

Environmental Assessment Report Erratum, September 2019 - A27 Arundel Bypass PCF Stage 2

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to summarise a set of corrections to the Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) dated August 2019.

All changes are made in red text. Text that is to be removed from the original is struck-out.

These corrections relate to data entry issues when the documents were drafted from the information on which the assessments were based. The corrections in the underlying technical documents do not affect or change the assessments undertaken and reported in the consultation documents.

2. CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

2.1. EAR Chapter 2: The Project

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
2.2.1	2.2.1.10	2 nd Sentence
Current Text		
As stated in Interim Scheme Assessment Report: Chapter 3, the A27 currently has a poor safety record, with a higher than average accident rate for rural A-roads. In the last 5 year period, 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2017 there have been 81 personal injury collisions, resulting in 121 casualties, recorded between Yapton Lane, to the east, and Crossbush junction to the west.		
Amended Text		
As stated in Interim Scheme Assessment Report: Chapter 3, the A27 currently has a poor safety record, with a higher than average accident rate for rural A-roads. In the last 5 year period, (1 January 2013 to 31 December 2017) there have been 81 personal injury collisions, resulting in 121 casualties, recorded between Yapton Lane Crossbush junction , to the east, and Crossbush junction Yapton lane to the west.		
Explanation		
The results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above as it is the result of a transcription error. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.		

2.2. EAR Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.8.1	6.8.1.1	Bullet Point 3
Current Text		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Grade II Listed Buildings of Firgrove House (LB 1277881); The Royal Oak Inn (LB 1274588); The lodge of Avisford Park Hotel (LB 1274555); Church Farmhouse, Binsted (LB 1222198); Morley's Crift (LB 1222201); Meadow Lodge (LB 1274878). 		
Amended Text		

- The Grade II Listed Buildings of Firgrove House (LB 12774881); The Royal Oak Inn (LB 1274588); The lodge of Avisford Park Hotel (LB 1274555); Church Farmhouse, Binsted (LB 1222198); Morley's Crioft (LB 1222201); Meadow Lodge (LB 1274878).

Explanation

The cultural heritage assessment was conducted based on the correct heritage assets as listed in Appendix 6-1. The results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above as it is the result of transcription errors between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter and not based on incorrect data. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
6.9.7	6.9.7.6	Final sentence
Current Text		
These impacts are outlined in Table 6-9.		
Amended Text		
These impacts are outlined in Table 6-9 Table 6-11.		
Explanation		
The corrected cross-reference would not affect the results or conclusions of the environmental assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.		

2.3. EAR Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Effects

Erratum 1

<i>For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-10 have been included in the table below.</i>		
Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.6.8	Table 7-10 - Sensitivity of identified receptors for landscape and visual assessment	
Current Table		

Receptor	Sensitivity	Scheme options
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22, 23, 36 – 45 and 56 – 58	High	Option 1V5
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22, 23, 36 – 45 and 56 – 58	High	Option 1V9
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22 - 27, 35 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 3V1
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 3, 9 – 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 28 – 30, 35 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 4/5AV1
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 7, 9 – 12, 15, 20, 21, 23, 28 – 30, 35 – 44 and 53 – 58,	High	Option 4/5AV2
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 3, 9 – 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 28 – 30, 35 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 5BV1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 46 – 49, 51 and 52	Moderate	Option 1V5
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 46 – 49 and 51	Moderate	Option 1V9
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 32, 34 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 3V1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, 31 – 34 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 4/5AV1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 8, 16, 31 – 34 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 4/5AV2
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRow network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, 16, 31 – 34 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 5BV1

Amended Text

Receptor	Sensitivity	Scheme options
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22, 23, 36 – 45 and 56 – 58	High	Option 1V5
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22, 23, 36 – 45 and 56 – 58	High	Option 1V9
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 22 - 27, 35, 36 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 3V1
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 3, 9 – 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 28 – 30, 35, 36 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 4/5AV1
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 7, 9 – 12, 15, 20, 21, 23, 28 – 30, 35, 36 – 44 and 53 – 58,	High	Option 4/5AV2
Users of main paths and trails in the SDNP and main residential receptors represented by viewpoints 3, 9 – 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 28 – 30, 35, 36 – 44 and 53 – 58	High	Option 5BV1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 46 – 49, 51 and 52	Moderate	Option 1V5
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 46 – 49 and 51	Moderate	Option 1V9
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 31, 32, 34, 35 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 3V1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 14, 16, 19, 31 – 3435 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 4/5AV1
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 8, 16, 31 – 3435 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 4/5AV2
Users of scenic transport routes; local PRoW network (outside the National Park) and distant edge settlements represented by viewpoints 1, 2, 5, 6, 14, 16, 19, 31 – 3435 and 46 – 52	Moderate	Option 5BV1

Explanation

The overall landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoints as listed in Appendix 7-2. The results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the correct sensitivity was used for the assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change, which arose as the result of transcription or data entry errors between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter.

Erratum 2

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-16 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	Table 7-16 - Operational phase likely effects on viewpoint viewpoints from Option 1V5	

Current Table

Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 39	High	Moderate	Moderate Adverse	Moderate	Moderate Adverse
Viewpoint 56	High	Negligible	Slight Adverse	Negligible	Slight
Viewpoint 58	High	Negligible	Slight Adverse	Negligible	Slight

Amended Text

Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 39	High	Moderate	Moderate Adverse	Moderate -Minor	Moderate -Slight Adverse
Viewpoint 52	Moderate	Negligible	Neutral	Negligible	Neutral
Viewpoint 56	High	Negligible	Slight Adverse	Negligible	Slight Adverse
Viewpoint 58	High	Negligible	Slight Adverse	Negligible	Slight Adverse

Explanation

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The overall results of the assessment for the viewpoints above have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 3

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-19 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	Table 7-19 - Construction phase likely effects on viewpoint receptors from Option 3V1	

Current Table

Likely impact of construction works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of effect
Viewpoint 50	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate Adverse

Amended Text

Likely impact of construction works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of effect
Viewpoint 50	Moderate	Moderate -Major	Moderate -Large Adverse

Explanation

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-19 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	Table 7-19 - Construction phase likely effects on viewpoint receptors from Option 3V1	

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a significant adverse effect in respect of the visual amenity assessment for Viewpoint 50. The baseline data is correct. The errata is the result of transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.16	

Current Text

Option 1V5 would not form a significant component in the range of views from within the elevated and open areas of the SDNP to the north. Viewpoints 54, 56, 57 and 58 demonstrate that Option 1V5 would either not be visible or would form a minor and distant element that is not likely to draw the focus away from the setting of Arundel or the broader expanse of the open floodplain. In the range of views from the south towards the SDNP the open foreground of the floodplains would generally be retained in views, particularly further south, where the contrast with the dramatic rise of the Downs and the prominent position of Arundel would still be experienced. Option 1V5 would influence the setting through the increased awareness of traffic movements crossing the northern expanse of floodplain in association with other built elements around the urban fringe of Arundel.

Amended Text

Option 1V5 would not form a significant component in the range of views from within the elevated and open areas of the SDNP to the north. Viewpoints ~~52, 54,~~ 56, 57 and 58 demonstrate that Option 1V5 would either not be visible or would form a minor and distant element that is not likely to draw the focus away from the setting of Arundel or the broader expanse of the open floodplain. In the range of views from the south towards the SDNP the open foreground of the floodplains would generally be retained in views, particularly further south, where the contrast with the dramatic rise of the Downs and the prominent position of Arundel would still be experienced. Option 1V5 would influence the setting through the increased awareness of traffic movements crossing the northern expanse of floodplain in association with other built elements around the urban fringe of Arundel.

Explanation

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The overall results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.37 and 7.9.4.38	

Current Text

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.37 and 7.9.4.38	
7.9.4.37	During construction there are likely to be large adverse effects from Option 3V1 for Viewpoints 22 - 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37B, 43, and 46 – 49 (representing residents, visitors and users of public rights of way in the SDNP and in non-designated landscapes as well as locations with cultural associations).	
7.9.4.38	During construction there are likely to be Moderate Adverse effects from Option 3V1 for Viewpoints 38, 39, 40, 41, 50 and 51 (representing residents, visitors and users of public rights of way in the SDNP and in non-designated landscapes as well as locations with cultural associations and users of the railway network and local lanes).	
Amended Text		
7.9.4.37	During construction there are likely to be large adverse effects from Option 3V1 for Viewpoints 22 - 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37B, 43, and 46 – 49 and 50 (representing residents, visitors and users of public rights of way in the SDNP and in non-designated landscapes as well as locations with cultural associations).	
7.9.4.38	During construction there are likely to be Moderate Adverse effects from Option 3V1 for Viewpoints 38, 39, 40, 41, 50 and 51 (representing residents, visitors and users of public rights of way in the SDNP and in non-designated landscapes as well as locations with cultural associations and users of the railway network and local lanes).	
Explanation		
The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The overall results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.		

Erratum 6

<i>For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-24 have been included in the table below.</i>					
Section	Paragraph / Table	Location			
7.9.4	Table 7-24 - Operational phase likely effects on viewpoint receptors as a result of Option 4/5AV2				
Current Table					
Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 1	Moderate	No change	Neutral	No change	Neutral
Amended Text					
Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 1	Moderate	No change Negligible	Neutral Slight Adverse	No change	Neutral
Explanation					

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-24 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	Table 7-24 - Operational phase likely effects on viewpoint receptors as a result of Option 4/5AV2	

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a not significant adverse effect in respect of Viewpoint 1 The baseline data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 7

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 7-26 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	Table 7-26 - Operational phase likely effects on viewpoint receptors as a result of Option 5BV1	

Current Table

Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 17	High	Major	Large Adverse	Major	Moderate Adverse

Amended Text

Likely Impact of operational works on visual amenity of receptors at:	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact Year 1	Significance of effect Year 1	Magnitude of Impact Year 15	Significance of effect Year 15
Viewpoint 17	High	Major	Large Adverse	Major	Moderate Large Adverse

Explanation

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a significant adverse effect in respect of Viewpoint 17. The baseline data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 8

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.9	

Current Text

By Year 15, limited mitigation planting (restricted to Crossbush junction and some sections to the west of Ford Road roundabout) would have matured and provide some additional screening. As no planting across the floodplain or over the flyover is proposed, then the majority of effects at Year 15 are the same as in Year 1 of opening. The residual effects would therefore result in significant moderate adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 36, 37A, 39, 43, 46 and 47.

Amended Text
By Year 15, limited mitigation planting (restricted to Crossbush junction and some sections to the west of Ford Road roundabout) would have matured and provide some additional screening. As no planting across the floodplain or over the flyover is proposed, then the majority of effects at Year 15 are the same as in Year 1 of opening. The residual effects would therefore result in significant moderate adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 36, 37A, 39 , 43, 46 and 47.
Explanation
The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a significant adverse effect in respect of Year 15 (Option 1V5). The baseline data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix and the summary text within the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.81	
Current Text		
The residual effects of Option 4/5AV2 at Year 15 would therefore result in significant large adverse visual effects on viewpoints 7, 9, 10, 12, 16A, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38 – 40 and 46 – 51 and significant moderate adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 11, 16A, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40 and 46 – 51.		
Amended Text		
The residual effects of Option 4/5AV2 at Year 15 would therefore result in significant large adverse visual effects in Year 15 on Viewpoints 7, 9, 10, 12, 16A, 15, 20, 21, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 40 and 46 – 51 30, 33, 35, 36, 37B and 43 and significant moderate adverse visual effects on Viewpoints 11, 16A, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40 and 46 – 51.		
Explanation		
The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a significant adverse effect Year 15 (Option 4/5AV2). The baseline data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.		

Erratum 10

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
7.9.4	7.9.4.96	
Current Text		
At operation by Year 15 there are therefore likely to be significant very large adverse effects from Option 5BV1 for Viewpoint 13 and significant large adverse effects for Viewpoints 10, 14, 16B, 19, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37B and 43. There are also likely to be significant moderate adverse effects for Viewpoints 2, 3, 5B, 9, 17, 18, 28, 31, 32, 34, 38 – 40 and 46 – 51.		
Amended Text		

At operation by Year 15 there are therefore likely to be significant very large adverse effects from Option 5BV1 for Viewpoint 13 and significant large adverse effects for Viewpoints ~~10~~, 14, 16B, 17, 19, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37B and 43. There are also likely to be significant moderate adverse effects for Viewpoints 2, 3, 5B, 9, ~~10, 17~~, 18, 28, 31, 32, 34, 38 – 40 and 46 – 51.

Explanation

The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The effect remains a significant adverse effect for Year 15 (Option 5BV1). The underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 11

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Appendix 7-2 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appendix 7.2	Viewpoint 4	Option 4/5AV2

Current Text

Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
Viewpoint 4 – Yapton Lane	Viewpoint 4 shows a section of Yapton Lane. ...On the west side of the view in the foreground, the entrance of a private property, 'Little Danes' can be seen. North of it, immediately before a bend in the lane, the main entrance to The Hilton Avisford Park Hotel is discernible. On the east side of Yapton Lane the edge of Little Danes Wood runs into the boundary of a further property with a densely planted boundary.	Moderate	4/5AV2	The proposed option would be approximately 230m to the north east. Construction: At construction, activities may be just discernible in distance, with some loss of tree canopies and traffic management slightly affecting use of Yapton Lane. Operation: At operation, there would be no discernible change to the view.	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral	No change	Neutral	No change

Amended Text

Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
--	-------------	-------------	--------	--	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------

Viewpoint 4 – Yapton Lane	Viewpoint 4 shows a section of Yapton Lane. ... On the west side of the view in the foreground, the entrance of a private property, 'Little Danes' can be seen. North of it, immediately before a bend in the lane, the main entrance to The Hilton Avisford Park Hotel is discernible. On the east side of Yapton Lane the edge of Little Danes Wood runs into the boundary of a further property with a densely planted boundary.	Moderate	4/5AV2	The proposed option would be approximately 230m to the north east. Construction: At construction, activities may be just discernible in distance, with some loss of tree canopies and traffic management slightly affecting use of Yapton Lane. Operation: At operation, there would be no discernible change to the view.	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral No change	No change Neutral	Neutral No change	No change Neutral
----------------------------------	---	-----------------	--------	--	------------	----------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Explanation

The significance of landscape assessments was determined by assessing the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of any impact. The overall assessment results (and significance of effect) for Viewpoint 4 (Option 4/5AV2) have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error (the columns were simply transcribed the wrong way around). There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 12

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Appendix 7-2 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appendix 7.2	Viewpoint 5A	Option 4/5AV2

Current Text

Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
Viewpoint 5A – Yapton Lane junction with Hedgers Hill Looking north	Viewpoint 5A is from a small grassed traffic island at the junctions of Yapton Lane and Hedgers Hill. Yapton Lane occupies the left side of the view and is bounded by dense vegetation associated with property boundaries and the edge of Avisford Park. In the centre of	Moderate	4/5AV2	The proposed option would be approximately 230m to the north east. At construction, activities may be just discernible in distance, with some loss of tree canopies perceptible.	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral	No change	Neutral	No change

the view, garden boundary vegetation to a corner property is seen between the two roads and adjoining this, the top of Hedgers Hill occupies the right hand side of the view. Further dense vegetation bounding the south side of Hedgers Hill is the edge of part of Avisford Park golf course.										
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Amended Text

Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
Viewpoint 5A – Yapton Lane junction with Hedgers Hill Looking north	Viewpoint 5A is from a small grassed traffic island at the junctions of Yapton Lane and Hedgers Hill. Yapton Lane occupies the left side of the view and is bounded by dense vegetation associated with property boundaries and the edge of Avisford Park. In the centre of the view, garden boundary vegetation to a corner property is seen between the two roads and adjoining this, the top of Hedgers Hill occupies the right hand side of the view. Further dense vegetation bounding the south side of Hedgers Hill is the edge of part of Avisford Park golf course.	Moderate	4/5AV2	The proposed option would be approximately 230m to the north east. At construction, activities may be just discernible in distance, with some loss of tree canopies perceptible.	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral No change	No change Neutral	Neutral No change	No change Neutral

Explanation

The significance of landscape assessments was determined by assessing the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of any effect. The overall assessment results (and significance of effect) for Viewpoint 5A (Option 4/5AV2) have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error (the columns were simply transcribed the wrong way around). There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.

Erratum 13

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Appendix 7-2 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table		Location							
Appendix 7.2	Viewpoint 6		Option 4/5AV2							
Current Text										
Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
Viewpoint 6 – Hedgers Hill Looking south west	Viewpoint 6 shows a south west facing view from within a dip, which forms the lowest lying point of Hedgers Hill, looking into the shrubs and trees on the edge of Avisford Park golf course; this vegetation effectively forms a spur of Little Danes Wood on the south side of	Moderate	5BV1	The proposed option would be approximately 250m to the south west. At construction, activities may be discernible through foreground vegetation in winter, with some loss of tree canopies perceptible. With mitigation planting to the north of the proposed option, there would be no discernible change to the view at operation.	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral	No change	Neutral	No change
Amended Text										
Viewpoint name, number and direction of view	Description	Sensitivity	Option	Description of impacts (construction/ operation)	Magnitude of Impact (C'truction)	Significance of Effect (C'truction)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 1)	Significance of Effect (Year 1)	Magnitude of Impact (Year 15)	Significance of Effect (Year 15)
Viewpoint 6 – Hedgers Hill Looking south west	Viewpoint 6 shows a south west facing view from within a dip, which forms the lowest lying point of Hedgers Hill, looking into the shrubs and trees on the edge of Avisford Park golf course; this vegetation effectively forms a spur of Little Danes Wood on the south side of	Moderate	5BV1	The proposed option would be approximately 250m to the south west. At construction, activities may be discernible through foreground vegetation in winter, with some loss of tree canopies perceptible. With mitigation planting to the north of the proposed option, there would be no discernible change to the	Negligible	Slight adverse	Neutral No change	No change Neutral	Neutral No change	No change Neutral

				view at operation.						
Explanation										
<p>The significance of landscape assessments was determined by assessing the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of any effect. The overall assessment results (and significance of effect) for Viewpoint 6 (Option 5BV1) have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error (the columns were simply transcribed the wrong way around). There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.</p>										

2.4. EAR Chapter 8: Biodiversity

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.8.3	Table 8-11 - Review of mitigation complexity	Option 5BV1
Current Text		
<p>Option 5BV1 will result in loss of relatively small areas of ancient woodland which it is not possible to compensate. It will require areas of land to be acquired for new woodland and wetland habitat compensation.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Option 5BV1 will not result in the loss of ancient woodland. which it is not possible to compensate. It will require areas of land to be acquired for new woodland and wetland habitat compensation.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>Option 5BV1 does not lead to the loss of ancient woodland. The errata referred to above is the result of a transcription error within the main EAR chapter. The loss of ancient woodland associated with Option 5BV1 is stated in the following locations within the EAR chapter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Table 8-9 (Construction phase potential impacts) states 5BV1 leads to a loss of 0ha of ancient woodland. 2 Paragraph 8.9.2.12 states that only Options 1V5, 1V9, 3V1, 4/5AV1 and 4/5AV2 may lead to a loss of ancient woodland. 3 Table 8-12 (Construction phase likely significant effects) –states that the effect of 5BV1 on ancient woodland is Neutral (not significant). 4 Supporting GIS figures (e.g. Figures 8-1 to 8-7) utilise the correct technical layout for Option 5BV1. Figure 8-6 illustrates that 5BV1 does not intersect with any areas of ancient woodland. <p>The overall assessment results (and significance of effect) for Option 5BV1 have not changed as a result of the errata described above as the underlying (and baseline) data is correct. There would be no amendment to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this errata.</p>		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.7.2	Table 8-9 - Construction phase potential impacts	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS (Edge effects)
Current Text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.7.2	Table 8-9 - Construction phase potential impacts	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS (Edge effects)
<p>Following habitat loss and severance of Binsted Wood Complex by Option 3V1 and Option 4/5AV1 it is likely that indirect edge effects would permeate into Binsted Wood Complex LWS. The previously enclosed woodland would be exposed to additional light, wind and altered humidity. This is likely to degrade the habitat adjacent to the new road, leading to alterations to the ancient woodland plant community due to these 'edge' effects.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Following habitat loss and severance of Binsted Wood Complex by Option 3V1 and Option 4/5AV1 4/5AV2 it is likely that indirect edge effects would permeate into Binsted Wood Complex LWS. The previously enclosed woodland would be exposed to additional light, wind and altered humidity. This is likely to degrade the habitat adjacent to the new road, leading to alterations to the ancient woodland plant community due to these 'edge' effects.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The overall assessment results regarding potential construction phase effects on Binsted Wood Complex LWS for 4/5AV1 and 4/5AV2 are stated incorrectly and should be reversed.</p> <p>There is no change in either the importance or significance category of the receptor (Binsted Wood Complex LWS) between the two options. The underlying baseline data and GIS figures, and therefore the environmental assessment undertaken, are correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error regarding the option names.</p> <p>This would lead to one less adverse effect on 4/5AV1 and one additional adverse effect on 4/5AV2 stated in the EAR, but this does not change the output of the results of the assessments, it is simply as a result, as stated above, of a transcription error.</p>		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.7.3	Table 8-10 - Operational phase potential impacts	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS (Edge effects)
Current Text		
<p>Following severance of Binsted Wood Complex by Option 3V1 and Option 4/5AV1 it is likely that indirect edge effects would permeate into Binsted Wood Complex LWS. The previously enclosed woodland would be exposed to additional light, wind and altered humidity. This is likely to degrade the habitat adjacent to the new road, leading to alterations to the ancient woodland plant community due to these 'edge' effects.</p>		
Amended Text		
<p>Following severance of Binsted Wood Complex by Option 3V1 and Option 4/5AV1 4/5AV2 it is likely that indirect edge effects would permeate into Binsted Wood Complex LWS. The previously enclosed woodland would be exposed to additional light, wind and altered humidity. This is likely to degrade the habitat adjacent to the new road, leading to alterations to the ancient woodland plant community due to these 'edge' effects.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The overall assessment results regarding potential operational phase effects on Binsted Wood Complex LWS for 4/5AV1 and 4/5AV2 are stated incorrectly and should be reversed.</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.7.3	Table 8-10 - Operational phase potential impacts	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS (Edge effects)
<p>There is no change in either the importance or significance category of the receptor (Binsted Wood Complex LWS) between the two options. The underlying baseline data and GIS figures, and therefore the environmental assessment undertaken are correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error regarding the option names.</p> <p>This would lead to one less adverse effect on 4/5AV1 and one additional adverse effect on 4/5AV2 stated in the EAR, but this does not change the output of the results of the assessments, it is simply as a result, as stated above, of a transcription error.</p> <p>This table, including the errata, is one of the data sources for the following (the errata for which, that are linked to this errata, are reported below):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 EAR Chapter 8 – Biodiversity: Table 8-13; 2 EAR Chapter 19 – Summary: Paragraphs 19.5.10.1 and 19.5.11.1 3 SAR Chapter 12 – Summary of the environmental assessment: Paragraph 12.5.5.3; and 4 Public Consultation Brochure: Environmental Context Table. 		

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location				
8.9.3	Table 8-13 - Operational phase likely significant effects	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS				
Current Table Layout (partial table)						
Ecological Feature	Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Binsted Wood Complex LWS	Not Significant - Neutral	Not Significant - Neutral	Significant – Large Adverse	Significant – Large Adverse	Not Significant - Neutral	Not Significant - Neutral
Amended Table Layout						
Ecological Feature	Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Binsted Wood Complex LWS	Not Significant - Neutral	Not Significant - Neutral	Significant – Large Adverse	Significant – Large Adverse Significant – Slight Adverse	Not Significant – Neutral Significant – Large Adverse	Not Significant - Neutral
Explanation						
<p>The overall assessment results regarding potential operational phase effects on Binsted Wood Complex LWS for 4/5AV1 and 4/5AV2 are stated incorrectly in the summary table.</p> <p>There is no change in the significance category of the receptor (Binsted Wood Complex LWS) between the two options. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the main EAR chapter and the summary table (Table 8-13 - Operational phase likely significant effects).</p> <p>This would lead to one additional adverse effect on 4/5AV2 stated in the EAR, but this does not change the output of the results of the assessments, it is simply as a result, as stated above, of a transcription error.</p> <p>This table, including the errata, is one of the data sources for the following (the errata for which, that are linked to this errata, are reported below):</p>						

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 8-13 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.9.3	Table 8-13 - Operational phase likely significant effects	Row: Binsted Wood Complex LWS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 EAR Chapter 19 – Summary: Paragraphs 19.5.10.1 and 19.5.11.1 2 SAR Chapter 12 – Summary of the environmental assessment: Paragraphs 12.5.4.3 and 12.5.5.3; and 3 Public Consultation Brochure: Environmental Context Table. 		

Erratum 5

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 8-13 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
8.9.3	Table 8-13 - Operational phase likely significant effects	Row: Bats

Current Table Layout (partial table)

Ecological Feature	Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Bats	Significant – Moderate Adverse	Significant – Moderate Adverse	Significant – Very Large Adverse	Significant – Very Large Adverse	Significant – Large Adverse	Significant – Moderate Adverse

Amended Table Layout

Ecological Feature	Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Bats	Significant – Moderate Adverse	Significant – Moderate Adverse	Significant – Very Large Adverse	Significant – Very Large Adverse Significant – Large Adverse	Significant – Large Adverse Significant – Very Large Adverse	Significant – Moderate Adverse

Explanation

The overall assessment results regarding potential operational phase effects on Bats for 4/5AV1 and 4/5AV2 are stated incorrectly and should be reversed.

The underlying baseline data and GIS figures, and therefore the environmental assessment undertaken, are correct. The errata is the result of a transcription error regarding the option names

This table, including the errata, is one of the data sources for the following (the errata for which, that are linked to this errata, are reported below):

- 1 EAR Chapter 19 – Summary: Paragraphs 19.5.10.1 and 19.5.11.1
- 2 SAR Chapter 12 – Summary of the environmental assessment: Paragraph 12.5.5.3; and
- 3 Public Consultation Brochure: Environmental Context Table.

2.5. EAR Chapter 12: Population and Health

Erratum 1

For ease of readability, only the relevant rows of Table 12.9 have been included in the table below.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location					
12.5.5	12-19	Row: Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take					
Current Table							
Key Environmental Value		Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take	Broomhurst Farm (Sheep, cattle and arable)	88.3ha	87.9ha	11.53 ha	11.54 ha	11.54ha	11.51ha
Amended Table							
Key Environmental Value		Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take	Broomhurst Farm (Sheep, cattle and arable)	88.3ha 9.14ha	87.9ha 9.09ha	11.53ha 11.55ha	11.54ha 11.58ha	11.54ha 11.58ha	11.51 11.55ha
Explanation							
<p>The overall assessment results regarding potential land take on Broomhurst farm are stated incorrectly. The corrected land take figures take into account a misaligned decimal point and the corrected land take figures derived the design freeze in June 2019.</p> <p>The assessment was conducted based on correct underlying baseline data and GIS figures. The overall results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above. The errata is due to a data entry error in the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this errata.</p>							

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location					
12.5.5	12-19	Row: Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take					
Current Table text							
<p>There are two different values for the likely land take on the Arundel Arboretum. These are under 'Private property', and 'Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take'.</p>							
Key Environmental Value		Option 1V5	Option 1V9	Option 3V1	Option 4/5AV1	Option 4/5AV2	Option 5BV1
Private property	Arundel Arboretum (Horticultural nursery)	3.17ha Access is also within footprint.	3.16ha Access is also within footprint.	2.25ha	N/a	N/a	N/a
Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take	Arundel Arboretum (Horticultural nursery)	3.01ha Access is also within footprint.	2.80ha Access is also within footprint.	2.28ha	N/a	N/a	N/a
Clarification							
<p>The following text is an additional explanation to aid the reader's understanding of the data. This is not making a correction to the data in the table.</p>							

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
12.5.5	12-19	Row: Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take
<p>The apparent difference in land take values associated with the arboretum is due to a minor difference in the area of land held under private ownership, compared to the area of land used for agricultural purposes. The two measurements were based on the following calculation methodologies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The land take under the 'Private property' category was based on measurements from Land Registry parcels. 2 Land take under the 'Effect on agricultural land in terms of land-take' was measured (or digitised) on a non cadastral map of the apparent farm extent (i.e. visual interpretation of available land maps / imagery). <p>Land Registry parcel information was not available during the assessment of agricultural land take potential effects. The information from the digitisation of other mapping was used to inform the assessment.</p> <p>The assessments are correct. This erratum merely provides further detail on methods of measurement.</p>		

2.6. EAR Chapter 14 – Climate: Greenhouse Gases

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
14.2.1.1	Table 14-1	Row: The Climate Change Act 2008
Current text		
<p>The Climate Change Act 2008 created a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK. It commits the UK Government by law to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% of 1990 levels by 2050 and sets successive 5 year carbon budgets.</p>		
Amended text		
<p>The Climate Change Act 2008 created a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK. It commits the UK Government by law to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% 100% of 1990 levels by 2050 and sets successive 5 year carbon budgets.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The UK Government amended its greenhouse gas reduction targets in June 2019 from at 'least 80%' to 'at least 100%'.</p>		

2.7. EAR Chapter 17: Cumulative impacts

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
17.1.1	17.1.1.4	Reference to PINS Advice Note 17
Current text		
<p>'In preparing the assessment, it should not be forgotten that a key purpose of EIA is to inform the examination and decision making process (its findings must be 'taken into consideration'). Whilst applicants should make a genuine attempt to assess the effects arising from multiple, individually non-significant effects, the CEA should be</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
17.1.1	17.1.1.4	Reference to PINS Advice Note 17
<p>proportionate and not be any longer than is necessary to identify and assess any likely significant cumulative effects that are material to the decision making process, rather than cataloguing every conceivable effect that might occur.'</p>		
<p>Amended text</p>		
<p>In preparing the assessment, it should not be forgotten that a key purpose of EIA is to inform the examination and decision-making process (its findings must be 'taken into consideration') the ES is to enable the examination necessary to inform decisions (the Secretary of State must examine the environmental information in reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development)¹². Whilst applicants should make a genuine attempt to assess the effects arising from multiple, individually non-significant effects, the CEA should be proportionate and should not be any longer than is necessary to identify and assess any likely significant cumulative effects</p> <p>¹² refers to Regulation 21(1) of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 CEA: Cumulative Effects Assessment</p>		
<p>Explanation</p>		
<p>The cumulative assessment was conducted based on PINS Advice Note 17. However, the text in the EAR mis-quoted the Advice Note.</p> <p>The results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.</p>		

2.8. EAR Chapter 19: Summary

Summary Explanation for Errata 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12

Errata 1 to Errata 4, Errata 6, Errata 8, Errata 9, Errata 11 and Errata 12 within EAR Chapter 19 – Summary refers to a cross reference of data between the specific topic chapter and the Chapter 19 - Summary document. The cross reference requires a correction to direct the reader to the correct table within the EAR. The corrected cross-reference would not affect the results or conclusions of the environmental assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of these errata.

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.2	19.3.2.1	Final sentence
<p>Current text</p>		
<p>Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).</p>		
<p>Amended text</p>		
<p>Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).</p>		
<p>Explanation</p>		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.2	19.3.2.1	Final sentence
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.3	19.3.3.1	Final sentence
Current text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).		
Amended text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.4	19.3.4.1 and 19.3.4.2	Final sentence of each paragraph
Current text (Para 19.3.4.1)		Current text (Para 19.3.4.2)
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).		Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology for all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).
Amended text (Para 19.3.4.1)		Amended text (Para 19.3.4.2)
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).		Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology for all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.5	19.3.5.1	Final sentence
Current text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.5	19.3.5.1	Final sentence
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).		
Amended text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.5	19.3.5.2	Final sentence
Current text		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on below ground archaeology are likely on four Archaeological Notification Areas (ANAs), and a Building in Binsted Wood (MWS2301). For the heritage asset 'Park – Binsted House (MWS2354)' further investigation would be necessary before any assessment can be determined, since the park may contain previously unrecorded archaeological features.		
Amended text		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on below ground archaeology are likely on four Archaeological Notification Areas (ANAs), and a Building in Binsted Wood (MWS2301), and a historic landscape (HWS24819) . For the heritage asset 'Park – Binsted House (MWS2354)' further investigation would be necessary before any assessment can be determined, since the park may contain previously unrecorded archaeological features.		
Explanation		
The overall cultural heritage assessment was conducted based on the correct heritage assets as listed in Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage. The overall results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above. The errata is the result of a transcription error between EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage and Chapter 19 - Summary. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this errata.		

Erratum 6

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.6	19.3.6.1 and 19.3.6.3	Final sentence of each paragraph
Current text (Para 19.3.6.1)		Current text (Para 19.3.6.3)
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).		Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9).

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.6	19.3.6.1 and 19.3.6.3	Final sentence of each paragraph
Amended text (Para 19.3.6.1)		Amended text (Para 19.3.6.3)
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).		Moderate Adverse effects (significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-9 Table 6-11).
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 7

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.8	19.3.8.1	Final sentence
Current text		
During the operational phase, Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10) for all Scheme options.		
Amended text		
During the operational phase, Neutral effects (not significant) no post mitigation effects are likely on below ground archaeology for all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10 Table 6-12) for all Scheme options.		
Explanation		
The text within Chapter 19 – Summary should be corrected to match the same terminology as Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage.		
The effect remains a not significant effect. The errata is the result of a transcription error between EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage and Chapter 19 - Summary.		
The cross reference requires a correction to direct the reader to the correct table within Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage. The corrected cross-reference would not affect the results or conclusions of the environmental assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of these errata		

Erratum 8

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.9	19.3.9.1	Final sentence
Current text		
During the operational phase, Option 1V5 and 1V9 are likely to have Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on the setting for all heritage assets ((Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10)).		
Amended text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.9	19.3.9.1	Final sentence
During the operational phase, Option 1V5 and 1V9 are likely to have Slight Adverse effects (not significant) on the setting for all heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10-Table 6-12).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.10	19.3.10.1	Final sentence
Current text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10).		
Amended text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for all other identified heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10-Table 6-12).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 10

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.10	19.3.10.1	Final sentence
Current text		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the below ground archaeology of two Archaeology Notification Areas and a section of the Chichester to Brighton Roman Road.		
Amended text		
19.3.10.2 Slight Adverse effects (not significant) No post mitigation effects are likely on the below ground archaeology of two Archaeology Notification Areas and a section of the Chichester to Brighton Roman Road for this option.		
Explanation		
The text within Chapter 19 – Summary has been corrected to match the same terminology as Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage. The formatting has also been updated to provide a paragraph number.		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.10	19.3.10.1	Final sentence
<p>The effect remains a not significant adverse effect. The errata is the result of a transcription error between EAR Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage and Chapter 19 - Summary.</p> <p>The cross reference requires a correction to direct the reader to the correct table within Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage. The corrected cross-reference would not affect the results or conclusions of the environmental assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of these errata.</p>		

Erratum 11

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.11	19.3.11.1	Final sentence
Current text		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10).		
Amended text		
Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 – Table 6-10 Table 6-12).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 12

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.12	19.3.12.1	Final sentence
Current text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10).		
Amended text		
Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting of the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10 Table 6-12).		
Explanation		
See Summary Explanation at the start of this section.		

Erratum 13

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.3.13	19.3.13.1	Final sentence
Current text		
<p>Option 5BV1 was considered to have a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn and a further eight Grade II buildings (Morley's Croft; House at Meadow Lodge; Glebe House; Church Farmhouse, Binsted; Avisford Park Hotel; House at Beam Ends; Swiss Cottage; and St Mary's Church, Binsted). Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10).</p>		
Amended text		
<p>Option 5BV1 was considered to have a Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on Tortington Augustinian Priory and Grade II* Tortington Priory Barn and a further eight Grade II buildings (Morley's Croft; House at Meadow Lodge; Glebe House; Church Farmhouse, Binsted; Avisford Park Hotel; House at Beam Ends; Swiss Cottage; and St Mary's Church, Binsted). Slight Adverse effects (not significant) are likely on the Walberton Conservation Areas during the operational phase. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on the setting for the remaining heritage assets (Refer to EAR Chapter 6 - Table 6-10 Table 6-12).</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The overall cultural heritage assessment was conducted based on the correct assets provided in Chapter 6 – Cultural Heritage. The errata is the result of transcription error between the main EAR chapter (Chapter 6) and Chapter 19 - Summary. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.</p>		

Erratum 14

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.4.4.	19.4.4.3	
Current text		
<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>		
Amended text		
<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 5 of Moderate Adverse (significant) and 17 18 of Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The errata is the result of transcription error into the summary section from the technical appendix and main EAR chapter text (both correct). There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change.</p>		

Erratum 15

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.4.9	19.4.9.3 & 19.4.9.4	
Current text		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity by Year 1 of the operational phase would diminish from construction phase effects, with 2 visual receptor viewpoints 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>		
Amended text		
<p>Effects on potential changes in visual amenity by Year 1 of the operational phase would diminish from construction phase effects, with 2²³ visual receptor viewpoints experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 11¹¹ 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 3³⁴ experiencing an impact of Neutral (not significant), 11 of Slight Adverse (not significant), 1 of Slight Beneficial (not significant) and 6⁶⁵ of Moderate Adverse (significant)</p>		
Explanation		
<p>The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The errata is the result of transcription error into the summary section between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change</p>		

Erratum 16

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.4.14	19.4.14.3	
Current text		
<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>		
Amended text		
<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), 18¹⁹ of Moderate Adverse (significant), 11 of Large Adverse (significant) and 1 of Very Large Adverse (significant).</p>		
Explanation		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.4.14	19.4.14.3	
<p>The landscape assessment was conducted based on the correct viewpoint assessments provided in Appendix 7-2. The errata is the result of transcription error between the technical appendix and the main EAR chapter. There would be no changes to the conclusions of the EAR as a result of this change</p>		

Erratum 17

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.5.10	19.5.10.1	Refers to Option 4/5AV1
Current text		
<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. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features referenced in Chapter 8.</p>		
Amended text		
<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. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Slight Adverse (significant) or Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features referenced in Chapter 8.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>This errata is a consequence of Errata 4 within Chapter 8 – Biodiversity. This has led to the Large Adverse effect on Binsted Wood Complex LWS being incorrectly linked to Option 4/5AV1. The effect should be assigned to Option 4/5AV2. There is no change in the significance category of the receptor (Binsted Wood Complex LWS) between the two options. The errata is the result of a transcription error between the main EAR chapter and the Summary Chapter.</p> <p>The underlying baseline data and GIS figures behind the environmental assessment are correct.</p> <p>Other than the correction of the effect, there is no change to the overall biodiversity assessment of Option 4/5AV1.</p>		

Erratum 18

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.5.11	19.5.11.1	4/5AV2
Current text		
<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 referenced in Chapter 8.</p>		
Amended text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
19.5.11	19.5.11.1	4/5AV2
<p>During the operational phase, a Very Large Adverse effect (significant) on bats and a Large Adverse effect on the Binsted Wood Complex LWS is likely. A Moderate Adverse effect (significant) on barn owls is likely. Neutral effects (not significant) are likely on other identified ecological features referenced in Chapter 8.</p>		
Explanation		
<p>This errata is a consequence of Errata 4 within Chapter 8 – Biodiversity. This has led to the Large Adverse effect on Binsted Wood Complex LWS being incorrectly linked to Option 4/5AV1. The effect should be assigned to Option 4/5AV2. There is no change in either the importance or significance category of the receptor (Binsted Wood Complex LWS). The underlying baseline data and GIS figures behind the environmental assessment are correct.</p> <p>Other than the re-allocation of the effect, there is no change to the overall biodiversity assessment of Option 4/5AV2.</p>		

2.9. SDNP Special Qualities Assessment

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location				
6.5.1	Table 6.4 - Potential land take from farm holdings for each Scheme option footprints (in hectares)					
Current Table						
Key environmental value	Potential land take from each scheme option (hectares)					
	1V5	1V9	3V1	4/5AV1	4/5AV2	5BV1
Broomhurst farm (sheep, cattle and arable)	8.83	8.79	11.53	11.54	11.54	11.51
Amended Table						
Key environmental value	Potential land take from each scheme option (hectares)					
	1V5	1V9	3V1	4/5AV1	4/5AV2	5BV1
Broomhurst farm (sheep, cattle and arable)	8.83 9.14	8.79 9.09	11.53 11.55	11.54 11.58	11.54 11.58	11.51 11.55
Explanation						
<p>The overall assessment results regarding potential land take on Broomhurst farm are stated incorrectly. The corrected land take figures take into account a misaligned decimal point and the updated land take figures derived the design freeze in June 2019.</p> <p>The assessment was conducted based on correct underlying baseline data and GIS figures. The overall results of the assessment have not changed as a result of the errata described above. The errata is due to a data entry error between the supporting documentation and the SDNP Special Quality Assessment. There would be no changes to the conclusions as a result of this errata.</p>						