

A27 Arundel Bypass Public Consultation Brochure Errata

PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

February 2020

Consultation Brochure Errata, February 2020
A27 Arundel Bypass
PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Corrections.....	1
2.1. Biodiversity erratum	1
2.2. Population and health errata	2
2.3. Noise and vibration errata	3
2.4. Cultural heritage errata	4
2.5. Supplementary Information - Arboretum woodland areas	8

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to summarise a set of corrections to the revised A27 Arundel Bypass - Further Consultation Brochure (the 'Consultation Brochure') published in September 2019, which formed part of material available at the 2019 Further Consultation.

In each case, this note sets out the existing text in the Consultation Brochure 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 that is to be removed from the Existing Text is shown 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 errata presented in this note are based on the corrections made within the other environmental documents. There are some errata that make corrections to the level of significance of effect reported on a particular topic. In general, these errata relate to specific element of an environmental topic, for a specific Scheme option.

One item of supplementary information is provided in Section 2.5 below. This is not a correction or errata but explains the method of calculation of woodland areas affected by the Scheme options.

There are no attachments with this Errata document.

2. CORRECTIONS

2.1. Biodiversity erratum

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Biodiversity	Table - Summary of environmental effects Crimson (Option 3V1) column, Biodiversity row	Page 24
Existing Text		
Operation: Very large adverse effects for bats. Slight beneficial effects for Arundel Park SSSI and Fairmile Bottom SSSI. Large adverse effect on Binsted Wood Complex LWS.		
Amended Text		
Operation: Very large adverse effects for bats. Slight beneficial effects for Arundel Park SSSI and Fairmile Bottom SSSI. Large adverse effect on Binsted Wood Complex LWS. Moderate adverse effect on barn owl.		
Explanation		
<p>This amendment corrects the omission of an operational adverse effect relating to barn owls from the assessment of Crimson (Option 3V1). This correction has also been applied to the Project Control Framework (PCF) Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) Table 8-13 – Operational phase likely significant effects (see the Environmental Assessment Report Errata, February 2020).</p> <p>An additional operational adverse effect on Crimson (Option 3V1) is introduced as a result of this erratum, however this does not alter the overall conclusion of the EAR. Alone, barn owl effects are not a differentiating factor between off-line Scheme options as all have a moderate adverse impact in the operational phase. Furthermore Crimson (Option 3V1) is the worst performing option for biodiversity, with or without an additional adverse effect on barn owl.</p>		

2.2. Population and health errata

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Population and health	Table - Summary of environmental effects Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) column, Population and health row	Page 27
Existing Text		
Construction: Neutral effect on community land or facilities (or access to) for construction purposes. Moderate adverse permanent effect due to requirement of agricultural land or access.		
Amended Text		
Construction: Neutral Slight adverse effect on community land or facilities (or access to) for construction purposes. Moderate adverse permanent effect due to requirement of agricultural land or access.		
Explanation		
<p>This is a transcription error from PCF Stage 2 EAR, Chapter 12 Population and Health Table 12-41. Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) was assessed as having a Slight adverse effect on community land (for the Binsted strawberry festival) during the construction phase. The effect on community land or facilities during construction for Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) has been correctly stated in PCF Stage 2 EAR - Chapter 12 paragraph 12.10.5.8 and the assessment has been carried out correctly. The overall assessment of effects on community land or facilities during construction for Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) remains valid. There are no changes to the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR as a result of this amendment.</p> <p>This correction also applies to the PCF Stage 2 EAR – Chapter 12 Table 12-41. This correction has been reported in Environmental Assessment Report Errata, February 2020.</p>		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Population and health	Table - Summary of environmental effects All Scheme options, Population and health row	Page 26/27
Existing Text		
Operation: Moderate adverse effects on permanent road and public right of way diversions or closures which result in changes in journey length or severance. Moderate adverse effects on permanent changes in amenity. Positive effects on health outcomes resulting from air quality improvements and access to active travel opportunities. Negative impacts on health outcomes resulting from changes in noise levels.		
Amended Text		
Operation: Moderate adverse effects on permanent road and public right of way diversions or closures which result in changes in journey length or severance. Moderate adverse effects on permanent changes in amenity. Positive effects on health outcomes resulting from air quality improvements and access to active travel opportunities. Positive and negative impacts on health outcomes resulting from changes in noise levels.		
Explanation		

The amendment is due to a transcription error from PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 12 Table 12-42. 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 for health has been assessed correctly and the amendments do not change the overall conclusions in the PCF Stage 2 EAR. This effect is not a differentiating factor between Scheme options.

The positive effects from PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 12 – ‘Table 12-42 - Population and Health operation phase likely significant effects’ were omitted. The corrections will also be applied to Table 12-42. This correction has been reported in Environmental Assessment Report Errata, February 2020.

2.3. Noise and vibration errata

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Noise	Table - Summary of environmental effects Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) column, Noise and Vibration row	Page 27
Existing Text		
Operation: Significant adverse effects on existing dwellings:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ East and south of Crossbush ■ In Tortington and Binsted ■ South of A27 (west of Ford Road roundabout) 		
Amended Text		
Operation: Significant adverse effects on existing dwellings:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ East and south of Crossbush ■ On Fitzalan Road ■ In Tortington and Binsted ■ South of A27 (west of Ford Road roundabout) 		
Explanation		
<p>This correction is the result of a typographical error, which originated in Table 11-21 of the PCF Stage 2 EAR. For the Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) Fitzalan Road should have been identified as a significant adverse effect and as a consequence, Fitzalan Road was omitted from the Summary of environmental effects table in the Consultation Brochure. Whilst the conclusion for Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) has changed for the existing properties on Fitzalan Road, all the modelling, prediction and assessment work for PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) is correct. The revised conclusion for Magenta (Option 4/5AV1) at Fitzalan Road will be considered during the overall evaluation of the Scheme options.</p>		

2.4. Cultural heritage errata

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Cultural heritage	Table - Summary of environmental effects Cyan (Option 1V5) and Beige (Option 1V9), Cultural heritage row	Page 24
Existing Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect for all heritage assets with exception of Lyminster Conservation Area which is neutral. Slight adverse significance of effect on below-ground archaeology.</p> <p>Operation: Slight adverse significance of effect for all heritage assets.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect for all heritage assets with exception of numerous assets within Arundel. Slight adverse effect for 1 Grade II* and 10 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel. The effect on Lyminster Conservation Area which is neutral. Slight adverse significance effect on below-ground archaeology.</p> <p>Operation: Slight adverse significance of effect for all heritage assets Effects would be as per the construction phase but would be permanent. There are no effects on buried heritage assets.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>This erratum is a correction to asset counts in the construction and operation phase assessment of effects. The corrections are set out in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report Errata, February 2020) and reflects transcription errors in the number of designated heritage assets affected 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 are the result of a transcription error within a complex dataset.</p> <p>Whilst the erratum change 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 Interim Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) and the South Downs National Park Special Qualities Assessment (SDNP SQA).</p> <p>Regarding the operational phase, the erratum is a simplification of the description of the significance of effects. It is also a correction as the number of assets and the significance of effect was incorrect as a result of the transcription error from material that was available from the consultation documents. Whilst there is change to this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, it does not affect the overall scoring and the conclusions.</p>		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Cultural heritage	Table - Summary of environmental effects Crimson (Option 3V1), Cultural heritage row	Page 24
Existing Text		
<p>Construction: Large adverse effects on setting of Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Neutral effects in setting for the remainder of heritage assets. Slight adverse effects on all heritage assets for below-ground archaeology including the course of the Roman road (MWS14385).</p> <p>Operation: Large adverse effects on setting of Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Neutral effects on setting for all remaining heritage assets.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Construction: Large adverse effects on setting of Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Moderate adverse effect on numerous assets within Arundel. Neutral effects in setting for the remainder of heritage assets Slight adverse effects on the setting of 1 Grade II*, 9 Grade II listed buildings. Slight adverse effects on all heritage assets for below-ground archaeology including the course of the Roman road (MWS14385).</p> <p>Operation: Large adverse effects on setting of Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Neutral effects on setting for all remaining heritage assets. Effects on setting would be as per the construction phase but would be permanent. There are no effects on buried heritage assets.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>This erratum is a correction to asset counts in the construction and operation phase assessment of effects. The corrections are set out in detail in the corrected PCF Stage 2 EAR Cultural Heritage chapter (Attachment 1 of the PCF Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report Errata, February 2020) and reflect transcription errors in the number of designated heritage assets affected 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 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 (Crimson – Option 3V1, Magenta - Option 4/5AV1, Amber – Option 4/5AV2, Grey – Option 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 in the impact assessment for the offline options. This does not affect the overall assessment but provides a more robust assessment.</p> <p>Whilst the erratum change 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 SAR and SDNP SQA.</p> <p>Regarding the operational phase, the erratum is a simplification of the description of the significance of effects. It is also a correction as the number of assets and the significance of effect was incorrect as a result of the transcription error from material that was available from the consultation documents. Whilst there is change to this PCF Stage 2 (Options Selection) assessment, it does not affect overall scoring and the conclusions.</p>		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Cultural heritage	Table - Summary of environmental effects Magenta (Option 4/5AV1), Cultural heritage row	Page 25
Existing Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Slight adverse significance of effect on setting for the remainder of the heritage assets. Moderate adverse significance of effect on the curtilages of six Grade II Listed Buildings. Slight adverse effects on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets.</p> <p>Operation: Moderate adverse significance of effect for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Slight adverse significance of effect for the remainder of the Grade II listed buildings.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Moderate adverse effect on numerous assets within Arundel. Slight adverse significance of effect on setting of 1 Grade II* and 13 Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel for the remainder of the heritage assets. Moderate adverse significance of effect on the curtilages of six eight Grade II Listed Buildings outside Arundel. Slight adverse effects on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets.</p> <p>Operation: Moderate adverse significance of effect for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* listed building. Slight adverse significance of effect for the remainder of the Grade II listed buildings. Effects on setting would be as per the construction phase but would be permanent. There are no effects on buried heritage assets.</p>		
Explanation		
As per the Section 2.4 Erratum 2 explanation applied to the offline Magenta option (Option 4/5AV1).		

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Cultural heritage	Table - Summary of environmental effects Amber (Option 4/5AV2), Cultural heritage row	Page 25
Existing Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and two Grade II listed buildings. Neutral effects for the remainder of the heritage assets. Slight adverse effects on below-ground archaeology for all heritage assets.</p> <p>Operation: Moderate adverse significance of effect for the Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and two Grade II listed buildings. Neutral for the remainder of the Grade II listed buildings.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and two Grade II listed buildings. Moderate adverse effect on numerous assets within Arundel. Moderate adverse effect on 1 Grade II listed building outside Arundel. Slight adverse effect on 1 Grade II* and 19 Grade II</p>		

listed buildings outside Arundel. ~~Neutral effects for the remainder of the heritage assets.~~ Slight adverse effects on below-ground archaeology for all heritage assets.

Operation: ~~Moderate adverse significance of effect for the Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and two Grade II listed buildings. Neutral for the remainder of the Grade II listed buildings.~~ Effects on setting would be as per the construction phase but would be permanent. There are no effects on buried heritage assets.

Explanation

As per the Section 2.4 Erratum 2 explanation applied to offline Amber option (Option 4/5AV2).

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Page Location
Cultural heritage	Table - Summary of environmental effects Grey (5BV1) Option, Cultural heritage row	Page 25

Existing Text

Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and eight Grade II listed buildings. Neutral effect on the remaining Grade II listed buildings. Slight adverse significance of effect on the setting for Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Areas. Moderate adverse significance of effect on below-ground archaeology for all heritage assets.

Operation: Moderate adverse significance of effect for the Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and eight Grade II listed buildings. Neutral effect on the remaining Grade II listed buildings. Slight adverse significance of effect for Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Areas.

Amended Text

Construction: Moderate adverse significance of effect on setting for Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and ~~eight~~ **seven** Grade II listed buildings ~~outside Arundel.~~ ~~Moderate adverse effect on numerous assets within Arundel.~~ ~~Moderate adverse effect on seven Grade II listed buildings outside Arundel.~~ ~~Neutral effect on the remaining Grade II listed buildings.~~ Slight adverse ~~significance of~~ effect on ~~1~~ Grade II* and ~~15~~ Grade II listed buildings ~~outside Arundel and on~~ the setting for Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Areas. ~~Moderate~~ **Slight** adverse significance of effect on below-ground archaeology for all heritage assets.

Operation: ~~Moderate adverse significance of effect for the Tortington Priory Scheduled Monument and one Grade II* and eight Grade II listed buildings. Neutral effect on the remaining Grade II listed buildings. Slight adverse significance of effect for Walberton Village and Walberton Green Conservation Areas.~~ Effects on setting would be as per the construction phase but would be permanent. There are no effects on buried heritage assets.

Explanation

As per the Section 2.4 Erratum 2 explanation applied to the offline Grey option (Option 5BV1).

2.5. Supplementary Information - Arboretum woodland areas

This supplementary information has been provided to explain the method of calculation of woodland areas affected by the Scheme options. This is not a correction or errata.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Comparing the routes	Table – Benefits and Impacts Page 17, Row 5 (Environment)	Page 17

Existing Text

Deliver a scheme that minimises environmental impact and seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment through its high-quality design

All six options would have significant potential environmental impacts with the potential to adversely impact biodiversity, heritage features, landscape, soils, noise and hydrology. These impacts could be both direct (such as loss of habitat area) or indirect (such as edge effects and fragmentation of woodland areas). However, some impacts can be mitigated and compensated through design and construction phase environmental management. The design development process takes into account environmental considerations through numerous iterations – from initial concept through to detailed design. Further detail can be found in the Environmental Assessment Report (EAR). Each option would impact¹⁶ woodland to a varying degree, as shown below:



Supplementary information

The Public Consultation Brochure states the area of ‘impacted woodland’ for each option. The area of ‘impacted woodland’ comprises areas of ‘woodland loss’ and areas of ‘woodland at risk’. Definitions for these terms are also provided in Footnote 16 of the Public Consultation Brochure.

The calculated areas of impacted woodland were based on the National Forest Inventory (which comprises the same dataset as Magic Maps¹). Both of these datasets have been issued by the UK Government. There is no error in the calculation of impacted woodland based on these datasets and the stated area of ‘impacted woodland’ is correct.

Highways England surveys identified that the Arundel Arboretum area is now grassland (as stated in PCF Stage 2 EAR – Chapter 8). It is recognised that the nationally issued datasets do not reflect this. However, the need and criteria for updating or changing this parcel within the National Forest Inventory is a matter for the Forestry Commission.

The government issued datasets were used to perform these calculations as the use of official datasets allows access to the information by any member of the public.

Footnote 1: DEFRA. Magic Maps. Available online at: <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/> [Accessed January 2020].

Comparison of Arboretum woodland area calculations

The consultation brochure presents woodland loss calculations based on the inclusion of the Arundel Arboretum as woodland (as per National Forest Inventory). These are presented in the table below.

For comparison, the table below also presents woodland loss calculations based on the exclusion of the Arundel Arboretum from woodland areas.

The results of the woodland loss calculations with the arboretum included as woodland and with the arboretum excluded from woodland areas, are provided below, for each Scheme option.

Option	Public Brochure 'Impacted Woodland' (Arboretum included as woodland)	Revised 'Impacted Woodland' (Arboretum excluded from woodland)
Cyan - 1V5	8.37 ha	5.61 ha (decrease by 2.76ha)
Beige - 1V9	7.44 ha	4.68 ha (decrease by 2.76ha)
Crimson - 3V1	20.57 ha	17.76 ha (decrease by 2.81ha)
Magenta - 4/5AV1	3.51 ha	3.51 ha
Amber - 4/5AV2	5.33 ha	5.33 ha
Grey - 5BV1	1.49 ha	1.49 ha