

From: [-----]

Sent: Tuesday, 13 December 2022, 11:32

To: [-----]

Cc: [-----]

Subject: Refusal to Answer Questions About the Supplementary Consultationjoy

Dear [-----]

National Highways refuses to answer my traffic and some other questions submitted on 22 November 2022 (attached). It has also ignored my email of 6 December 2022 (also attached). Several excuses have been offered.

- National Highways complains that the questions are too detailed. However, it cannot even provide traffic forecasts for each of the locations considered at Statutory Consultation which this consultation continues (my Question 1).
- With some exceptions, none of my other questions ask for more detail than was provided by during route selection. National Highways won't answer any of the questions to enable that comparison either.
- I have not received any requests to simplify the questions which would be expected if National Highways wanted to facilitate scrutiny and understanding of the issues being consulted on.
- National Highways also complains that it does not hold the requested information in the format I requested. However, it refuses to release any information in any format.
- National Highways complains that I am asking for immature information. Immaturity was the reason given by National Highways for describing the less well-refined traffic data presented at Statutory Consultation as a "first stab" (1). The data presented at Supplementary Consultation is still immature, still a Work in Progress and, as such, a "second stab".
- National Highways has no plans to consult using mature data, insisting that immature data is sufficient to meet the requirements of the Statement of Community Consultation.

Please also note that the suggestion by National Highways that my traffic questions were considered on Saturday 3 December 2022 is entirely false. Engagement on traffic modelling on that occasion was limited exclusively to handing [National Highways representatives] printed copies of my questions. This is because I was led to believe that National Highways was seeking a date for a meeting with residents as requested by Walberton Parish Council. Therefore, I simply repeated my request for written answers, now refused.

The impromptu discussion that you joined at Fontwell on Monday 5 December took place as the direct result of National Highways eventually refusing that meeting. Without giving examples or any justification, National Highways is now seeking to undermine and distance itself from the answers it gave and which it refuses to give in writing.

If consideration of the consultation is any way influenced by the undisclosed recollections of National Highways' representatives, they should share them now,

Please would you bring this matter to the attention of your respective organisations.

Kind regards

[-----]

Walberton, West Sussex

1. <https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.nationalhighways.co.uk/roads/road-projects/A27+Arundel+Improvement/A27+Arundel+Bypass+Elected+Representatives+Forum+May+Minutes+-+Final.pdf>

Subject:
Supplementary Consultation Unanswered Questions

From:
[-----]

Date:
06/12/2022, 16:14

To:
[-----]

CC:
[-----]

Dear [-----]

Despite some hard graft on all sides, no-one really got what they needed from discussions in Fontwell yesterday.

I was suprised to be confronted by [National Highways representative] saying he could not be expected to answer questions handed to him by me in Arundel on Saturday. If that really was the first time he had seen my questions, of course he couldn't, and it soon became obvious that it was. Time after time, Alan directed me to submit requests for information unaware that the project team received those same requests on 22 November 2022.

Therefore, please would you provide the information I have already requested and answer the questions that I submitted 2 weeks ago.

In addition, please may I also have the following:

46. All design changes, including those brought about by the A27 de-trunking strategy, which are incorporated in the traffic forecasts on page 20 of the Consultation Brochure but which are not included in the traffic forecasts in the Walberton Traffic Mitigation Assessment. Alan identified these changes as the primary cause of the large difference in mitigated traffic flows in The Street West of Tye Lane, summarised below.

If design changes do not account for the difference between the Fixed and Variable Demand forecasts, what does?

| AADT Change from DM | The Street East of Tye Lane | The Street West of Tye Lane |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Fixed Demand (WTMA Table 3.2) | 148 | 119 |
| Variable Demand (SCB page 20) | 200 (+35%) | 800 (+672%) |

47. Traffic counts undertaken by National Highways in April 2022 for any local road shown in the map on page 19 of the Consultation Brochure, including the date and type of survey undertaken. I did not know about these counts until yesterday.

48. Traffic flow forecasts for Yapton Lane South in the same format as page 20 of the Consultation Brochure (point K at Statutory Consultation).

49. The Approach to Supplementary Consultation that was agreed with host authorities.

Finally, as confirmed to Jan Simpson yesterday, please do not treat any of my questions as consultation feedback.

Kind regards

[-----]

Walberton, West Sussex