

A27 Corridor Feasibility Study

Stakeholder Reference Group Meeting

Date: 4th November 2014, 10:00am

Venue: Jurys Inn Brighton
101 Stroudley Road,
Brighton BN1 4DJ

Attendee	Organisation
Eike Ndiweni-Muller (Meeting Chair)	Department for Transport
Andrew Renaut	Brighton and Hove County Council
Cllr Ian Davey	Brighton and Hove County Council
Andy Beattie	South Downs National Park Authority
Geoff Copley	South Downs National Park Society
Iain Reeve	Coast to Capital LEP
Neil Border	West Sussex CC
Mark Sullivan	CPRE Sussex
Georgia Wrighton	CPRE Sussex
Derrick Coffee	Campaign for Better Transport
Chris Todd	Campaign for Better Transport
Tony Whitbread	Sussex Wildlife Trust/ Sussex Local Nature P'ship/ South Downs Network
Keith Wilcox	Hampshire County Council
Jon Wheeler	East Sussex County Council
James Harris	East Sussex County Council
Kathleen Covill	Natural England
Rebecca Pearson	Natural England
Cllr Caroline Ansell	Eastbourne Borough Council
Lisa Rawlinson	Eastbourne Borough Council
Karl Roberts	Arun District Council
James Appleton	Worthing DC Head of Planning
Robert King	Lewes DC
Bernadette McGuigan	Wealden DC
Marina Brigginsshaw	Wealden DC Planning Policy manager
Rosalyn St. Pierre	Norman Baker representative
Mark McFadden	Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce
Christina Ewbank	Alliance of Chambers in East Sussex
Trevor Leggo	Sussex and Surrey Association of Local Councils
Nick Herbert	MP for Arundel and South Downs
Stephen Lloyd MP	MP for Eastbourne

Other Attendees	Organisation
Carl Sutcliffe	Department for Transport
Paul Harwood	Highways Agency
Peter Phillips	Highways Agency
Theo Genis	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Thomas Pettyt	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Andrew Cleaver	Parsons Brinckerhoff

Meeting Minutes and Actions

Agenda Ref.		
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions.</p> <p>Eike Ndiweni-Muller welcomed attendees and explained that this would be the last meeting of this particular group for the purpose of the feasibility study. She reminded the Group of its role in informing the study work.</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes and actions from previous Reference Group meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and DfT provided updates on the actions detailed, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current transport data sources and SoCOMMS study information has been reviewed and considered; • Further discussions and analysis of South Downs National Park impacts have been undertaken; • A detailed assessment of short-listed options and associated sustainable transport packages has been undertaken; • Land-use planning issues have been further considered; • The option assessment approach has been reviewed; • Liaison with southern Rail over their future investment plans has been undertaken; and • The reasons for previous rejection of off-line proposals to the east of Lewes have been further considered. <p>Group members agreed the minutes to be an accurate reflection of the previous meeting.</p>	
3.	<p>Study Context and update on activities</p> <p>Eike Ndiweni-Muller reminded the Group that the work is progressing via three stages of which two are now complete, and the third is work in progress. Reporting of all will follow - likely to be published after the 3rd December 2014 Autumn Statement.</p> <p>Attendees were reminded of the need for responsible dissemination of information that is shared during meetings, particularly bearing in mind that it concerns work in progress about locally sensitive issues. The information can be misrepresented if quoted out of context and this can cause unnecessary distress.</p>	

	<p>Eike Ndiweni-Muller noted that the assessment of options followed standard process and taken a proportionate approach as have all the 6 feasibility studies in hand. PB additionally pointed to the limitations of the available modelling tools.</p> <p>She reminded the Group of the objectives of the study and the hotspots prioritised during stage 1 and the options prioritised at Stage 2.</p>	
4.	<p>Overview of Stage 3</p> <p>During Stage 3 the team has assessed the prioritised options in terms of Affordability, Deliverability and Value for Money criteria. The study team explained that the Highways Agency had applied a consistent cost estimation process to all the feasibility studies, with cost estimates including a wide range of risk items.</p> <p>Theo Genis provided an overview of the travel characteristics data for the hotspots prioritised in Stage 1. This included details of through traffic and Annual Average Daily Traffic.</p> <p>Queries were raised about the definition of 'through traffic' and further detail was requested. The study team agreed that this information is to be made available in published study reports. Additional concerns were noted about the quantification of traffic 'rat running' away from the corridor in response to congestion for e.g. at Storrington. This was noted as an issue requiring further analysis.</p> <p>Options at each priority problem area were discussed and the following specific issues were raised:</p> <p><u>Arundel:</u></p> <p>The long list of options with costs estimates was shown relative to objectives. From subsequent discussion the following issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general comment about the crude nature of the assessment presented. • A discussion of whether the environmental impact of going through the National Park is more detrimental than going through Binsted. The concern of the residents of communities that could be affected by alignments around Arundel was explicitly raised. • Consideration of how wider economics have been incorporated into the assessment, with some doubt being expressed about the validity of local economic benefits. 	Study Team

- Queries on why route option C has the same scoring as options A and B when assessed against objectives, and whether this therefore means it is an equally valid option.
- The need to expand on the detail of the on-line sustainable transport package.
- A concern that Noise, Air Quality and visual intrusion impacts on the national park and local communities are underestimated.

It was noted that any option to be progressed to scheme stage would require environmental impact assessment. Particular concern was raised in relation to evaluation of the environmental impacts for Binsted and Warburton.

Worthing:

The long list of options was presented relative to the objectives. The following queries were raised whilst discussing the option assessment process:

- Tunnel options were accepted as unrealistic in value for money terms
- The extent of through traffic was again a subject for discussion with this accepted as impacting directly on scheme viability
- Agreed the general need for a more comprehensive assessment of scheme impacts. This will need to include the impacts of 'rat running' etc. on towns such as Littlehampton
- Accepted that environmental impacts have not been monetised
- Agreed the need to further consider the deliverability of on-line schemes proposals. Schemes identified as having potential to be deliverable within the highway boundary.
- Re-iterated the need for Arundel and Worthing schemes to be considered together.

East of Lewes:

Theo Genis outlined the travel patterns East of Lewes and presented the work on considering options done to date. Options were presented relative to a high level assessment of their ability to address objectives.

Discussion again followed around long distance traffic data and the extent of change of travel demand over time. ESCC volunteered access to additional information if required. It was agreed that Census data on

Page 6 of 6

She noted the need to address unresolved issues, and pointed out that the preliminary nature of this work will influence how detailed the commitments may be in the Autumn statement.

Eike Ndiweni-Muller reminded the Group that this had been the last meeting scheduled for this Group for this purpose. She thanked everyone for their useful contributions throughout the study process and particularly for their patience during the meeting.

The need for sensitivity in the circulation of information shared in the meetings was re-emphasised also by other members of the Group.