

Regional Investment Programme

A27 Arundel Bypass

Addendum to the Technical Appraisal Report

August 2017

HE551523-WSP-GEN-A27A-RP-ZM-0001

A27 ARUNDEL BYPASS

ADDENDUM TO THE TECHNICAL APPRAISAL REPORT

Highways England

Project no: 70015214

Prepared for

Highways England
Bridge House
Walnut Tree Close
Guildford
Surrey
GU1 4LZ

WSP

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4YB
www.wspgroup.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 ADDENDUM TO THE TECHNICAL APPRAISAL REPORT1**
- 1.1 INTRODUCTION.....1**
- 1.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION1**

1 ADDENDUM TO THE TECHNICAL APPRAISAL REPORT

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 The purpose of this addendum is to provide additional information on the recommendations for options to be presented at public consultation in PCF Stage 2 – Option Selection.

1.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1.2.1 The performance of the five options being considered to deliver the A27 Arundel bypass scheme was assessed by the Project Board in April 2017 with the aim of recommending options to be taken forward to public consultation in PCF Stage 2.

1.2.2 The differences between the alternative options were highlighted and discussed in order to present justifications for shortlisting options for further consideration in PCF Stage 2. This was achieved by considering the following questions:

- How well does each option fit with the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) requirements?
- How well does each option fit with the project objectives (as set out in the Client Scheme Requirements)? In particular, how do the options help achieve the objectives on environment and journey times?
- How well does each option fit with the NNNPS?
- How affordable are each option?
- How well do the options perform in terms of providing value for money?

1.2.3 At the Board meeting a series of recommendations were made based on the overall performance of each option.

1.2.4 Though Option 0A performs well in terms of value for money it does not meet the RIS requirements and does not adequately meet project objectives. It was therefore not recommended that Option 0A be taken forward to public consultation.

1.2.5 Options 3, 5A and 5B meet the RIS requirements. Option 5B performs marginally better in terms of environmental impacts and significantly better on compliance with two of the four key NNNPS clauses. Option 5B however performs least well in terms of value for money and has significantly the highest cost to deliver the scheme which was assessed as not within the scheme affordability range. Option 5B was therefore not recommend to be taken forward to public consultation and both Options 3 and 5A were.

1.2.6 Option 1 out-performs Options 3 and 5A in overall value for money, compliance with two of the four key NNNPS clauses and has a lower overall environmental impact. It also performs well against the RIS requirements and project objectives. Option 1 was therefore recommended for taking forward to public consultation.

1.2.7 In summary it is therefore recommended that Options 1, 3 and 5A are taken forward to public consultation and Option 0A and 5B are not.

