

A27 Arundel Bypass Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Errata

PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

February 2020

Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Errata, February 2020
A27 Arundel Bypass
PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Corrections.....	1
2.1. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 1: Introduction	1
2.2. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 2: Air Quality	1
2.3. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 3: Cultural Heritage	1
2.4. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 4: Biodiversity.....	1
2.5. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration	1
2.6. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 6: Population and Health	8
2.7. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 7: Greenhouse Gases	12
2.8. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects.....	12
2.9. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 9: Summary.....	12

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to summarise a set of corrections to the A27 Arundel Bypass - Project Control Framework (PCF) Stage 2 Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note dated September 2019 which formed part of the package of material available at the 2019 Further Consultation for the A27 Arundel Bypass scheme.

In each case, this note sets out the existing text in the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note 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 Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note 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 a 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.

There are no attachments with this Errata document.

2. CORRECTIONS

2.1. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 1: Introduction

No errata were present in Chapter 1: Introduction of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.2. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 2: Air Quality

No errata were present in Chapter 2: Air Quality of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.3. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 3: Cultural Heritage

No errata were present in Chapter 3: Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.4. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 4: Biodiversity

No errata were present in Chapter 4: Biodiversity of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.5. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table						Location
5.4.2	Paragraph 5.4.2.1 and Table 5-1 – Results summary – number of properties affected by Option 1V5						Option 1V5
Existing Text							
Metric	[1] With WL (EAR)		[2] Without WL		Difference [2] – [1]		
Short term adverse impacts	Moderate 841	Major 224	Moderate 771	Major 293	Moderate -70	Major 69	
Long term adverse impacts	Moderate 380	Major 0	Moderate 393	Major 23	Moderate 13	Major 23	
Short term beneficial impacts	Moderate 77	Major 9	Moderate 60	Major 10	Moderate -17	Major 1	
Long term beneficial impacts	Moderate 6	Major 1	Moderate 7	Major 1	Moderate 1	Major 0	
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL (design year)	Do minimum 419	Do something 273	Do minimum 444	Do something 251	Do minimum 25	Do something -22	
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL within NIAs (design year)	Do something minus Do minimum -5		Do something minus Do minimum -5		Do something minus Do minimum 0		
Potential qualification under the Noise Insulation Regulations	54		54		0		
<p>5.4.2.1 From the table above comparing the results for Option 1V5, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would decrease by 22 compared to the EAR. These properties are located along the A29 south of Fontwell. 							

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location	
5.4.2	Paragraph 5.4.2.1 and Table 5-1 – Results summary – number of properties affected by Option 1V5	Option 1V5	
Amended Text			
Metric	[1] With WL (EAR)	[2] Without WL	Difference [2] – [1]
Short term adverse impacts	Moderate 841 Major 224	Moderate 771 Major 293	Moderate -70 Major 69
Long term adverse impacts	Moderate 380 Major 0	Moderate 393 Major 23	Moderate 13 Major 23
Short term beneficial impacts	Moderate 77 Major 9	Moderate 60 Major 10	Moderate -17 Major 1
Long term beneficial impacts	Moderate 6 Major 1	Moderate 7 Major 1	Moderate 1 Major 0
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL (design year)	Do minimum 419 Do something 273-255	Do minimum 444 Do something 251	Do minimum 25 Do something - 422
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL within NIAs (design year)	Do something minus Do minimum -5	Do something minus Do minimum -5	Do something minus Do minimum 0
Potential qualification under the Noise Insulation Regulations	54	54	0
<p>5.4.2.1 From the table above comparing the results for Option 1V5, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would decrease by 22 4 compared to the EAR. These properties are located along the A29 south of Fontwell. 			
Explanation			
<p>The corrections described above are the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix (Table 11-3-2 of Appendix 11-3 – Noise Model Results of the PCF Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report (EAR)) and the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 11 – Noise and Vibration, which carried through to the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing are unaffected and remain valid.</p>			

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
5.4.3	Paragraph 5.4.3.1, bullet point 2	Option 1V9
Existing Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would increase by four compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north of Ford Road roundabout. 		
Amended Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would increase by four five compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north of Ford Road roundabout. 		
Explanation		
<p>The correction is required to rectify a transcription error that resulted in an inconsistency within the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration. Table 5-2 reports the correct value, whilst the text in paragraph 5.4.3.1 immediately following reports the incorrect value. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location				
5.4.4	Table 5-3 - Results summary – number of properties affected by Option 3V1	Option 3V1				
Existing Text						
Metric	[1] With WL (EAR)		[2] Without WL		Difference [2] – [1]	
Short term adverse impacts	Moderate 339	Major 215	Moderate 253	Major 245	Moderate -86	Major 30
Long term adverse impacts	Moderate 317	Major 9	Moderate 325	Major 33	Moderate 8	Major 22
Short term beneficial impacts	Moderate 148	Major 51	Moderate 153	Major 51	Moderate 5	Major 0
Long term beneficial impacts	Moderate 44	Major 1	Moderate 39	Major 1	Moderate -5	Major 0
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL (design year)	Do minimum 428	Do something 249	Do minimum 451	Do something 239	Do minimum 23	Do something -10
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL within NIAs (design year)	Do something minus Do minimum -9		Do something minus Do minimum -8		Do something minus Do minimum +1	
Potential qualification under the Noise Insulation Regulations	3		3		0	

Amended Text						
Metric	[1] With WL (EAR)		[2] Without WL		Difference [2] – [1]	
Short term adverse impacts	Moderate 339	Major 215	Moderate 253	Major 245	Moderate -86	Major 30
Long term adverse impacts	Moderate 317	Major 9	Moderate 325	Major 33	Moderate 8	Major 22 24
Short term beneficial impacts	Moderate 148	Major 51	Moderate 153	Major 51	Moderate 5	Major 0
Long term beneficial impacts	Moderate 44	Major 1	Moderate 39	Major 1	Moderate -5	Major 0
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL (design year)	Do minimum 428	Do something 249	Do minimum 451	Do something 239	Do minimum 23	Do something -10
Number of dwellings above the SOAEL within NIAs (design year)	Do something minus Do minimum -9		Do something minus Do minimum -8		Do something minus Do minimum +1	
Potential qualification under the Noise Insulation Regulations	3		3		0	
Explanation						
The correction described above rectifies a simple subtraction error. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing are unaffected and remain valid.						

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
5.4.5	Paragraph 5.4.5.1, bullet point 1	Option 4/5AV1
Existing Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 30 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout, at Barnham Lane and at Slindon. A minor proportion of these properties (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. 		
Amended Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 30 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout, at Barnham Lane and at Slindon. A minor proportion of these properties (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of other properties located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout (six) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. 		
Explanation		
The correction described above is required to rectify a non-sequitur in the text. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing are unaffected and remain valid.		

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
5.4.6	Paragraph 5.4.6.1, bullet point 1	Option 4/5AV2
Existing Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 7 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north and south of Ford Road roundabout, along Fitzalan Road and along School Hill in Slindon. There are no new properties subject to a major adverse noise impact and absolute noise levels above the LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of these properties (three) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. 		
Amended Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 7 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north and south of Ford Road roundabout, along Fitzalan Road and along School Hill in Slindon. There are no new properties subject to a major adverse noise impact and absolute noise levels above the LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of these properties (three) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of other properties located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short term. 		
Explanation		
The correction described above is required to rectify a non-sequitur in the text. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing are unaffected and remain valid.		

2.6. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 6: Population and Health

Erratum 1

<i>For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 6-3 have been included in the table below.</i>		
Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.5.3	Table 6-3 – Health operational phase likely significant effects	Option 1V5
Existing Text		
Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL	
Option 1V5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Comparing the results for Option 1V5, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL): ■ ... ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would decrease by 22 compared to the EAR. These properties are located along the A29 south of Fontwell. 	
Amended Text		
Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL	
Option 1V5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Comparing the results for Option 1V5, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL): ■ ... ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would decrease by 22 4 compared to the EAR. These properties are located along the A29 south of Fontwell. 	
Explanation		
<p>The correction described above is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix (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 Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing with respect to population and health are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

Erratum 2

<i>For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 6-3 have been included in the table below.</i>		
Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.5.3	Table 6-3 – Health operational phase likely significant effects	Option 1V9
Existing Text		
Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL	
Option 1V9	Comparing the results for Option 1V9, Without WL, with those in the EAR (With WL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ... ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would increase by four compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north of Ford Road roundabout. 	
Amended Text		
Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL	
Option 1V9	Comparing the results for Option 1V9, Without WL, with those in the EAR (With WL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ... ■ The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would increase by four five compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north of Ford Road roundabout 	
Explanation		
<p>The correction is required to rectify a transcription error that resulted in an inconsistency within the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 5: Noise and Vibration. Table 5-2 reports the correct value, whilst the text in paragraph 5.4.3.1 immediately following reports the incorrect value. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing with respect to population and health are unaffected and remain valid.</p>		

Erratum 3

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 6-3 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.5.3	Table 6-3 – Health operational phase likely significant effects	Option 4/5AV1

Existing Text

Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL
Option 4/5AV1	<p>Comparing the results for Option 4/5AV1, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 30 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout, at Barnham Lane and at Slindon. A minor proportion of these properties (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would be the same compared to the EAR.

Amended Text

Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL
Option 4/5AV1	<p>Comparing the results for Option 4/5AV1, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 30 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout, at Barnham Lane and at Slindon. A minor proportion of these properties (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of other properties located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout (six) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. The number of properties subject to noise levels above the SOAEL in the design year, would be the same compared to the EAR.

Explanation

The correction described above is required to rectify a non-sequitur in the text. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing with respect to population and health are unaffected and remain valid.

Erratum 4

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 6-3 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.5.3	Table 6-3 – Health operational phase likely significant effects	Option 4/5AV2

Existing Text

Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL
Option 4/5AV2	<p>Comparing the results for Option 4/5AV2, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 7 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north and south of Ford Road roundabout, along Fitzalan Road and along School Hill in Slindon. There are no new properties subject to a major adverse noise impact and absolute noise levels above the LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of these properties (three) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. The number of properties subject to noise levels above SOAEL in the design year, would increase by 16 compared to the EAR. These properties are located near to Fontwell along the A27 and along the A29 near to Slindon. A number of properties are also located near to the A27 to the north Binsted.

Amended Text

Option	Comparison of With WL and Without WL
Option 4/5AV2	<p>Comparing the results for Option 4/5AV2, Without WL with those in the EAR (With WL):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of properties subject to a major adverse noise impact would increase by 7 compared to the EAR. These properties are located immediately north and south of Ford Road roundabout, along Fitzalan Road and along School Hill in Slindon. There are no new properties subject to a major adverse noise impact and absolute noise levels above the LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of these properties (three) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short-term. A minor proportion of other properties located immediately south of Ford Road roundabout (seven) would experience a moderate adverse impact with absolute noise levels above LOAEL in the short term. The number of properties subject to noise levels above SOAEL in the design year, would increase by 16 compared to the EAR. These properties are located near to Fontwell along the A27 and along the A29 near to Slindon. A number of properties are also located near to the A27 to the north Binsted.

Explanation

The correction described above is required to rectify a non-sequitur in the text. The noise assessment was based on the correct information and so the conclusions of the sensitivity testing with respect to population and health are unaffected and remain valid.

2.7. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 7: Greenhouse Gases

No errata were present in Chapter 7: Greenhouse Gases of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.8. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects

No errata were present in Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.

2.9. Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note Chapter 9: Summary

No errata were present in Chapter 9: Summary of the Environmental Sensitivity Testing Technical Note.