

# A27 Arundel Bypass Interim Scheme Assessment Report Errata

PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

February 2020

**Interim Scheme Assessment Report Errata, February 2020**  
**A27 Arundel Bypass**  
**PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation**

**CONTENTS**

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Corrections.....	2
2.1. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 1: Introduction.....	2
2.2. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 4: Environmental Status.....	3
2.3. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 6: Alternative Options.....	5
2.4. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 8: Descriptions of Options .....	5
2.5. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 12: Summary of the Environmental Assessment.....	7
2.6. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Noise and Vibration.....	23
2.7. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Cultural Heritage .....	26
2.8. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Water Environment.....	30
2.9. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Appendix F – Social Impacts - Accidents .....	31

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to summarise a set of corrections to the Interim Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) dated August 2019 which formed part of material available at the 2019 Public Consultation.

In each case, this note sets out the existing text in the Interim SAR requiring correction (labelled as 'Existing Text') and below it, the corrected text (labelled as 'Amended Text'). All changes required to be made in the Amended Text are shown in red text. Text that is to be removed from the Existing Text is struck-out.

The errata presented herein are intended to be read in conjunction with the published consultation documents provided on Highways England's A27 Arundel Bypass website (<https://highwaysengland.co.uk/projects/a27-arundel-improvement/>).

The corrections presented in this note do not affect the assessments undertaken for the purposes of the Interim SAR as the vast majority are relatively minor technical corrections. There are some changes that make corrections to the level of significance of effect reported on a particular topic. In general, these corrections relate to specific element of an environmental topic, for a specific Scheme option. As such, it is unlikely that the validity of any comments made as part of the consultation would be materially impacted.

No attachments are included in this note.

## 2. CORRECTIONS

### 2.1. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 1: Introduction

#### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
1.2	1.2.1.5	Final Sentence
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>The congestion caused by the lack of capacity on the A27 through Arundel results in delays for traffic. This is demonstrated by comparing journey times in peak periods to off peak periods (see Chapter 5 and 9 for further details). The worst delays in the AM peak are in the westbound direction when journey times are up to 1 minute longer. This is forecast to increase by over 3 minutes by 2041. In the eastbound direction delays are worst in the PM period when journey times are up to 6 minutes longer. This is forecast to increase by over 6 minutes by 2041.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>The congestion caused by the lack of capacity on the A27 through Arundel results in delays for traffic. This is demonstrated by comparing journey times in peak periods to off peak periods (see Chapter 5 and 9 for further details). The worst delays in the AM peak are in the westbound direction when journey times are up to 1 minute longer. This is forecast to increase by over 3 minutes by 2041. In the eastbound direction delays are worst in the PM period <del>when journey times are up to 6 minutes longer. This is forecast to increase by over 6 minutes by 2041.</del> <b>when journey times are up to 6 minutes longer. This is forecast to remain over 6 minutes longer by 2041.</b></p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This is a correction to a typographical error to accurately describe the forecast delays.</p>		

## 2.2. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 4: Environmental Status

### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
4.3	4.3.1.3	Baseline Conditions
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>A total of 387 heritage assets were identified as being present within the Inner and Wider Study Areas of the Scheme. Of these, 325 are statutory designated: 6 Scheduled Monuments, 9 Grade I, 10 Grade II* and 300 Grade II Listed Buildings, 1 Registered Park and Garden, 5 Conservation Areas.</p>		
<b>Amended text</b>		
<p>A total of <del>387-279</del> heritage assets were identified as being present within the Inner and Wider Study Areas of the Scheme. <del>Of these, 325 are statutory designated</del> These comprise: 6 Scheduled Monuments, <del>5</del> 9 Grade I, <del>8</del> 10 Grade II* and <del>254</del> 300 Grade II Listed Buildings, 1 Registered Park and Garden, 5 Conservation Areas.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections to the number of designated heritage assets affected is set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset. Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, the Interim Scheme Assessment Report (SAR), and the South Downs National Park Special Qualities Assessment (SDNP SQA).</p>		

### Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
4.3	4.3.1.4	Baseline Conditions
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>A total of 8 Archaeological Notification Areas, 3 Historic Landscapes and 51 non-designated assets lie within the Wider Study Areas. A list of Buildings or Structures of Character, or locally listed buildings has been compiled by Arun District Council, the majority of which are located in Arundel and Walberton, with smaller numbers in Tortington, Slindon, Lyminster and Binsted<sup>2</sup>.</p>		
<b>Amended text</b>		
<p>A total of <del>8</del> 7 Archaeological Notification Areas, <del>3 Historic Landscapes</del> and <del>54</del> over 50 non-designated assets lie within the <del>Wider-Inner</del> Study Areas. A list of Buildings or Structures of Character, or locally listed buildings has been compiled by Arun District Council, the majority of which are located in Arundel and Walberton, with smaller numbers in Tortington, Slindon, Lyminster and Binsted<sup>2</sup>. <del>These are of lesser heritage significance and have not been assessed in this high level Stage 2 assessment.</del></p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
4.3	4.3.1.4	Baseline Conditions
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset. Historic Landscape areas have been considered as a single non-designated heritage asset, as would be appropriate for an asset of this level of sensitivity at this stage of assessment. A more detailed assessment of individual landscapes would be considered in PCF Stage 3.</p> <p>Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. Some of these amendments enhance and simplify, with an aim of clarifying what is a complex topic that covers both above ground and buried heritage assets and setting. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim SAR and SDNP SQA.</p>		

### Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
4.10.1	4.10.1.2, 4.10.1.3	Water environment
<b>Existing Text</b>		
4.10.1.2	The River Arun, designated as a main river, flows through the centre of Arundel in a southerly direction to discharge to the sea approximately 6.5 kilometres downstream at Littlehampton. Two further designated rivers, Tortington Rife and Binsted Rife, discharge into the River Arun.	
4.10.1.3	The River Arun is classified as a heavily modified waterbody, with its current ecological quality assessed to be ‘moderate’ and chemical quality assessed to be ‘good’ (cycle 2, 2016) under the Water Framework Directive. Tortington Rife and Binsted Rife have not yet been assessed against the objectives of the Water Framework Directive as determined by the Environment Agency. The scope of assessment will be established in PCF Stage 3 Preliminary Design.	
<b>Amended text</b>		
4.10.1.2	The River Arun, designated as a main river, flows through the centre of Arundel in a southerly direction to discharge to the sea approximately 6.5 kilometres downstream at Littlehampton. Two further designated rivers, Tortington Rife and Binsted Rife, discharge into the River Arun. <b>The Study Area also has 2 tributaries of the Lidsey Rife (Figure 13-2) designated a main river at National Grid References 496644, 106031 and 496458, 106090 (West Walberton Lane). The tributaries converge approximately 800m downstream of the Study Area extent (to the of north of Nanny Copse) before discharging into the Lidsey Rife (main river) 2.8km downstream of their convergence as part of a network of ordinary watercourses.</b>	
4.10.1.3	The River Arun is classified as a heavily modified waterbody, with its current ecological quality assessed to be ‘moderate’ and chemical quality assessed to be ‘good’ (cycle 2, 2016) under the Water Framework Directive. <del>Tortington Rife and Binsted Rife</del> <b>Tortington Rife, Binsted Rife and the tributaries of Lidsey Rife</b> have not yet been assessed against the objectives of the Water Framework Directive as determined by the Environment Agency. <b>The tributaries of the Lidsey Rife flow into the main channel of the Lidsey Rife which is assessed against the objectives of the Water Framework Directive at National Grid Reference</b>	

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
4.10.1	4.10.1.2, 4.10.1.3	Water environment
<p>494637, 103139 (outside of the Study Area). It is not designated as an artificial or heavily modified waterbody, with its current ecological quality assessed to be 'moderate' and chemical quality assessed to be 'good' (cycle 2, 2016). The scope of assessment will be established in PCF Stage 3 Preliminary Design.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The tributaries of the Lidsey Rife were mapped but not labelled in the PCF Stage 2 EAR (see Figure 13-1). The text did not specifically identify that these tributaries are associated with an EA designated 'main river' known as the Lidsey Rife. The Study Area includes ordinary watercourses in culvert along the existing A27 alignment just west of Yapton lane feeding into minor tributaries of the Lidsey Rife in (see revised version of PCF Stage 2 EAR Figure 13-1 – provided as Attachment 4 to the PCF Stage 2 EAR Errata document).</p> <p>Option 5BV1 also crosses a ditch LID_AQ116 associated with the tributaries of the Lidsey Rife.</p> <p>The baseline description is correct, but to specifically describe the 'main river', the text has been amended to reflect the two tributaries upstream of the Lidsey Rife. This additional information does not change the conclusions of the overall assessment and conclusions in the PCF Stage 2 EAR.</p>		

### 2.3. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 6: Alternative Options

#### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.3	Table 6-4	Row 11 – Biodiversity Column 5 – 5A
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Large Adverse		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<del>Large Adverse</del> Moderate Adverse		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Transcription error from Stage 1 Technical Appraisal Report.		

### 2.4. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 8: Descriptions of Options

#### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.3	8.3.1.1	Second Sentence
<b>Existing Text</b>		
They all have a common alignment east of River Arun across River Arun floodplain but extend different lengths west of the river to reduce and ultimately avoid impacts on both SDNP and ancient woodland.		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.3	8.3.1.1	Second Sentence

**Amended Text**

They all have a common alignment east of River Arun across River Arun floodplain but extend different lengths west of the river to reduce and ultimately ~~avoid impacts on both SDNP and ancient woodland~~ avoid entering the SDNP and direct impact on ancient woodland.

**Explanation**

This is a correction to a typographical error to ensure the description of the relevant options is accurate.

**Erratum 2**

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.5.2	8.5.2.1	Fourth bullet point

**Existing Text**

- Access to and from following roads and private accesses will be closed to mitigate safety concerns associated with them.
  - Jarvis Road
  - Park Farm
  - Arundel Cricket Club
  - Binsted Lane/Tortington Lane
  - The White Swan Hotel
  - Arundel Arboretum
  - 56A and 57A Chichester Road

**Amended Text**

- Access to and from following roads and private accesses will be closed to mitigate safety concerns associated with them.
  - Jarvis Road
  - Park Farm
  - Arundel Cricket Club
  - Binsted Lane/Tortington Lane
  - The White Swan Hotel
  - Arundel Arboretum
  - ~~55, 56, 56A, 57~~ and 57A Chichester Road

**Explanation**

Three properties were missed off the list of accesses affected by Option 1V5 in error. This correction in the Interim SAR has not affected any of the environmental appraisals as in so as is relevant they were taken into account in the environmental assessments

### Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.5.3	8.5.3.1	
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Access to and from following roads and private accesses will be closed to mitigate safety concerns associated with them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jarvis Road</li> <li>- Park Farm</li> <li>- Arundel Cricket Pitch</li> <li>- The White Swan Pub</li> <li>- Arundel Arboretum</li> <li>- 55, 56A and 57A Chichester Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Access to and from following roads and private accesses will be closed to mitigate safety concerns associated with them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jarvis Road</li> <li>- Park Farm</li> <li>- Arundel Cricket Pitch</li> <li>- The White Swan Pub</li> <li>- Arundel Arboretum</li> <li>- 55, 56, 56A, 57 and 57A Chichester Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>Two properties were missed off the list of accesses affected by Option 1V9 in error. This correction in the Interim SAR has not affected any of the environmental appraisals as in so as is relevant they were taken into account in the environmental assessments.</p>		

## 2.5. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Chapter 12: Summary of the Environmental Assessment

### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.3	12.3.3.1	Cultural Heritage Option 1V5 and 1V9
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the construction phase Moderate Adverse effects (significant) were likely on the setting of all heritage assets with the exception of the Lyminster Conservation Area (Neutral effect (not significant)). These include the town of Arundel, within which lie the castle and Maison Dieu Scheduled Monuments, and Grade I, II*, II, Listed Buildings. Slight Adverse (not significant) effects are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details). Sight Adverse (not significant) effects are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the construction phase Option 1V5 and 1V9 are considered to have Moderate Adverse effects (significant) <del>were likely</del> on the setting of <del>all numerous</del> heritage assets <del>with the exception of the Lyminster Conservation Area (Neutral effect (not significant))</del>. <del>These within include</del> the town of Arundel. There is a slight adverse effect (not significant) for 1 Grade II* and 10 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel. The effect on Lyminster Conservation Area which is considered to be neutral. <del>within which lie the castle and Maison Dieu Scheduled Monuments, and Grade I, II*, II, Listed Buildings</del>. Slight Adverse (not significant) effects are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets <del>and on historic landscapes</del> (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.3	12.3.3.1	Cultural Heritage Option 1V5 and 1V9
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections to the number of designated heritage assets affected is set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset. Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) and South Downs National Park Special Quality Assessment (SDNP SQA).</p>		

## Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.3	12.3.3.2	Cultural Heritage Option 1V5 and 1V9
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, Option 1V5 and 1V9 were considered to have Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on the setting of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p><del>The residual environmental effects on the setting of heritage assets during the operational phase of Option 1V5 and 1V9 were considered to have Slight Moderate Adverse effects (not significant) on the setting of all heritage assets would be as the Construction phase but would be permanent.</del> (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The erratum is a simplification of the description of the significance of effects. It is also a correction in the assessment of effects following a correction in the asset count, an error that is a result of transcription errors from a complete dataset and contained material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). However, this has no bearing on the results of the study, which is focussed on specific impacts of particular assets. Whilst there is change to specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim SAR and SDNP SQA.</p>		

### Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.4	12.3.4.1	Cultural Heritage Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During construction Large Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and the adjacent Grade II* listed Tortington Priory Barn due to the close proximity of the footprint of the Scheme option to the assets. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During construction Large Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and the adjacent Grade II* listed Tortington Priory Barn due to the close proximity of the footprint of the Scheme option to the assets. <b>Moderate adverse effect (significant) on numerous assets within Arundel. Slight adverse effects (not significant) on the setting of 1 Grade II* and 9 Grade II listed buildings</b> <del>Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets</del> (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections to the number of designated heritage assets affected is set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset.</p> <p>The historic town of Arundel and the numerous designated heritage assets within it, along with a group of designated assets primarily at the eastern end of all of the Scheme options, was included in the baseline of the consultation documents but the impact assessment was not presented for offline options (3V1, 4/5AV1, 4/5AV2, 5BV1) as it lay just outside the Study Areas of these options. For technical correction, and to allow a more balanced comparison between the route options, this has now been included for the offline options. This does not affect the overall assessment but provides a more robust assessment.</p> <p>Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim SAR and SDNP SQA.</p>		

### Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.4	12.3.4.2	Cultural Heritage Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Neutral effects (not significant) on the Lyminster Conservation Area and Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on two Archaeology Notification Areas (ANAs) (DWS8481 and DWS8132), and a section of the Chichester to Brighton Roman Road.</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.4	12.3.4.2	Cultural Heritage Option 3V1
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Neutral effects (not significant) on the Lyminster Conservation Area and Slight Adverse effects (not significant) <del>are likely on two Archaeology Notification Areas (ANAs) (DWS8481 and DWS8132), and a section of the Chichester to Brighton Roman Road.</del> on below ground heritage assets and historic landscapes.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset. Archaeological Notification Areas have been removed from the impact assessment, as these are not a heritage asset but are areas of archaeological potential identified for development control purposes. The entire route has potential for possible, previously unrecorded remains. Historic Landscape areas have been considered as a single non-designated heritage asset, as would be appropriate for an asset of this level of sensitivity at this stage of assessment. A more detailed assessment of individual landscapes would be considered in PCF Stage 3.</p> <p>Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. Some of these amendments enhance and simplify, with an aim of clarifying what is a complex topic that covers both above ground and buried heritage assets and setting. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim SAR and SDNP SQA.</p>		

#### Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.5	12.3.5.1	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During construction, Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are expected on the setting the Scheduled Monument of Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details). This includes Grade II Listed Buildings at Crossbush, Binsted, Tortington and Yapton Lane.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During construction, Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are expected on the setting the Scheduled Monument of Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn, <b>numerous assets contained within Arundel and 8 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel.</b> Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of <b>1 Grade II* and 13 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel for the remaining heritage assets</b> (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details). <del>This includes Grade II Listed Buildings at Crossbush, Binsted, Tortington and Yapton Lane.</del></p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.5	12.3.5.1	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV1
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 3 explanation.		

#### Erratum 6

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.5	12.3.5.2	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets which include four ANAs (DWS8130, DWS8131, DWS8132 and DWS8481) and a Historic Landscape (HWS24819).		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets <b>and historic landscapes.</b> <del>which include four ANAs (DWS8130, DWS8131, DWS8132 and DWS8481) and a Historic Landscape (HWS24819).</del>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 4 explanation.		

#### Erratum 7

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.5	12.3.5.4	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
During the operational phase, Option 4/5AV1 was considered to have Moderate Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
During the operational phase, <del>Option 4/5AV1 was considered to have Moderate Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets</del> the significance of effects for all assets in terms of setting will be the same as the construction phase, although they would be permanent (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 2 explanation.		

### Erratum 8

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.6	12.3.6.1	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory, the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn and two Grade II listed buildings. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory <b>Scheduled Monument</b> and the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn <del>and two Grade II listed buildings</del> . Moderate Adverse effect (Significant) on numerous assets within Arundel and on 1 Grade II listed building outside Arundel. Slight Adverse effect (not significant) on 1 Grade II* and on 19 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel. <del>Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</del>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 3 explanation.		

### Erratum 9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.6	12.3.6.2	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on below ground archaeology are likely on four ANAs (DWS8130, DWS8131, DWS81312 and DWS8481), a single Historic Landscape (HWS24819) and two other non-designated assets in Binsted Woods.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on below ground archaeology <b>and historic landscapes</b> . <del>are likely on four ANAs (DWS8130, DWS8131, DWS81312 and DWS8481), a single Historic Landscape (HWS24819) and two other non-designated assets in Binsted Woods.</del>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 4 explanation.		

## Erratum 10

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.6	12.3.6.3	Cultural Heritage Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, Option 4/5AV2 was considered to have a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory, the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn and two Grade II listed buildings. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, <del>Option 4/5AV2 was considered to have a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory, the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn and two Grade II listed buildings. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets</del> the significance of effects for all assets in terms of setting will be the same as the construction phase, although they would be permanent (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 2 explanation.		

## Erratum 11

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.7	12.3.7.1	Cultural Heritage Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely during the construction phase on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory and the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on a further eight Grade II Listed Buildings around Binsted and Yapton Lane. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the two Walberton conservation areas. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets. Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets during construction (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely during the construction phase on the setting for Tortington Augustinian Priory and the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. <del>Moderate Adverse effects (significant) on numerous assets within Arundel. Moderate adverse effect (significant) on 7 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel. Slight Adverse Effect (not significant) on 1 Grade II* and 15 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel on a further eight Grade II Listed Buildings around Binsted and Yapton Lane.</del> Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the two Walberton conservation areas. <del>Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets. Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets during construction</del> Slight Adverse effects on below ground heritage assets and historic landscapes (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 3 explanation.		

## Erratum 12

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.3.7	12.3.7.2	Cultural Heritage Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, Option 5BV1 was considered to have moderate Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the setting of other Grade II listed buildings in Binsted and Yapton Lane. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the Walberton Conservation Areas during the operational phase. Neutral effects are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, <del>Option 5BV1 was considered to have moderate Adverse effects (significant) on the setting of Tortington Augustinian Priory and the Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn. Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the setting of other Grade II listed buildings in Binsted and Yapton Lane. Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the Walberton Conservation Areas during the operational phase. Neutral effects are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</del> the significance of effects for all assets in terms of setting will be the same as the construction phase, although they would be permanent (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage for details).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.5, Erratum 2 explanation.		

## Erratum 13

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.2	12.4.2.6 – 12.4.2.7	Landscape Option 1V5
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>By Year 1 of the operational phase these effects would diminish, with 2 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 11 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 4 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 3 of Large Adverse (significant).</p> <p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 11 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant) and 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>By Year 1 of the operational phase these effects would diminish, with 2 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), <del>4</del><sup>10</sup> of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 4 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 3 of Large Adverse (significant).</p> <p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), <del>4</del><sup>10</sup> of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant) and <del>6</del><sup>5</sup> of Moderate Adverse (significant).</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.2	12.4.2.6 – 12.4.2.7	Landscape Option 1V5
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of an error in the totals calculated for the number of effects assessed as being Slight Adverse and Moderate Adverse. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 14

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.4	12.4.4.4	Landscape Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 7 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 17 of Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 7 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), <del>6</del>5 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and <del>17</del>18 of Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7, subsequently carried through to the PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 15

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.5	12.4.5.4	Landscape Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Walberton, Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 10 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 26 of Large Adverse (significant) and 2 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Walberton, Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 10 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), <del>26</del>23 of Large Adverse (significant) and <del>2</del>5 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.5	12.4.5.4	Landscape Option 4/5AV1
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 16

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.5	12.4.5.6	Landscape Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 8 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 15 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 17 of Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), <del>8</del> 9 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 15 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 17 of Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 17

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.6	12.4.6.4	Landscape Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 11 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 22 of Large Adverse (significant) and 3 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 11 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), <del>22</del> 20 of Large Adverse (significant) and <del>3</del> 5 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.6	12.4.6.4	Landscape Option 4/5AV2
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 18

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.6	12.4.6.5	Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>By Year 1 of the operational phase these effects would diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 9 of slight adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 8 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 18 of Large Adverse (significant) and 3 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>By Year 1 of the operational phase these effects would diminish, with 3 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), <del>9</del><sup>10</sup> of slight adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 8 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 18 of Large Adverse (significant) and 3 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 19

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.7	12.4.7.7	Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Walberton, Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 9 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 25 of Large Adverse (significant) and 2 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity during construction would primarily relate to visual receptors within and around Walberton, Binsted, Tortington and Crossbush. Of the 58 representative viewpoints, 9 would experience an impact of Slight Adverse (not significant), 6 of Moderate Adverse (significant), <del>25</del><sup>24</sup> of Large Adverse (significant) and <del>2</del><sup>3</sup> of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.7	12.4.7.7	Option 5BV1
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 20

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.4.7	12.4.7.7	Landscape Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 2 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 8 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), 18 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 11 of Large Adverse (significant) and 1 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>By Year 15 of the operational phase these effects would further diminish, with 2 experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 8 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant), <del>18</del> 19 of Moderate Adverse (significant), 11 of Large Adverse (significant) and 1 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error between PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2 and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7. The conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment were based on the correct information contained within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Appendix 7-2, therefore the findings of the assessment remain unchanged as reported within the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 7 and PCF Stage 2 Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 21

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.2	12.5.2.3	Biodiversity Option 1V5 and 1V9
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. <b>A Slight Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely.</b> Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.2	12.5.2.3	Biodiversity Option 1V5 and 1V9
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This amendment corrects for the omission of an operational adverse effect relating to barn owl for Options 1V5 and 1V9. This correction has also been applied to PCF Stage 2 EAR Table 8-13 – Operational phase likely significant effects (see Environmental Assessment Report Errata, January 2020). This amendment does not alter the overall conclusion of the EAR and would not be a differentiating factor between Options.</p>		

#### Erratum 22

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.3	12.5.3.3	Biodiversity Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Large Adverse effect (significant) on Binsted Woods Complex LWS and a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Large Adverse effect (significant) on Binsted Woods Complex LWS and a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. <b>A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely.</b> Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features referenced in Chapter 8.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This corrects the omission of an operational adverse effect relating to barn owl for Option 3V1. This correction has also been applied to PCF Stage 2 EAR Table 8-13 – Operational phase likely significant effects (see Environmental Assessment Report Errata, January 2020). This amendment does not alter the overall conclusion of the EAR and would not be a differentiating factor between off-line options as all have a moderate adverse operational effect.</p>		

#### Erratum 23

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.4	12.5.4.1	Biodiversity Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During construction, a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) is likely on ancient and veteran trees. Large Adverse effects (significant) are likely on Binsted Wood Complex LWS and Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh HPI. Ancient woodland and Traditional orchard HPI are likely to experience Moderate Adverse effects (significant). Slight Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the Avisford Notable Road Verge.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During construction, a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) is likely on ancient and veteran trees. Large Adverse effects (significant) are likely on Binsted Wood Complex LWS and Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh HPI. Ancient woodland and Traditional orchard HPI are likely to experience Moderate Adverse effects (significant). Slight Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the Avisford Notable Road Verge <b>and Deciduous woodland HPI.</b></p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.4	12.5.4.1	Biodiversity Option 4/5AV1
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This amendment corrects for the omission of an adverse effect relating to deciduous woodland for Option 4/5AV1 in the Interim SAR. Table 8-12 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR correctly defines the effect of Slight Adverse on deciduous woodland HPI and thus the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 the EAR remain unchanged. This was caused by a transcription error between the Environmental Assessment Report and the Interim SAR.</p>		

#### Erratum 24

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.5	12.5.4.3	Biodiversity 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a <del>Very</del> Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. <b>A Slight Adverse effect (significant) on Binsted Wood Complex LWS is likely.</b> Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This transcription error relates to the adverse effects associated with Binsted Wood Complex LWS. This error was corrected for in the EAR Errata issued in September 2019. However, it remained incorrect in the Interim SAR. The results of the assessment have already been corrected by the previously issued errata and thus this further erratum affecting the Interim SAR does not change the assessment previously provided.</p>		

#### Erratum 25

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.5	12.5.5.3	Biodiversity Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, a <del>Very</del> Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats is likely. <b>A Large Adverse effect (significant) on Binsted Wood Complex LWS.</b> A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features.</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.5	12.5.5.3	Biodiversity Option 4/5AV2
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This transcription error relates to the adverse effects associated with Binsted Wood Complex LWS and bats. This error was corrected for in the EAR Errata issued in September 2019. However, it remained incorrect in the Interim SAR. The results of the assessment have already been corrected by the previously issued errata and thus this further erratum affecting the Interim SAR does not change the assessment previously provided</p>		

#### Erratum 26

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.8.4	12.8.4.2	Noise and Vibration Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>An estimated 379 properties would experience a noise level increase classified as moderate (370 properties) and major (9 properties) in the long-term</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>An estimated <del>379</del> 326 properties would experience a noise level increase classified as moderate (<del>370</del> 317 properties) and major (9 properties) in the long-term</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections described above are the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix (see Table 11-3-16 of Appendix 11-3 – Noise Model Results of the PCF Stage 2 EAR) and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration, which carried through to the Interim SAR and are corrected here. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

#### Erratum 27

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.8.5	12.8.5.3	Noise and Vibration Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, significant adverse effects are likely at existing properties east and south of Crossbush, in Tortington and Binsted. Significant adverse effects are also likely at properties south of A27, west of Ford Road Roundabout.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, significant adverse effects are likely at existing properties east and south of Crossbush, in Tortington and Binsted. Significant adverse effects are also likely at properties south of A27, west of Ford Road Roundabout <b>and Fitzalan Road.</b></p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.8.5	12.8.5.3	Noise and Vibration Option 4/5AV1
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This correction is the result of a transcription error from Table 11-21 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, which carried through to the Interim SAR. For Scheme option 4/5AV1, Fitzalan Road should have been identified as a significant adverse effect and as a consequence Fitzalan Road was omitted from paragraph 12.8.5.3.</p> <p>Whilst the conclusion for Scheme option 4/5AV1 has changed for the existing properties on Fitzalan Road, all the modelling, prediction and assessment work for PCF Stage 2 is correct.</p>		

#### Erratum 28

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.8.6	12.8.6.2	Noise and Vibration Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>The following is a summary of aspects which have potential significant adverse effects over the long-term during the operational phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An estimated 224 properties would experience a noise level increase classified as moderate (160 properties) and major (61 properties) in the long-term.</li> </ul>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>The following is a summary of aspects which have potential significant adverse effects over the long-term during the operational phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An estimated 224 properties would experience a noise level increase classified as moderate (160 properties) <del>and</del> or major (61 properties) in the long-term.</li> </ul>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The correction rectifies a simple subtraction error. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the assessment and conclusions are unaffected and remain valid</p>		

#### Erratum 29

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.9.2	12.9.2.6	Population and Health All options
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During operation, positive effects on health due to permanent changes in air quality. There are negative effects on health arising from noise levels across all Scheme options.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During operation, positive effects on health due to permanent changes in air quality. There are <b>positive and</b> negative effects on health arising from noise levels across all Scheme options.</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.9.2	12.9.2.6	Population and Health All options
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>There are some noise improvements as a result of the scheme as illustrated in PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 12, Section 12.10. The assessment text has been correctly presented in Section 12.10 and this amendment does not impact the overall conclusion of the environmental impact assessment. The results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the correction described above as it is the result of a transcription error between the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 12, Section 12.10 and Table 12-42.</p>		

### Erratum 30

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.10.2	12.10.2.4 -12.10.2.5	Road Drainage and Water Environment All options
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the following aspects: water quality in the River Arun and other watercourses, and flood risk and flood flow, and the recharge rate of groundwater assets.</p> <p>All options are likely to result in Slight Adverse effects (not significant) Secondary A aquifers due to pond dewatering during the operational phase.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>During the operational phase, Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the following aspects: water quality in the River Arun and other watercourses, <b>and flood risk and flood flow, <del>and the recharge rate of groundwater assets</del> assuming that appropriate mitigation is in place.</b></p> <p>All options are likely to result in Slight Adverse effects (not significant) <b>on the recharge rate of groundwater assets</b> Secondary A aquifers due to pond dewatering during the operational phase.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The groundwater assessment was conducted based on the correct assessments provided in the body of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 13 (paragraph 13.9.8.27). The corrections are the result of transcription error between the summary section and the body text of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 13: Road Drainage and Water Drainage. Therefore, the erratum does not affect the conclusions of the assessment.</p>		

## 2.6. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Noise and Vibration

### Erratum 1

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	4 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V5
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>419 properties within the study area would be subject to noise levels exceeding the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) in the design (forecast) year without Option 1V5, this number would reduce to 273 once the option is in operation in the design year. There will, therefore, be 146 fewer properties with noise levels above SOAEL with Option 1V5 in operation compared to do-minimum in the design year.</p>		

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	4 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V5
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>419 properties within the study area would be subject to noise levels exceeding the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) in the design (forecast) year without Option 1V5, this number would reduce to <del>273</del> 255 once the option is in operation in the design year. There will, therefore, be <del>446</del> 164 fewer properties with noise levels above SOAEL with Option 1V5 in operation compared to do-minimum in the design year.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections described above are the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix (see Table 11-3-2 of Appendix 11-3 – Noise Model Results of the PCF Stage 2 EAR) and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration, which carried through to the Appraisal Summary Table and are corrected here. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

## Erratum 2

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	8 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V9
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>NIAs to the west of Option 1V9, along the existing A27, and to the east and south of Crossbush (12491, 5491, 12490, 6158, 5490, 12489, 5487, 5488, 12488, 5485, 5486, 5484, 6157) generally experience a negligible to minor adverse impact in the short-term, and negligible impact in the long-term; although one area (6157) continues to experience minor adverse impact in the long-term (6157 and 5486). Conversely, one property within NIAs 5487 will experience a minor beneficial impact in the short-term and negligible in the long-term.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>A summary of key noise impacts is presented below; the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 provides a full description. NIAs to the west of Option 1V9, along the existing A27, and to the east and south of Crossbush (12491, 5491, 12490, 6158, 5490, 12489, 5487, 5488, 12488, 5485, 5486, 5484, 6157) generally experience a negligible to minor adverse impact in the short-term, and negligible impact in the long-term; <del>although one area (6157) continues to experience minor adverse impact in the long-term (6157 and 5486)</del> although two areas continue to experience a minor adverse impact in the long-term (6157 and 5486). Conversely, one property within NIAs 5487 will experience a minor beneficial impact in the short-term and negligible in the long-term.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The correction described above rectifies an inconsistency in the original text. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

### Erratum 3

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	5 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
379 properties would experience a moderate and major adverse impact in the long-term (moderate adverse: 370 properties; major adverse: 9 properties).		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<del>379</del> 326 properties would experience a moderate and major adverse impact in the long-term (moderate adverse: <del>370</del> 317 properties; major adverse: 9 properties).		
<b>Explanation</b>		
The corrections described above are the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix (see Table 11-3-16 of Appendix 11-3 – Noise Model Results of the PCF Stage 2 EAR) and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration, which carried through to the Appraisal Summary Table and are corrected here. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.		

### Erratum 4

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	8 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
NIAs to the west of Option 3V1 (6158 and 5490) generally experience a minor adverse impact in the short-term, and negligible impact in the long-term. NIAs to the east and south of Crossbush (12486, 12485 and 5482) experience a minor to moderate impact in the short-term and long-term. NIAs along the existing A27 through Arundel (12489, 5487, 5488, 12488, 5485 and 5486) generally experience a minor to moderate beneficial impact in the short-term and negligible to minor beneficial impact in the long-term.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
NIAs to the west of Option 3V1 (6158 and 5490) generally experience a minor adverse impact in the short-term, and negligible impact in the long-term. NIAs to the east and south of Crossbush (12486, 12485 and 5482) experience a minor to moderate <b>adverse</b> impact in the short-term and <b>a negligible to moderate adverse impact in the</b> long-term. NIAs along the existing A27 through Arundel (12489, 5487, 5488, 12488, 5485 and 5486) generally experience a minor to moderate beneficial impact in the short-term and negligible to minor beneficial impact in the long-term.		
<b>Explanation</b>		
The corrections described above rectify a simple typographical error and more accurately explain the long-term impacts shown in Figure 11-25 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.		

## Erratum 5

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Environment/ Noise Row	4 <sup>th</sup> Paragraph	Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>428 properties within the study area would be subject to noise levels exceeding the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) in the design (forecast) year without Option 4/5AV1, this number would reduce to 232 once the option is in operation in the design year. There will, therefore, be 196 fewer properties with noise levels above SOAEL with Option 4/5AV1 in operation compared to do-minimum in the design year.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>428 properties within the study area would be subject to noise levels exceeding the significant observed adverse effect level (SOAEL) in the design (forecast) year without Option 4/5AV1, this number would reduce to <del>232</del> 231 once the option is in operation in the design year. There will, therefore, be <del>196</del> 197 fewer properties with noise levels above SOAEL with Option 4/5AV1 in operation compared to do-minimum in the design year.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections described above are the result of a transcription error into the Appraisal Summary Table from paragraph 11.10.6 (third bullet point) of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the assessment are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

## 2.7. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Cultural Heritage

### Erratum 1

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V5
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V5 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including two Scheduled Monuments, four Grade I Listed Buildings, four Grade II* Listed Buildings, 205 Grade II Listed Buildings and one Conservation Area. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V5 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including <del>two</del> five Scheduled Monuments, four Grade I Listed Buildings, <del>four</del> six Grade II* Listed Buildings, <del>205</del> 206 Grade II Listed Buildings, <del>one</del> Grade II * registered park and garden and <del>one</del> two Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.</p>		

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V5
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The corrections to the number of designated heritage assets affected is set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR errata Feb 2020) reflect transcription errors from material that was available from the consultation documents, such as the PCF Stage 2 EAR –Appendix 6-1 (Gazetteer) and accompanying figures (Figures 6-1 to 6-18). The errata above are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset. Whilst the erratum changes specific elements of this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, they do not affect overall scoring and the conclusions. The erratum applies to all the supporting documents, comprising the Consultation Brochure, Interim Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) and South Downs National Park Special Quality Assessment (SDNP SQA).</p>		

## Erratum 2

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 1V9
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V9 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including two Scheduled Monuments, four Grade I Listed Buildings, four Grade II* Listed Buildings, 206 Grade II Listed Buildings and one Conservation Area. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V9 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including <del>two</del> <b>five</b> Scheduled Monuments, four Grade I Listed Buildings, <del>four</del> <b>six</b> Grade II* Listed Buildings, <del>206</del> <b>205</b> Grade II Listed Buildings, <b>one Grade II* registered park and garden</b> and <del>one</del> <b>two</b> Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>Refer to Section 2.7, Erratum 1 explanation.</p>		

### Erratum 3

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 3V1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Option 3V1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including one Scheduled Monument, one Grade II* Listed Building, seven Grade II Listed Buildings and one Conservation Area. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Option 3V1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of heritage assets, including <del>one four</del> Scheduled Monuments, <del>one six</del> Grade II* Listed Buildings, <del>seven 27</del> Grade II Listed Buildings and <del>one two</del> Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.7, Erratum 1 explanation.		

### Erratum 4

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 4/5AV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Option 4/5V1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of one Scheduled Monument, one Grade II* Listed Building and 22 Grade II Listed Buildings. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Option 4/5V1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of <del>one four</del> Scheduled Monuments, <del>one Grade I Listed Building</del> , <del>one three</del> Grade II* Listed Buildings, <del>and 22 55</del> Grade II Listed Buildings <del>and four</del> Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.7, Erratum 1 explanation.		

### Erratum 5

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 4/5AV2
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Option 4/5AV2 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of one Scheduled Monument, one Grade II* Listed Building and 13 Grade II Listed Buildings. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Option 4/5AV2 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of <del>one</del> <b>four</b> Scheduled Monuments, <del>one</del> <b>two</b> Grade II* Listed Buildings, and <del>13</del> <b>54</b> Grade II Listed Buildings <b>and four Conservation Areas</b> . The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.7, Erratum 1 explanation.		

### Erratum 6

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal Summary Table – Summary of Key Impacts - Environment / Historic Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
Option 5BV1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of one Scheduled Monument, one Grade II* Listed Building, 14 Grade II Listed Buildings and two Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
Option 5BV1 will have direct impacts on the context (setting) of <del>one</del> <b>two</b> Scheduled Monuments, <b>one Grade I Listed Building</b> , <del>one</del> <b>three</b> Grade II* Listed Buildings, <del>14</del> <b>63</b> Grade II Listed Buildings and <del>two</del> <b>five</b> Conservation Areas. The impacts are likely to include harm to the relationship between the asset and its setting so that the relationship is no longer readily appreciable; the interpretability of the significance of the asset is significantly reduced; a loss or reduction of rural tranquillity and / or where traffic noise, light and movement are likely to increase.		
<b>Explanation</b>		
Refer to Section 2.7, Erratum 1 explanation.		

## 2.8. Interim SAR Appendix F: Appraisal Summary Tables (ASTs) – Water Environment

### Erratum 1

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal summary Table - Summary of Key Impacts - Environment/ Water Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	Option 5BV1
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>The route requires the construction of new carriageway within undeveloped land to the west and east of Arundel, crossing several ordinary watercourses and land drains. The option also crosses the River Arun and the Binsted and Tortington Rife. The route option will also cross an EA designated main river Tortington and Binsted Rife and its minor tributaries, which are Lead Local Flood Authority designated ordinary watercourses. These watercourses convey flow to the River Arun.</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>The route requires the construction of new carriageway within undeveloped land to the west and east of Arundel, crossing several ordinary watercourses and land drains. The option also crosses the River Arun and the Binsted and Tortington Rife. The route option will also cross an EA designated main river Tortington and Binsted Rife and its minor tributaries, which are Lead Local Flood Authority designated ordinary watercourses. These watercourses convey flow to the River Arun. <b>The Scheme option also crosses ordinary watercourses associated with the tributaries of the Lidsey Rife.</b></p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>The tributaries of the Lidsey Rife were mapped but not labelled in the PCF Stage 2 EAR (see Figure 13-1). The text did not specifically identify that these tributaries are associated with an EA designated ‘main river’ known as the Lidsey Rife. The Study Area includes ordinary watercourses in culvert along the existing A27 alignment just west of Yapton lane feeding into minor tributaries of the Lidsey Rife in (see revised version of PCF Stage 2 EAR Figure 13-1 – provided as Attachment 4 to the PCF Stage 2 EAR Errata document).</p> <p>Option 5BV1 also crosses a ditch LID_AQ116 associated with the tributaries of the Lidsey Rife.</p> <p>The baseline description is correct, but to specifically describe the ‘main river’, the text has been amended to reflect the two tributaries upstream of the Lidsey Rife. This additional information does not change the conclusions of the overall assessment and conclusions in the PCF Stage 2 EAR.</p>		

### Erratum 2

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal summary Table - Summary of Key Impacts - Environment/ Water Environment Row</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	All Options
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Groundwater quality and groundwater flow pathway issues may arise from construction phase activities including, (but not limited to) soil stripping, cutting, reducing aquifer overburden and intrusive piled structures. This may consequently create a shorter flow pathway to the groundwater body and increase groundwater vulnerability. With appropriate mitigation measures, the magnitude will be Negligible, and the overall impact will be low significance.</p>		

Row	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal summary Table - Summary of Key Impacts - Environment/ Water Environment Row	1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph	All Options
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Groundwater quality and groundwater flow pathway issues may arise from construction phase activities including, (but not limited to) soil stripping, cutting, reducing aquifer overburden and intrusive piled structures. This may consequently create a shorter flow pathway to the groundwater body and increase groundwater vulnerability. With appropriate mitigation measures, the magnitude will be Negligible, and the overall impact will be <del>insignificant low significance</del>.</p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>This change corrects a minor inconsistency in terminology and applies to all Scheme options. The corrections refer to a matter of low significance and do not affect the overall assessment of the Scheme options.</p>		

## 2.9. Interim Scheme Assessment Report Appendix F – Social Impacts - Accidents

### Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appraisal Summary Table - Accidents	Quantitative Assessment	All Options
<b>Existing Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V5 - Total number of accidents saved 411, and 600 casualties of which fatal, 7, serious, 88, slight 505</p> <p>Option 1V9 - A total of 397 accidents and 562 casualties would be saved. Of the casualties; 6 fatal, 80 serious, 475 slight</p> <p>Option 3V1 - Total number of accidents saved; 379 and casualties saved 548. Of these, 7 fatal, 85 serious, 457 slight</p> <p>Option 4/5AV1 - Total number of accidents saved, 527 and casualties saved, 756. Of these 10 fatal, 106 serious and 640 slight</p> <p>Option 4/5AV2 - Total number of accidents saved, 727 and number of casualties [SIC] saved, 1,028. Of these 12 fatal, 134, serious and 882 slight</p> <p>Option 5BV1 - Total number of accidents saved, 676 and number of casualties saved, 954. Of these, 11 fatal, 127 serious and 816 slight</p>		
<b>Amended Text</b>		
<p>Option 1V5 - Total number of accidents saved 411, and <del>600</del> 589 casualties saved of which <del>fatal, 7, serious, 88, slight 505</del> 4 fatal, 85 serious, 500 slight</p> <p>Option 1V9 - <del>A total of 397 accidents and 562 casualties would be saved. Of the casualties; 6 fatal, 80 serious, 475 slight</del> Total number of accidents saved 397, and 555 casualties saved of which 4 fatal, 78 serious, 473 slight</p> <p>Option 3V1 - Total number of accidents saved; 379, and <del>548</del> 545 casualties saved <del>548. Of these, 7 fatal, 85 serious, 457 slight</del> of which 4 fatal, 85 serious, 457 slight</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
<b>Appraisal Summary Table - Accidents</b>	Quantitative Assessment	All Options
<p>Option 4/5AV1 - Total number of accidents saved, 527 and 751 casualties saved, 756. <del>Of these 10 fatal, 106 serious and 640 slight of which 8 fatal, 105 serious and 639 slight</del></p> <p>Option 4/5AV2 - Total number of accidents saved, 727 and 1,019 <del>number of casualites</del> casualties saved, 1,028. <del>Of these 12 fatal, 134, serious and 882 slight of which 9 fatal, 133 serious and 878 slight</del></p> <p>Option 5BV1 - Total number of accidents saved, 676 and 952 <del>number of</del> casualties saved, 954. <del>Of these, 11 fatal, 127 serious and 816 slight of which 9 fatal, 126 serious and 817 slight</del></p>		
<b>Explanation</b>		
<p>A superseded draft version of the casualty analysis with very small differences in casualty numbers was retained within Appendix F. The revised numbers shown reflect the final version of the casualty analysis. Note that the values are rounded to the nearest whole number. Use of this version does not affect or change the assessments undertaken or any results / conclusions drawn.</p>		