

A27 Corridor Feasibility Study Stakeholder Reference Group Meeting

Date: 27th August 2014, 2:00pm
Venue: Cavendish Hotel
38 Grand Parade
Eastbourne BN21 4DH

Attendee	Organisation
Eike Ndiweni-Muller (Meeting Chair)	Department for Transport
Andy Beattie	South Downs National Park Authority
Trevor Beeston	South Downs National Park Society
Iain Reeve	Coast to Capital LEP
Pieter Montyn	West Sussex CC
Darryl Hemmings	West Sussex CC
Mark Sullivan	CPRE Sussex
Georgia Wrighton	CPRE Sussex
Derrick Coffee	Campaign for Better Transport
Jon Wheeler	East Sussex County Council
Kathleen Covill	Natural England
Cllr Caroline Ansell	Eastbourne Borough Council
Lisa Rawlinson	Eastbourne Borough Council
Steve Ankers	Policy Officer South Downs Society
Karl Roberts	Arun District Council
Robert King	Lewes DC
Rosalyn St. Pierre	Norman Baker representative
Mark McFadden	Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce
Trevor Leggo	Sussex and Surrey Association of Local Councils
Stephen Lloyd MP	MP for Eastbourne
Tim Laughton MP	MP for East Worthing and Shoreham

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

Meeting Minutes and Actions

Agenda Ref.		
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions.</p> <p>Eike Ndiweni-Muller welcomed attendees to the Stakeholder Reference Group meeting including new members (from Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce and Surrey and Sussex Association of Local Councils).</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes and actions from previous Reference Group meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and Eike provided updates on the actions detailed in the minutes, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DfT had invited Eastbourne Chamber of Commerce (in attendance) in response to calls for more business representation; • DfT is taking a proportionate approach to information provision for all feasibility studies by meeting with the Reference Group at each key stage of the study. On this occasion the presentation slides would not be circulated but there would be a record of the meeting. Other methods such as newsletters may be more relevant for project development that might follow after the feasibility study. • The next Reference Group meeting will be scheduled for October. • Tim Lawson (DfT) had written to Chris Todd to address specific comments on the initial scope of work. <p>Group members raised questions about the timetable for the work and whether documents circulated to the Reference Group could be shared more widely. Eike responded that the study is aiming to provide input for the Autumn Statement, that scoping documents for each feasibility study are published on the DfT's website and that the methodology document provided before the meeting could be shared with others.</p>	
3.	<p>Study Context and update on activities</p> <p>Eike reminded the Group of the background and purpose of the study, that the work is progressing in three stages of which two are now completed, and that the feasibility studies are being progressed alongside route strategies and will feed into the RIS (Road investment Strategy) particularly into the first RIS period (up to 2021) but also into further RIS periods.</p> <p>Queries were raised about how the proposals would be reported in the</p>	

	<p>Autumn Statement, and whether there would be any comparison between the data underpinning the study and the research provided in the SoCoMMS report.</p> <p>Eike stated that the format and level of detail could vary and would depend on the progress achieved by each study and Ministerial decision-making. The study team have drawn on the SoCoMMS findings, and the study team would provide a comparison showing the changes between the SoCoMMS study period and the present, based on traffic volumes along the route.</p> <p>Theo Genis reminded the Group of previous Reference Group meetings, namely that the first meeting approved the Terms of Reference and that the second reference group meeting in Worthing finalised the scoping document and agreed the objectives of the study.</p> <p>Theo also reminded the Group of the analysis which led the study to focus on three main hotspot locations along the corridor - Arundel, Worthing and East of Lewes – and that Chichester isn't a focus of this study as a scheme has already been identified by the HA. The study has looked at the three locations separately in order to find the best solution to the specific challenges at each location.</p>	Study Team
4.	<p>Overview of Stage 2</p> <p>Theo set out the methodology used during Stage 2 of the study (with reference to process note circulated prior to the meeting). Theo outlined analysis - using TEMPRO projected growth data - which demonstrated that substantive public transport initiatives would be required to achieve relatively small decreases in the volume of trips along the A27 due to modal shift to public transport modes. Future road traffic growth due to development in the region would negate the effects of modal shift, although public transport improvements could have a greater impact on modal shift in some areas.</p> <p>At each of the three locations the study team identified a long list of proposals and undertook an initial sift using the study objectives, feasibility and deliverability to decide whether certain options should be taken forward for further analysis. The study team then applied the DfT's Early Assessment Sifting Tool (EAST).</p> <p><u>Arundel:</u></p> <p>A long list of options was identified. Some did not meet one or more of the study objectives and, therefore, only the following options were shortlisted</p>	

<p>and assessed using EAST:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A- Offline, former 'pink-blue' alignment • Option B- Offline, minimising impact on National Park • Option C- Offline, closer to Arundel built area • Option D- Online widening with a 250m tunnel • Option E- Sustainable Travel Improvements (included in Options A-D) 	
<p>Of these options, the study team have prioritised Options A+ B for further appraisal. The following points were queried in discussion:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether the impact of diverting traffic around the South Down National Park had been analysed - Theo advised that the team would further assess qualitative environmental impacts including possible positive impacts on the South Downs National Park; • whether HGV users have been consulted in the process - Eike advised that representative organisations – RHA and FTA – are in regular dialogue with DfT and had been informed about the feasibility studies; • what the plans were for Ford Road and Ford Road train station and whether the Arun Chord (a train option) would be considered within the study; - Theo advised that the intention would be to integrate sustainable transport solutions as best as possible as part of further option development if the options are taken forward in future; • support for options A or B - It was noted that Arun District council would be in full support of either Option A or B but that others would favour on-line options; • if option E (Low Cost / Sustainable option) could be taken forward - Theo stated that option E would form part of the overall package of Options A and B; and • whether there could be clarity about the variety of proposed route alignments that would be assessed at stage 3 of the study - Eike advised that at this early stage any lines on maps are indicative and merely allow the study team to estimate the scale of cost and impacts. If the decision is taken to develop one of the options into a full business case in future, then further work would be done on generating and assessing different route alignments. 	<p>Study Team</p>
<p><u>Worthing:</u></p>	<p>A long list of options was identified. Some did not meet one or more of the study objectives and, therefore, only the following options were shortlisted and assessed using EAST:</p>	<p>Study Team</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Option A- Worthing and Lancing Tunnel</i> • <i>Option B- Tunnel at Worthing, dualling and junction improvements at Lancing</i> • <i>Option C- 4 lanes and bypass including junction improvements and turning restrictions at Worthing. Tunnel at Lancing</i> • <i>Option D- 4 lanes and bypass including junction improvements and turning restrictions at Worthing. Dualling and junction improvements at Lancing.</i> • <i>Option E- 4 lanes including junction improvements and turning restrictions at Worthing. Tunnel at Lancing</i> • <i>Option F- Public Transport Improvements only</i> <p>The study team propose to undertake further assessment work on all of these shortlisted options.</p> <p>Following points were covered in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether the impact on land use would be analysed; Theo confirmed that this will be considered on a high level as part of this study, and detailed investigation would be included as part of future business case development if the options were taken forward; • the need for more information and clarity on the reasons behind the scoring of each option and why certain options score better than others – the study team agreed to consider this request for the next meeting; • the need to incorporate demand management into the public transport improvement option; • whether Southern Rail have been consulted in the process in view of the various projects which they would like to implement along the corridor. Theo agreed that the study team would liaise with Southern Rail regarding their current and future network plans; and • it was noted that West Sussex County Council are not currently pursuing the Coastal Transit System and consider that improvements are required in the A27 corridor before bus based solutions can be implemented. <p><u>East of Lewes:</u></p> <p>A long list of options was identified. Some did not meet one or more of the study objectives and, therefore, only the following options were shortlisted and assessed using EAST:</p>	<p>Study Team</p> <p>Study Team</p> <p>Study Team</p> <p>Study Team</p>
--	--	---

- *Option A- Dual off line between Beddingham and Cophall Rbt*
- *Option B- Single off line between Beddingham and Cophall Rbt*
- *Option C and D- On-line with bypasses at Selmeston and Wilmington*
- *Option E- Folkington Link*
- *Option F- On-line improvements to carriageway standard and sustainable travel*

The study team propose to undertake further assessment work on all of these shortlisted options. The following points were covered in discussion:

- how options C,D and E had been analysed and whether or not TR-3 junction improvements had been incorporated. Theo agreed the study team would verify the details.
NOTE: Following the meeting, the Study team has verified that the TR-3 schemes are assumed within all the schemes;
- whether the safety concerns along the corridor are met by each of the options going forward into Stage 3 – Theo explained that any future scheme development would be assessed on their ability to address safety concerns;
- what consideration there has been of the impacts of other changes to the transport network in and around East of Lewes (e.g. new rail signalling system between Lewes and Eastbourne soon to be implemented which would improve rail services in the region, consideration of the Willingdon Chord, as well as other public transport options). -The uncertainty around the scale and impacts of rail improvements was noted;
- it was pointed out that the Sussex route study is currently being undertaken by Network Rail, and the THAMESLINK is unlikely to extend to the Eastbourne area;
- the need to better understand why the East of Lewes options A/B were rejected previously – the study team agreed that this would be further investigated;
- that option C would be difficult to deliver as the land it goes through is highly valued by the current owners – the study team noted this; and
- the need for more detailed data around the options so that stakeholders can provide a more informed view on the options (e.g. developments planned in the vicinity as quoted by John Wheeler) - Theo stated that there is a high likelihood of traffic growth in the area due to development pressures and that as part of Stage 3 the options and their impacts would be further assessed.

Study
Team

4.	<p>Next Stage</p> <p>Theo explained that Stage 3 will include further work on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Estimating costs• Modelling of Benefits• Refinement of the environmental impact assessment and consideration of mitigation measures <p>Eike thanked everyone for their contributions and patience during the meeting. The intention is to schedule the next meeting during October and to offer a reserve date.</p>	
----	---	--