

Bob Lanzer
Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.

Telephone: 0330 22 22871
e-mail: bob.lanzer@westsussex.gov.uk

Room 102
County Hall
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RZ



www.westsussex.gov.uk

10 July 2018

To: Andrew Barrett-Miles
Chairman of Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee
By email

Dear Andrew,

Re: Build A Better A27

Thank you for the Committee's recent debate on 5 June 2018 and recommendations on the A27 Chichester Bypass Improvements and the County Council's submission to the Government's Roads Investment Strategy. As you will be aware, the County Council has subsequently submitted the Systra report to Highways England for them to review and we expect them to report their findings in autumn 2018.

In recent correspondence with a local resident and former specialist in transport scheme appraisal, it has been pointed out to me that some contributions to the Select Committee debate did not use the same terminology that is used in the Systra report. As a result, it has been put to me that the Select Committee was misled during the debate, so, for the avoidance of doubt, I would like to clarify two points that appear to have caused some concern and provide the Committee with an opportunity to share any concerns.

Firstly, the Systra report points out that despite the mitigation measures included in the Mitigated Northern Route, there will still be some residual impacts. The presence of residual impacts was not mentioned during the officers' introductory statement on the Mitigated Northern Route. I note that the officers' report stated in paragraph 4.8 that; "The environmental impacts of this option will be significant, even with carefully configured environmental mitigation measures and there may be some challenging business impacts particularly during construction."

Secondly, during the debate I referred to the potential for the Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) to increase as a result of the additional benefits associated with the Mitigated Northern Route. However, the Systra report indicates that in their view, the changes to the cost of the scheme are unlikely to materially affect the 'wider value for money' assessment. The wider value for money assessment would include an economic assessment and monetised BCR but additionally non-monetised wider economic and environmental impacts. Therefore, it would have been more accurate for me to refer to the potential for benefits to increase as part of a wider value for money assessment rather than a BCR.

Please would you pass these points of clarification onto members of the Committee so that they are aware of these points.

Although I do not consider that the Committee was misled on either of these points, I would be grateful for you to confirm in due course if you consider that to be the case.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bob Lanzer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the letter "z".

Bob Lanzer

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.