

## Response to PEIR section 2.2 - Scheme Objectives

The PEIR states that,

*2.2.1 The high-level objectives for the Scheme have been formulated both to address identified problems and to take advantage of the opportunities that new infrastructure would provide, and are as follows:*

a	<i>Improve the safety of travellers along the A27 and, consequently, the wider local road network.</i>	The marked increase in traffic on minor roads (eg The Street, Walberton) leads to increased conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. Increased queuing at Fontwell leads to increased risk of accidents. Increased traffic for Worthing, already stated to be significantly over capacity, will have adverse effects on safety. National Highways, under its former identities, has had issues in the past with designing schemes to improve safety– for example, Smart Motorways.
b	<i>Ensure that customers and communities are fully considered throughout the design and delivery stages.</i>	Requests by customers and communities for information have been left unanswered for extended periods of time. Their overwhelming rejection of the proposed route (7% support) has been ignored. Key requests from a wide range of stakeholders such as a Ford Road junction have been denied.
c	<i>Improve capacity of the A27 whilst supporting local planning authorities to manage the impact of planned economic growth.</i>	The capacity over a tiny stretch is improved at the expense of causing increased delays (and associated adverse economic impacts) outside the scope of the scheme along the A27.
d	<i>Reduce congestion, reduce travel time and improve journey time reliability along the A27.</i>	The proposals increase congestion outside the immediate scheme area which will lead to reduced journey time reliability along the A27 as a whole.
e	<i>Improve accessibility for all users to local services and facilities.</i>	The lack of a Ford Road junction and closure of the Arundel Road exit will reduce accessibility for a number of users.
f	<i>Deliver a Scheme that minimises environmental impact and seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment through its high-quality design.</i>	The environmental impact of such a length of dual carriageway is significant. The negative impacts on protected species of bats are a major concern.
g	<i>Respect the SDNP and its special qualities in our decision-making.</i>	The visual impact of a dual carriageway on the views out of the SDNP will be significant.

The objectives would be better addressed by a proposal that...

a	<i>Improve the safety of travellers along the A27 and, consequently, the wider local road network.</i>	...does not force traffic onto unsuitable local roads, but improves flow by providing grade separation.
---	--	---

		...slows traffic through Arundel while permitting it to flow, increasing road capacity but acts to reduce the impacts at Fontwell and Worthing.
b	<i>Ensure that customers and communities are fully considered throughout the design and delivery stages.</i>	...is supported by a wider range of customers and communities and ensures that their needs are better met.
c	<i>Improve capacity of the A27 whilst supporting local planning authorities to manage the impact of planned economic growth.</i>	...improves capacity without leading to costly congestion and pollution elsewhere.
d	<i>Reduce congestion, reduce travel time and improve journey time reliability along the A27.</i>	...increases journey reliability across a wider part of the A27 rather than having adverse effects elsewhere along the route.
e	<i>Improve accessibility for all users to local services and facilities.</i>	...maintains existing accessibility and builds further on it.
f	<i>Deliver a Scheme that minimises environmental impact and seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the surrounding environment through its high-quality design.</i>	...has even less impact by not building large stretches of dual carriageway across green space.
g	<i>Respect the SDNP and its special qualities in our decision-making.</i>	...has a minimal visual impact on the SDNP by changing the landscape to a lesser degree.

All of these can be demonstrated to hold, for example, by the Arundel Alternative proposal. As such a scheme fulfils the described objectives in a better way than the proposed scheme, failing to consider it at all is completely inappropriate.