

MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 24th March 2015 (14:00 – 16:00)

Venue: Arun Civic Centre, Littlehampton

Meeting Title: A27 Arundel and A27 Worthing-Lancing Improvements Engagement Meeting

Present:

████████████████████	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
████████████████████	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
██████████████████	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
██████████████████	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
██████████████████	WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
██████████████████	Highways England
██████████████████	Highways England
██████████████████	Atkins
██████████████████	Arun District Council
██████████████████	Adur & Worthing Councils
██████████████████	West Sussex County Council
██████████████████	West Sussex County Council
██████████████████	South Downs National Park Authority
██████████████████	South Downs National Park Authority

Item	Action and date required
1. INTRODUCTION	
Introductions were made.	
2. PURPOSE OF MEETING	
████ presented the background to the A27 schemes and the purpose of the meeting:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">To introduce attendees to the A27 projects team;to discuss the Objectives of the schemes and to enable Adur-Worthing, Arun, South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council to provide input; andto discuss the options to be assessed.	
3. OBJECTIVES	
████ presented the Objectives for the two schemes, which include high level objectives from the A27 Feasibility Study and local objectives from the Local Plans, West Sussex Transport Plan and the South Downs National Park (SDNP) Position Statement. The objectives of the A27 Chichester Bypass were included as an example.	
████ summarised the process for Development Consent Orders (DCOs) which recommends open engagement, inviting input from stakeholders.	
████ commented that the local economy in Arun District is also linked to tourism as well as Worthing. An objective should be to help make Arun a more attractive	

location for investment. The presentation refers to national and local objectives but this suggested objective would be best treated as an objective for the regional economy.

■ referred to the need to consider people living in the SDNP, as well as visitors and those passing through. He also referred to the need to address rat-running of traffic through the National Park in Storrington. ■ voiced opposition to a route past Binsted. He emphasised the duty to conserve and enhance the National Park. Economic development which supports the Purposes of the National Park would be supported.

■ referred to the need for the A27 to be aligned to future economic development in the area. He asked why no Members were being invited to the stakeholder consultation when Members were included in the Chichester Bypass consultation. ■ replied that the Chichester Bypass is at a much more advanced stage than the Arundel or Worthing-Lancing schemes. Members will be consulted at the appropriate stage.

■ referred to some scepticism being expressed by some stakeholders at meetings being held with limited stakeholder participation. ■ confirmed that Member engagement will take place as the schemes take shape. An engagement plan will be developed.

■ to
prepare a
Member
engagement
plan

■ queried what is meant by connectivity, and referred to a planned cycle route into the National Park. Agreed that measures like this need to be taken into account when defining the options.

■ referred to the need for journey time reliability for local and strategic connections across the A27 as well as along it. In response to a query on the definition of 'reliability', ■ confirmed that there is a defined formula which is used for Highways England schemes.

■ referred to the need for attractive infrastructure, given the castle setting of Arundel. He gave Millau Viaduct in France as an example of attractive infrastructure. ■ pointed to the reference to the A27 Bypass to be of a high design standard reflecting the quality of the landscape and the setting of Arundel in the presentation, taken from the Arun Local Plan.

■ indicated that the SDNP Position Statement is not a legal document, but merely guidance. It has two purposes:

1. To preserve and enhance the National Park, and
2. To improve accessibility to the National Park.

The position statement makes it clear that the SDNPA expects any scheme that is proposed to fully consider the impacts of the scheme on the Special Qualities - which are why the SDNP was designated.

(The 2 purposes of the SDNPA are in essence to conserve and enhance the wildlife, landscape and cultural heritage, and secondly to improve people's understanding and enjoyment of the Special Qualities).

■ indicated that mitigation of the impact of the A27 can contribute towards environmental enhancement. ■ added that mitigation works could help to enhance the floodplain, referring to the Arundel Wetlands Centre and Pulborough Brooks as examples.

■ advised the A27 team that Worthing Borough Council is reviewing their Core

■ to amend
objectives
removing
reference to
South Downs
National Park
Position
Statement as
a legal
document

Strategy, and there may be new strategic sites coming forward. Worthing is currently a long way short of the borough's housing needs. Housing development at Lyons Farm will need to be considered. ■ also referred to planned housing development at Shoreham, close to the eastern end of the Worthing-Lancing scheme.

■ suggested that consideration should be given to the specific economy of Worthing in the objectives for the Worthing-Lancing scheme. Access routes across the A27 will need to be provided to reduce severance. ■ confirmed that options for Non-Motorised Users (NMUs) will be considered, and agreed that they are not good enough at present. This will be linked to access to the National Park.

■ *to consider access routes in Worthing to reduce severance*

■ queried the source documents referred to in the Objectives section of the presentation. ■ confirmed that the high level objectives have been taken from the Local Plans and the SDNP Position Statement. ■ reminded the meeting that SDNP policies are defined in the Management Plan, available on the SDNP website and ■ would send links through.

■ *to provide links to SDNP Management Plan on website*

■ noted that there are more opportunities for sustainable transport measures in Worthing than in Arundel. ■ added that this is particularly the case in the area between Worthing and Lancing, where development is planned to take place. ■ referred to the strategic housing allocation in Worthing.

It was noted that there is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Worthing which the A27 improvements may help to address. ■ was concerned that traffic volumes will increase if capacity on the A27 is improved through Worthing, so air quality may continue to be a problem. ■ suggested that whilst traffic may continue to grow, it should be able to move more freely than at present, reducing emission levels. There will thus be a trade-off between traffic volumes and delays.

■ suggested that an objective of the Worthing-Lancing scheme should be to reduce rat-running through West Street, Sompting, part of which is a conservation area.

■ advised that the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan should be taken into consideration. He also reported that the Environment Agency are working on the Lower Tidal Arun Strategy, and this may provide opportunities for mitigation as part of the A27 improvements.

■ *to circulate new set of Objectives to attendees*

■ stated that a new set of Objectives will be developed as a result of this discussion, and will be circulated to attendees. Further comments will be welcome.

■ *to submit position statement to attendees by 31/3/15*

■ advised that he has a meeting arranged for Tuesday 31st March, and would appreciate receiving documentation summarising the contents of this meeting before that. ■ advised that a position statement would be circulated by 31st. He also advised that Highways England's delivery plan would be provided and circulated following this meeting. VS also offered to send suitable information to ■ by 31st.

■ *to circulate Highways England's delivery plan following this meeting*

■ agreed to forward an email to ■ with details of a pedestrian crossing at Arundel.

■ *to forward email to ■ on*

*pedestrian
crossing at
Arundel*

4. OPTIONS

■■■ presented the options for Arundel and Worthing-Lancing. Other options will be considered and Highways England confirmed that this would be the case when public consultation is opened up. The options being considered for Arundel from the Feasibility Study are:

- Option 1 – Optimal' online improvement
- Option 2 – Bypass option, passing nearby existing A27
- Option 3 – Bypass option, 'pink-blue' route
- Option 4 – Bypass option, avoiding majority of South Downs National Park

The options being considered for Worthing-Lancing from the Feasibility Study are:

- Option 1 – widen from centre line (as reference point)
- Option 2 – asymmetrical widening

■■■ confirmed that the tunnel options for Arundel and Worthing will not be progressed for a number of reasons identified in the Feasibility Study, including deliverability, strategic objectives and cost.

■■■ stated that his Members will be concerned that only online options are to be considered. Nothing should be discounted at this stage. ■■■ suggested that the colour scheme for the schematic diagram for Arundel should be changed so that they do not contradict the colours adopted for routes in previous studies.

■■■ to
consider
colour
scheme in
Schematic

■■■ queried what the layout would be at the western end of the A27 Arundel scheme. ■■■ indicated that this has not yet been confirmed and will be subject to the assessment.

■■■ raised a query about how the existing and proposed Ford Road junction would fit with the level crossing on Ford Road to the south. ■■■ confirmed that this will be examined as we get closer to the details. ■■■ replied that this will need to be considered for all options.

■■■ to
consider Ford
Road junction
layout for all
options

■■■ noted that access arrangements at Worthing will be complex. A concept plan will need to be defined.

In response to a query on narrow lanes, ■■■ confirmed that this would mean sub-standard carriageway widths. ■■■ explained that this currently applies to the Lancing section. Widening from the centre line would mean building the scheme within the existing highway.

■■■ asked whether Worthing is different from Arundel in terms of blight. ■■■ confirmed that Worthing would present a higher risk of potential blight.

■■■ reminded the meeting of the purdah constraints imposed by the General Election. ■■■ advised that Arun is already under purdah for local elections. ■■■

recommended that Highways England seek legal advice on what can be shown during purdah. ■■■ advised that ■■■ send whatever information they are able to.

■■■ advised that the DCO process requires that all options be tested.

■■■ asked how the A27 would be built across the Arun floodplain without building an embankment. ■■■ advised that this will be considered at the detailed stage if this option is adopted as the preferred option.

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Wider Stakeholder Engagement

■■■ stated that he had been expecting to see a delivery plan including dates. ■■■ confirmed that a programme showing key dates will be provided. ■■■ advised that the programmed date for start of construction is March 2021. Construction of both schemes is expected to take approximately 2 years, but would depend on what the preferred options would be. ■■■ reaffirmed that both schemes are to be delivered within the same period under the Government's Road Investment Strategy (RIS).

■■■ to
provide
programme

■■■ asked ■■■ when they would be able to provide a timescale for when public consultation could take place. ■■■ advised that this it should be possible to put this information together fairly quickly.

■■■ to provide
timescale for
public
consultation

■■■ expressed concern at the lack of a communication strategy. It was confirmed that ■■■ will be preparing a communication plan. He asked whether social media is intended to be used to provide information to the public. There are no plans for details of the schemes to be provided using social media.

■■■ to include
town and
parish
councils in
wider
consultation

For the wider consultation, it was suggested that the earlier reference group could be included. It was recommended that relevant town and parish councils should be included in the consultation. ■■■ noted that Worthing Members felt that they had not been consulted sufficiently.

■■■ asked how the groups would work, noting that there needs to be some linkages between the two groups as the schemes for both will impact on each. It was agreed that that stakeholder groups should be separate for the Arundel and Worthing-Lancing schemes.

■■■ noted that there will be different interest groups at different stages of the projects. ■■■ advised that there will be a need to manage expectations.

■■■ suggested a newspaper advert inviting public participation.

■■■ Highways
England to
consider
public
consultation
via
newspaper

■■■ advised that we will need on-going consultation before options are assessed in a year's time. There may be a requirement for other local authority personnel at a later stage. ■■■ to provide a communications plan and stakeholder plan be involved at later stages to assist with the consultation.

■■■ advised that a draft communications plan and a stakeholder plan will be provided.

■■■ to provide
separate
comms plans
and
stakeholder
plans for

■■■ reaffirmed WSCC's intention to work collaboratively with Highways England and provide input where appropriate.

■■■ asked whether there will be a similar process for East of Lewes. ■■■ replied

that this is on a different timescale to Arundel and Worthing-Lancing and the process for that project will be developed at the appropriate time.

*Arundel and
Worthing-
Lancing*

█████ indicated SDNP's intention to invite Highways England to Member meetings.

*SDNPA to
invite Highways
England to
Member
meetings*

█████ advised the meeting that the Arun Local Plan will go to Examination in Public in the first two weeks of June.

█████ advised the meeting that Adur are delaying their Local Plan.

6. NEXT STEPS

It was agreed that the next meeting should take place in July, after the roadside interviews. █████ tabled a plan of proposed roadside interviews for the local authorities and SDNP authority to comment. █████ to email attendees formally requesting their input.

*█████ to email
attendees
inviting
comment on
the proposed
roadside
interviews by
25/3/15*

█████ asked how the roadside interviews would be publicised. █████ quoted an example of how roadside interviews were publicised for Lyminster Bypass. █████ to consider.

*█████ to consider
publicity for
Lyminster
Bypass
roadside
interviews as
an example for
A27 surveys*

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees

Issued by: █████

Date: 01/05/2015