

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

Title:	A27 Arundel Bypass Elected Representatives' Forum		
Date:	14 November 2022	Time: 18:00-20:00	Location: Arundel Town Hall, BN18 9AP
Attendees:	<p>Sandra Fryer (SF) – Independent Chair</p> <p>Cllr Trevor Bence (Cllr TB) – West Sussex County Council, County Councillor for Fontwell</p> <p>Cllr Grant Roberts (Cllr GR) – Arun District Council, District Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Tony Hunt (Cllr TH) – Arundel Town Council, Mayor</p> <p>Cllr Joy Dennis (Cllr JD) – West Sussex County Council, Councillor for Hurstpierpoint & Bolney</p> <p>Cllr Sue Wallsgrove (Cllr SW) - Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Mario Trabucco (Cllr MT) - Aldingbourne Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Angela Standing (Cllr AS) – Arundel Town Council, Town Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Isabel Thurston (Cllr IT) – Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Sam Langmead (Cllr SL) – Lyminster Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Douglas McElvogue (Cllr DM) – Walberton Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Peter Fenton (Cllr PF) – Slindon Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Steve McAuliffe (Cllr SM)– Walberton Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Toby Hewson (Cllr HS) – Walberton Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Cllr Patrick Saintas (Cllr PS) – Slindon Parish Council, Parish Councillor</p> <p>Tim Burr (TB) – South Downs National Park Authority, Member</p>		
Observers:	<p>Darryl Hemmings (DH) – West Sussex County Council, Transport Planning and Policy Manager</p> <p>Karl Roberts (KR) – Arun District Council, Officer, Director of Growth</p> <p>Vicki Colwell (VC) – South Downs National Park Authority, Principal Planning Officer</p>		
Project Team:	<p>Andrew Jackson (AJ) – National Highways, Programme Lead</p> <p>Peter Philips (PP) – National Highways, Route Manager - South Coast Central & Kent Corridors</p> <p>Jan Simpson (JS) – National Highways, Stakeholder Manager</p>		

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	<p>Phil Wayles (PW) – Linkconnex, Design Project Director</p> <p>Rhys Mander (RM) – Linkconnex, Design Project Manager</p> <p>Alan Feeney (AF) – Linkconnex, Traffic Lead</p> <p>Steve Finnie (SFi) – Linkconnex, Planning and DCO Lead</p> <p>Alison Stevenson (AS) – Linkconnex, Design Manager</p> <p>Paul Boughen (PB) – Linkconnex, Stakeholder Engagement Principal</p> <p>Akasya Guner (AG) – Linkconnex, Stakeholder Engagement Consultant</p>
Apologies:	<p>Cllr Jan Rees (Cllr JR) – Slindon Parish Council, Parish Councillor / Chair</p> <p>Cllr Sarah Linfield (Cllr SL) – Slindon Parish Council, Clerk</p> <p>Cllr Andrew Ratcliffe (Cllr AR) – Walberton Parish Council, Vice Chairman</p>
Circulation list:	Attendees
Meeting Organiser:	Paul Boughen – Linkconnex

NB: As outlined within the ToR, notes of Forum meetings will not be a verbatim account of the discussion but are intended to act as a summary of the topics discussed together with the agreed actions.

No.	Item	Action (By whom, by when)
1.	Introductions	
	All Elected Members, Officers and members of the Project Team and Independent Chair introduced themselves.	
2.	Setting the scene	
	<p>SF opened with a reflection on the July forum meeting and spoke about the conduct of this and future forum meetings. SF confirmed that she would keep the meeting to time and updated on the outcomes of the engagement survey which had been carried out since the July forum.</p> <p>SF said that the engagement survey had shown that there was an equal desire to see both in person and face to face meetings in the future and that the project team were looking at this.</p> <p>In response to a question raised in advance of the meeting SF briefly spoke about how she had been appointed as Independent</p>	

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	Chair of the Forum. SF also confirmed that there had been a competitive interview process and that SF is paid an inclusive day rate.	
3.	Purpose of today	
	<p>AJ explained how the agenda had been formulated and outlined the rationale for, and the scope of, the supplementary consultation. AJ outlined how the supplementary consultation fits in with the project's critical path and looked forward to the DCO submission. AJ reiterated that the project is bound by the legal requirements of the planning process.</p> <p>AJ confirmed that the team is working to address queries received from local authorities and statutory bodies. AJ explained that the team had taken advice around a scheduled by-election locally and had timed public events to occur outside of the by-election campaign.</p> <p>Cllr DM and Cllr SM entered the room.</p>	
4.	Engagement survey outcomes	
	<p>JS outlined the results of the engagement survey which was conducted since the July forum meeting. JS outlined the key findings around duration, frequency and format of meetings in addition to looking at some comments received.</p> <p>JS outlined the initial response to the survey and noted that the project team will continue look at the meeting format, including looking at meetings with individual ERF members organisations and meetings focussed on particular topics as and when required.</p> <p>DH entered the room.</p> <p>Cllr TB asked to receive contact details for the team. JS suggested using the project email address.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: To contact the project team please email A27ArundelBypass@nationalhighways.co.uk</i></p> <p>A personal statement was read out by Cllr Roberts stating a number of his concerns including the position of the independent chair and the value of the Elected representatives Forum.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: National Highways will issue a separate response to Cllr Roberts' statement.</i></p>	
5.	DCO Resource Planning	
	<p>SFi gave a presentation regarding the time demands and pressures associated with DCO process.</p> <p>SFi commented that National Highways (NH) / Linkconnex (LCX) will share as much information as possible and if the Forum have</p>	

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	<p>any questions, to make the project team aware so that NH/LCX can provide any necessary support. Technical briefings can also be provided to the Forum.</p> <p>Cllr TB stated that he gathered valuable information around Ford Road from a conversation on the evening with AJ, AF and AS prior to the meeting. Cllr TB gave his view that technical information around the Ford Road junction should be shared with the Forum.</p> <p>DH provided an update on the Ford Road study being conducted by WSCC and that had been circulated to elected representatives and the project team prior to this meeting. AJ stated that further discussions around the report were required.</p> <p>Cllr TB asked why the BCR figures between the NH/LCX and WSCC reports were different.</p> <p>Cllr GR asserted that there is a business case for a Ford Road junction, and he asked for that the housing figures to justify the junction be provided. AF said that there was a balance to strike between numbers of cars and calculating the BCR and AS stated that there were still questions unanswered regarding the safety of any of the proposed designs. Further dialogue was also required regarding cost estimates that were still immature. There were also outstanding safety questions to be addressed before it would be appropriate to convene the meeting.</p> <p>DH stated that the Forum should not allow the WSCC study to generate disagreement when it actually identifies areas which need to be collaboratively worked through.</p> <p>Cllr IT said that not everyone in the room was supportive of the junction, due to concerns about environmental impacts.</p> <p>In relation to Ford Road, SF stated that a roundtable would be an appropriate route to progress this discussion and Forum members expressed an interest in participating. The project team agreed to develop a plan for a roundtable discussion.</p>	<p>Action: LCX/NH to agree a date with WSCC for the roundtable and confirm outline arrangements to ERF.</p>
6.	Project update	
	<p>PW gave an update on project progress and that the statutory consultation interim report been published on the website, summarising feedback received at the statutory consultation. He also explained that responses to the statutory consultation feedback were currently being compiled and written up.</p>	
	<p>PW explained that the design has been updated and DCO documents are being prepared and are being shared with host authorities and statutory bodies via meetings such as the Focus Group. The Focus Group is attended by technical officers from host</p>	

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	<p>authorities and statutory environmental bodies. There is a principal Focus Group to coordinate all engagement, supported by sub-working groups with a much narrower focus on technical details of specific issues.</p> <p>PW highlighted plans for construction phasing, safety of road users and efficiency to minimise disruption. The plan also minimises the amount of material brought in and out of the construction site which is a key consideration.</p>	
	<p>Cllr TB asked when information will be released in connection with the recent judgement from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). AJ explained that the ICO process gave clear timelines for release of information (14 December), or appeal and NH were consulting with legal counsel.</p> <p>Cllr TB stated that residents, ecology and environment were going to be affected by the new bypass and deserve equal privilege.</p>	
7.	Supplementary Consultation	
	<p>RM outlined the team's approach to supplementary consultation, the scope of the consultation and the specific proposals that were within the consultation.</p>	
	<p>The proposals for the consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changes to reduce traffic impacts in and around Walberton. 2. Mitigating the Scheme's effects on bats near Tye Lane. 3. Updated proposals regarding the Avisford Golf Club. 4. Potential changes at Crossbush Junction. <p>RM outlined the measures being proposed to reduce traffic impacts in and around Walberton. There followed a discussion regarding traffic through Barnham and sensitivity testing in the area. Forum members also asked questions about the maps being presented and the impact on Fontwell and local roads. RM explained that the visuals were intended to show an overview of the area.</p> <p>RM stated that there are other technical notes and consultation materials to be released with the consultation on Wed 16 November and that these will address these questions. A further briefing to ERF members regarding the supplementary consultation would be held on 16 November 2022 to discuss this detail.</p> <p>Cllr GR asked about impacts of signalisation at Fontwell West roundabout on journey time savings and wider impacts on Hooe Farm. RM stated that NH/LCX will conduct a sensitivity test.</p> <p>Cllr JD commented that these questions could be asked at the briefing on Wednesday 16 November 2022.</p>	

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	RM outlined the remaining proposals going forward to supplementary consultation, as noted above.	
8.	Next steps	
	<p>RM outlined that DCO submission is scheduled for Spring 2023.</p> <p>Cllr GR asked what the implications would be if a roundtable discussion concluded that a junction at Ford Road was feasible. RM answered that this would need to be examined on the basis of the facts.</p> <p>Cllr DM asked when the DCO application was to be submitted and RM answered that this would be no earlier than the end of March 2023.</p> <p>Cllr AR commented that the blue line on the visual did not show Fontwell and RM clarified that the blue line was the proposed Bypass route and pointed out where it joined the existing A27 at Fontwell.</p>	
9.	Update on actions	
	<p>Action- 'NH should consider sharing legal advice on whether or not advisors (i.e., those who are not Forum members) can attend the Forum'. AJ confirmed that this advice was legally privileged and for that reason it will not be shared. The Forum discussed the attendance of 'advisors' and the project team restated the earlier position that the ERF was not a public forum.</p> <p>Cllr GR commented that the Terms of Reference for the Forum gave a commitment that the Forum members would be able to influence how the Forum functions. AJ stated that the Forum was set up establish a dialogue between the project team and local elected representatives and confirmed National Highways' view on advisors attending the forum.</p> <p>Cllr MT asked whether the Terms of Reference had been approved by the Forum. SF replied that she believed the Terms of Reference had been approved between forum meetings, however SF committed to take this away as an action to check and update the forum. SF restated her view that the focus of this Forum should be to continue positive engagement with the project and project team.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: An amended Terms of Reference for the forum has been developed and will be circulated to the forum along with the November minutes, for information only.</i></p> <p>Cllr SW spoke about setting up a meeting between Barnham and Eastergate parish and the project team.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: A meeting between Barnham and Eastergate Parish has been scheduled for 30 November 2022.</i></p>	

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	<p>The flood modelling had been shared with Arun Town Council. Forum members advised that they would like to see flood modelling in the next forum agenda.</p>	<p>Action: Flood modelling to be discussed at next forum</p>
	<p>The project team confirmed that they are willing to hold one-to-one meetings with parish councils to explain aspects of the proposed Scheme. Cllr TB requested to be invited to Parish Council meetings in his ward.</p> <p>Cllr GR asked to receive a housing number in relation to Ford Road and stated that a range can be provided. SF said that the project team will consider whether this can form part of the agenda for the Ford Road round table meeting discussed previously.</p> <p>Cllr AR asked for a definition of 'not deliverable' in relation to the Ford Road junction. AJ responded that the overall model informs the judgement. AJ explained that there were ranges involved but there was no absolute number which would determine whether the Ford Road junction was viable or not viable</p> <p>Cllr TH stated that a recent meeting between the project team and Arundel Town Council had been very useful and had satisfied the Town Council that there was no additional flood risk to Arundel He asked to know more about Environment Agency comments on the flood risk assessment report. AS confirmed that the report was currently with the Environment Agency for comment and final sign off is still TBC.</p>	<p>Action: Project team to consider advising Cllr TB on engagement meetings taking place with parishes, where appropriate.</p>
	<p>Cllr GR asked whether the project team would bring a housing number to a roundtable discussion. AJ and AF stated that the round table would need to consider future housing projections and assumptions. Constraints around housing numbers and future development were also discussed.</p> <p>SF questioned where the actions should be covered in the meeting. Cllr TB responded at the beginning and end of the meeting to cover the four-month gap between meetings.</p> <p>Cllr JD suggested that actions form part of the minutes, and it could be attached with the draft agenda.</p> <p>Cllr SW questioned whether the supplementary consultation included the most up to date traffic data at Fontwell. AF confirmed that the traffic analysis that supports the supplementary consultation uses the most up to date and available modelling. Traffic flows are based on 2027 opening year and focused in and around Walberton. However, the traffic flows do cover Barnham Lane and Fontwell.</p>	<p>Action: Round Table to consider housing growth assumptions</p> <p>Action: To circulate actions with draft agenda.</p>

Minutes

A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme

	<p>Cllr SW responded that she was happy with this approach taken for supplementary consultation and that staff at events will help to explain the traffic modelling.</p> <p>SF reminded attendees that NH/LCX are committed to the roundtable as soon as possible. Cllr GR requested to know who would be attending the roundtable and AJ responded that this would need to be developed by the team.</p> <p>SF questioned whether Ford Road would be included in a consultation and AJ stated that the project team would take this point away in relation to the Ford Road roundtable meeting. AJ stated that NH will submit a DCO application and Cllr AS commented that if Ford Road is not viable, it would not be included in the DCO.</p> <p>Cllr PF queried whether the Scheme would remove its current access to Shellbridge Road B2132. AF confirmed that movement through this area could still be achieved.</p> <p>SF stated that the team will respond to Cllr GR's email from Friday 11 November.</p>	<p>Action: Ford Road roundtable to consider options and next steps in relation to DCO</p>
10.	Future Forum meetings	
	<p>There was a preference in the room amongst attendees for a late January meeting on Microsoft Teams. It was agreed that the outcome of supplementary consultation, flood risk and the roundtable discussion of Ford Road would all form part of the next agenda.</p>	<p>Action: Project team to advise the forum on the date of the next Forum meeting.</p>
11.	Questions	
	<p>Cllr JD queried when supplementary consultation response analysis would be completed. JS responded that this depends on nature and scale of responses.</p>	
	Close	

NEXT MEETING

Date:	TBC – January/February 2023	Time	18:00	Location:	MS Teams
--------------	-----------------------------------	-------------	-------	------------------	----------