties in and around Walberton, particularly those close to Yapton Lane, Binsted, and Tortington. Increases in noise levels are also expected in the vicinity of Dalloway Road and Fitzalan Road in south Arundel and Lyminster Road, south and east of Crossbush Junction.
- 2.95 Along with some locations becoming quieter due to reductions in road traffic noise, there are also likely to be increases in noise in parts of Fontwell, Slindon, Arundel, Lyminster and Crossbush, as a result of traffic redistribution. The County Council expects to be consulted as assessment work develops and about mitigation measures to be embedded into the design. Concerns are again

raised about the potential adverse impacts of traffic redistribution once the bypass is operational.

- 2.96 However, until the evidence base and quantitative assessment work has been provided and scrutinised, likely impacts cannot be predicted with confidence and required level of mitigations discussed.

Population and Human Health

- 2.97 It is disappointing that a draft Health Impact Assessment (HIA) has not been undertaken, which would have enabled the risk and benefits of the scheme on population health to be evaluated by the County Council with greater rigour. There is also insufficient information in the PEIR to demonstrate how each phase of the project would impact on all sensitive receptors, such as schools within the study area, and what measures are incorporated into the design to prevent harm. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the effects of the scheme at this stage.
- 2.98 It is currently predicted that during the construction phase, there could be potential adverse in-combination effects (where combined impacts are felt) on residential properties in Walberton, Binsted, and Tortington, which are in close proximity to the scheme, as well as on education facilities including Walberton and Binsted C of E Primary School, Walberton Pre-School, and community facilities, including places of worship, village halls and medical facilities. Construction of the scheme would require permanent land take from a number of receptors, including five residential properties on Binsted Lane, which is likely to result in the permanent loss of these properties. However, little information is given to quantify the impacts and proposed mitigation.
- 2.99 The receptors listed above are also likely to experience adverse in-combination effects during the operational phase of the scheme due to the introduction of new dual-carriageway in an area previously occupied with smaller local roads. Concern is raised about the potential health impacts to communities in areas where there is likely to be an increase in traffic flows, which needs further understanding and assessment.
- 2.100 It is also predicted that there are likely to be beneficial in-combination effects associated with a reduction in road traffic on the existing A27, including on residential receptors at Havenwood Park and parts of Arundel, including Canada Road and the north end of Jarvis Road.
- 2.101 As individual topic assessments are only at a preliminary stage, the assessment of in-combination effects has not been presented in detail within the PEIR. This, along with a robust Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA), must be presented to inform the requirement for mitigation measures.
- 2.102 Concern is raised about the potential likely temporary adverse effects with respect to Non-Motorised Users (NMU) during the construction of the scheme. Little detail is given in the PEIR concerning mitigation measures, other than to keep access available '*where possible*'. The assessment of impacts presented are preliminary and qualitative, given that the NMU survey and a Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment Report (WCHAR) have not been presented as part of the PEIR.
- 2.103 A Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Strategy is required, setting out general principles around providing access, where possible, throughout construction and

when this is not, how access can still be retained along alternative routes. Long-term closures for approximately three-four years would have a very negative impact on local communities and recreational access to the South Downs National Park. Therefore, a clearer plan is required setting out how impacts will be minimised.

- 2.104 The County Council makes more detailed comments about impacts and potential opportunities for individual PRoW in Appendix C. Further work and consultation are needed on how the scheme can better integrate into the wider network of NMU facilities. For example, proposals for detrunking the A27, which is currently a point of severance for many users, and how the scheme could tie in with the Lyminster Bypass, to provide desirable access to the south.

Climate

- 2.105 The County Council is unable to comment fully as several key documents have not yet been presented. These include the traffic modelling data and TA, a Sustainability Assessment, a Preliminary Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment, the EMP, and the CTMP.
- 2.106 The presented suggestions on emission minimisation are inconsistent, with confused references to material re-use, electric vehicle charging points, and provision of green bridges. Although there is some focus on adaptation with reference to both infrastructure and use of technology, the County Council expects to see a greater emphasis on climate change adaptation and resilience.
- 2.107 Paragraph 5.17 of the NPS states that applicants should "*provide evidence of the carbon impact of the project and an assessment against the Government's carbon budgets*". Based on '*other national highways projects*', the PEIR states that it is expected that when the full impact assessment is undertaken, it will show that the scheme would be unlikely to affect the UK's ability to meet its overarching binding greenhouse gas reduction targets. Although emissions from highway schemes may only be 0.1% of the UK's overall budget, it is the cumulative effect of these projects that should be considered. Therefore, the County Council expects to see detail of the mitigation options to reduce the impact of the proposed scheme on the national carbon budget.

Fire and Rescue

- 2.108 The West Sussex Fire and Rescue Service is unable to comment on the potential impact of the scheme of the Fire Station located in Ford Road, Arundel (which is staffed by retained 'on call' personnel) because the necessary information is not currently available within the PEIR. The proposals suggest an increase in some localised traffic and congestion, when operational and during the construction phase, and a compound operating on land east of Ford Road. This may have an impact on response standards in this area and will require modelling work to be undertaken to assess potential effects. To enable this, the results of the full TA and the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) are required and consultation on the scheme need to be undertaken with the service to ensure that any potential adverse impacts on emergency responders can be minimised.

Next Steps

- 2.109 Following approval of the County Council's consultation response by Cabinet, the next steps in the DCO process are as follows (with indicative timings):

- post-consultation engagement (March-July 2022): discussions with National Highways about the matters of concern raised in this report, including consideration of new or revised evidence.
- submission (August 2022): National Highways submits its DCO application to PINS. The County Council has 14 days to submit its 'adequacy of consultation response' to PINS.
- pre-examination (September-November 2022): if the application is accepted by PINS, negotiations with National Highways will continue about the DCO requirements, any S106 Agreement, and the preparation of a SoCG.
- examination (December 2022-May 2023): examination of the DCO application and the representations and submissions of 'interested parties' (including the County Council's written representation and LIR). As necessary, officers comment on third party written representations, attend the examination hearings, and answer the Panel's questions.
- examination report (June-August 2023): PINS reports to the relevant Secretary of State, recommending whether to grant or refuse development consent.
- decision (September-November 2023): the Secretary of State makes the decision to grant or refuse development consent.
- post-decision (December 2023-January 2024): there is a six-week period for Judicial Review.

3 Other options considered (and reasons for not proposing)

- 3.1 As a 'host' authority, one of the responsibilities of the County Council is to respond to the current formal consultation. The responsibilities also include: discussing the DCO requirements and S106 Agreement; providing an 'Adequacy of Consultation' response; preparing SoCG and LIR; and submitting written representations and participating in the examination process.
- 3.2 There is the option to not take on the role of being a relevant authority with responsibility for the discharge of requirements (if an order is granted). However, it seems sensible for it to undertake this task for the project (if costs are recovered) because it would give the Authority some control over implementation of the scheme.

4 Consultation, engagement, and advice

- 4.1 Internal officers have been involved in the analysis of the PEIR and preparation of the detailed comments on the PEIR in Appendix C.
- 4.2 Joint working, including the identification of key issues, has taken place with the Arun District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority. Joint working with those authorities will continue, as necessary, for the next stages of the DCO process.
- 4.3 An all-member briefing was held on 26 January 2022 at which an outline of the scheme and its impacts (and proposed mitigation) was given by National Highways, with the opportunity for questions and answers.
- 4.4 On 24 February 2022, the draft consultation response was considered by the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee. The following points were raised for consideration by Cabinet – that the Committee:

1. Recognised the importance of residents having confidence in the process, and the transparency of the process.
2. Expressed strong concerns around the lack of access and exit points on the proposed bypass.
3. Was disappointed by the lack of evidence provided by National Highways.
4. Acknowledged the deep concerns from local members about the impact of the proposed bypass on local villages (for example, Fontwell and Walberton) and the natural habitat.
5. Raised concerns about the financial consequences to the County Council of the impact of the proposed bypass on the local road network.
6. Felt that the proposed bypass might only move the traffic congestion, from Crossbush to east of Fontwell.
7. Raised concerns about the traffic modelling, in particular the projections for the number of new houses, which seemed to be well below the ambitions set out in local plans.
8. Acknowledged that the Council's policy is to have the bypass but questioned the choice of route selected (the Grey route). The Committee had strong concerns about the wording in the draft response around the Council expressing 'in principle' support for the Grey route. Different views were expressed, as follows:
 - although the Council should support a bypass that complements Council policies, it should not support the proposed route, having previously supported a different route and given the lack of information provided for the Grey route by National Highways.
 - the Council should support a bypass in principle, but support for the proposed route should be contingent on the concerns raised in the draft consultation response being adequately addressed, despite it not being the Council's preferred route.
 - the Council should support a bypass in principle, but the information provided by National Highways does not allow the Council to reach an informed view on the Grey route.
 - the Council should support a bypass in principle but reiterate that the Grey route is not its preferred option. There remain a number of significant questions with the proposed route, as set out in the consultation response.

4.5 In response to the Committee's comments, it is considered that most of the points of concern have been adequately addressed in the draft consultation response and will be the subject of dialogue with National Highways in the post-consultation/pre-submission period. However, some amendments have been made to strengthen the response by including references to: concern about the adequacy of funding to mitigate the adverse impacts of the scheme (including on the local road network); and the transport assessment taking account of all planned development (both permitted development and the development of sites allocated in the adopted Arun Local Plan).

5 Finance

5.1 Although the County Council has responsibilities as a statutory consultee, there is no requirement for National Highways to fund this additional work. However,

the County Council has agreed in principle to a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with National Highways that contributes towards the cost of the Authority engaging in the DCO process. This will enable the consultation work required to be delivered within existing budgets.

- 5.2 If a DCO is confirmed, a new PPA with National Highways will be sought in relation to the County Council discharging its requirements.

6 Risk implications and mitigations

- 6.1 There are no risks associated with responding to the consultation and engaging in the next stages of the DCO process.

Risk	Mitigating Action (in place or planned)
None	n/a

7 Policy alignment and compliance

- 7.1 Corporate Plan (Our Council Plan 2021-2025) – ‘A sustainable and prosperous economy’, one of the four priorities in the Plan, is key to the future wellbeing of West Sussex; this is especially important given the ongoing economic impact of COVID-19. Strategic improvements to the A27 at Arundel will help to ensure that businesses are supported to recover and grow, that local people have access to well-paid employment, and that the conditions are right for enterprise and innovation will have a positive impact on the long-term health of residents and on the potential of young people. Therefore, National Highways’ scheme for an Arundel Bypass aligns, in principle, with this priority. Responding to the challenges of climate change underpins the four priorities in the Plan; paragraph 7.4 of this report addresses this matter.
- 7.2 West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026 – improving the A27 at Arundel (and at Chichester and Worthing & Lancing) is the County Council’s highest priority for transport as identified in the Plan. The improvements are needed to increase capacity, to improve reliability and safety, to help increase the competitiveness of local businesses, and to attract investment. Therefore, National Highways’ scheme for an Arundel Bypass aligns, in principle, with this priority.
- 7.3 Economy Plan 2020-2024 – Theme 2 of the Plan is to ‘protect and revive the coastal towns’ of West Sussex. One of the headline actions under this theme is to work with central Government, Highways England, and local stakeholders to identify deliverable schemes to improve the A27 bottlenecks at Chichester, Arundel, Worthing & Lancing alongside public transport improvements. Therefore, National Highways’ scheme for an Arundel Bypass aligns, in principle, with this theme.
- 7.4 Climate Change – although focussed on the County Council’s activity, the Authority’s [Climate Change Strategy](#) is supportive of actions that reduce carbon associated with road-based transport, including through the increased use of sustainable transport options. As identified in paragraphs 2.103-2.105 of this report, the potential impacts of National Highways’ scheme for an Arundel Bypass on climate change are uncertain at this stage. However, in accordance with the NPS for National Highways, it is noted that the carbon impact of the scheme will be assessed at a national level, against the Government’s carbon budgets, not at a local level.

- 7.5 Legal Implications – the County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process. It has specific responsibilities as a ‘host’ authority, including: being a consultee on the draft SoCC [undertaken]; responding to the scoping request [undertaken]; responding to the formal consultation [this stage]; discussing the DCO requirements and S106 Agreement; providing an ‘Adequacy of Consultation’ response; preparing SoCG and LIR; and submitting written representations and participating in the examination process. The recommendations in this report seek to ensure that the County Council delivers its responsibilities for the current and remaining stages of the process.
- 7.6 Equalities – not applicable, as it is a response to a consultation by an external organisation.
- 7.7 Crime and Disorder, Public Health, and Social Value – not applicable.

Matt Davey

Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Contact Officers

Michael Elkington, Head of Planning Services, 0330 22 26463,
michael.elkington@westsussex.gov.uk

Darryl Hemmings, Transport Planning and Policy Manager, 0330 22 26437,
darryl.hemmings@westsussex.gov.uk.

Appendices

Appendix A: Location Plan

Appendix B: Preliminary Landscape and Environmental Masterplan

Appendix C: Detailed comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Background papers

None