

## **A303 Valuation Issues**

Notes on Deadline 6 submissions

*Notes on submissions by the applicant*

80034-R0017-00

*Reference: 20020712*

## 1.0 General notes:

1.1 Following the applicant's submissions to Deadline 6, I would expand on previous submissions and comment on the applicant's deadline 6 response: "Deadline 6 – 8.37.14 Responses to the ExA's Written Questions issued on 5 July 2019 - Traffic and Transport (Tr.2) - July 2019."

1.2 The quote below is extracted from the applicant's documents and shown in blue text:

*"The CVR's assessment of value for money does not form the basis of the Examining Authority's (ExA) assessment of the heritage impacts of the Scheme, which is done in the context of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the World Heritage Site (WHS) Convention."*

1.3 The NPSNN states:

*"4.4 In this context, environmental, safety, social and economic benefits and adverse impacts, should be considered at national, regional and local levels. These may be identified in this NPS, or elsewhere."*

1.4 Where a scheme would have both positive and negative effects, the Inquiry has to conduct a balancing exercise. If discrepancies exist in the evidence, and those discrepancies can not be tested by the Inquiry, a true assessment may not be possible.

1.5 The quantification of the heritage benefit is the CVR evidence provided by the applicant. Therefore, the evidence of benefit (the CVR) that was presented to the Inquiry appears to me to be a material consideration.

1.6 Where potential discrepancies exist, especially discrepancies that The Secretary of State may not have been aware of when making a funding decision, it seems to me that the wider public interest is further served by treating the CVR evidence as a material consideration.

My kind regards

Jonathan Morris