

An example of National Highways not differentiating Grey against other options: Comparing Option 1v5 with Option 5Bv1 on Client Scheme Requirements
(section 17.7.1, A27 Arundel Bypass Assessment Report, Oct 2020)

Strategic Case (CSRs)	National Highways Position	My Comments
Improve Safety	Neutral – no option favoured	<p>You say Neutral, and state 5Bv1 would improve safety by encouraging road users to use the new A27 rather than seeking alternative routes to avoid congestion. But, fail to state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Road users will still encounter congestion on the A27 at Worthing & Fontwell. That the roads and lanes around Fontwell & Walberton would be less safe. Access onto the A27 is currently worse than it is today Shunts will be moved to Fontwell and to a lesser extent Worthing <p>I would, however, agree that there is no overall safety benefit with either option. But, road safety around Walberton, for example, will be made worse with Option 5Bv1 and this cannot be allowed to happen.</p>
Customers & Communities	You state 5Bv1 has major community impacts yet you then say Option 5Bv1 is the preferred over Option 1V5. Key reason, citing better performance on the travelling public during construction	This is a very questionable differentiator and reason. I believe your position/decision is wrong for this CSR. This really should not even be up for debate because of the following: Option 5Bv1 is not conformant to Chapter 3 of NN NPS that states networks should be designed to minimise social and environmental impacts and improve quality of life. Option 5Bv1 does just the opposite. You even state it has major community impacts. There will be major disruption during construction for both options. So, surely a life-time degradation of the quality of life for communities such as Walberton easily outweighs the short-term (3 years) inconvenience for commuters and other travellers during construction.
Improve Capacity	You state, both options will increase capacity. As neither option is preferred you call this Neutral .	Neutral is a misleading position to take. We could charter a Liner to take us across the Channel or we could charter a Yacht. Both would have the capacity to get us there. So, which do we choose? It will come down to cost. So, making an assessment without factoring in the costs of each option as you do is misleading, it is wrong. If Option 1v5 increases capacity (today & future), and comes in at a fraction of the costs of 5Bv1, why position yourselves as Neutral!
Reduce congestion	You state both options are positive but opt for Option 5Bv1 because of greater resilience gained by the old A27 route.	Resilience, another tenuous differentiator. A bigger assessment factor, that surely significantly outweighs resilience is this: 5Bv1 increases traffic flows and this will in turn increase the congestion and wait times at Worthing and Fontwell. At Peak times, Fontwell is already at over capacity as is Worthing that filters into a single carriage way. This is greatly mitigated with Option 1. With 5Bv1, you are simply moving the problem to two locations and not fixing it. So, citing resilience is again misleading and wrong. 5Bv1 unnecessarily over engineers the solution in meeting the problem statement and is a ‘sledgehammer to crack a nut’ solution.
Minimise environmental Impact	You choose Option 1v5	Hard not to choose Option 1 given this is not a 4-lane carriage like 5Bv1 that cuts across 8 kms of water meadows and various habitats. Also, 5Bv1 has no environmental agency support and is non conformant with chapter 3 of NN NPS. I would agree with your assessment and choice.
Improve Accessibility	You choose option 5Bv1 because you say it should reduce the problems associated	Severance could to a large extent be fixed today without this Project. Citing 5Bv1 to fix the severance issue is a very expensive route to take. This severance issue can also be fixed with Option 1v5 at a fraction of the cost of 5Bv1. Plus, traffic will still exist on the old A27 with 5Bv1 especially as you advise using it as a resilience route. Therefore, walkways/cycling paths at the Ford-road roundabout will still be required. This projects problem statement is more about congestion & journey times and not ‘severance.’

	with 'severance' of the old and the new town of Arundel	Let's fix it, but it is wrong to come down on one option over another just to push what is a secondary benefit and not a major driver for this Project. Let's not forget, Grey now severs Binstead. But, of course, you have. Convenient.
Respect the SDNP	You choose Option 1v5 because it has less impact on the SDNP special qualities.	I am happy and agree with your choice and reason. You make a good point about the SDNPs special qualities and the impact of Option 5Bv1 within the setting of the SDNP. This is also true when we consider the vista and heritage views from Arundel castle. So, while I agree with your assessment for this CSR, this key aspect is ultimately pushed to one side as you are still pushing ahead with Option 5Bv1.
Summary after considering the CSRs from your assessment report	<p>After considering the CSRs, your score is as follows:</p> <p>Neutral – 2 Option 1v5 – 2 Option 5Bv1 – 3</p> <p>Despite these scores you state that that on balance neither option is not favoured at this stage. Knowing your trump card is still to come when considering just one National Policy statement.</p> <p>But this summary does not clearly identify Grey as the best option. You concluded this yourselves.</p>	<p>I would argue that given the points discussed above, Option 1v5 is a far better fit against all the CSRs.</p> <p>In the detail of your summary statement, the reasons behind your choices are a mix of (a) low-level-benefits without context; (b) contradicting statements and (c) some statements that are misleading. Here are some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You are promoting 5Bv1 as the solution to fix severance, but fail to say it comes at a cost. While it is an important factor it is a minor benefit when compared against the key drivers for this project. And Grey now severs Binstead. • You are promoting 5Bv1 because it performs better for Customers and communities. But, also state that it has major community impacts on communities it passes near to. A clear contradiction. • You are promoting 5Bv1 because it performs better for reducing congestion. But, fail to say it moves and makes worse the congestion and wait times at Worthing and Fontwell. Misleading at best. <p>Option 5Bv1 should be dead in the water at this stage: it simply moves many of the existing problems at Arundel eastward and westward at a great cost. It will also have a major detrimental impact on many communities. 5Bv1 also goes against the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Policy Statement for National Networks (NN NPS) chapter 3.</p> <p>I will come onto your presumption about developments in National Parks in a later response.</p>