



**THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980, THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981, THE
HIGHWAYS (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 1994 AND THE
COMPULSORY PURCHASE (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) RULES 2007**

PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO

**THE WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (A284 LYMINSTER BYPASS
(NORTH))**

COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2020

and

**THE WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (A284 LYMINSTER BYPASS
(NORTH) CLASSIFIED ROAD)**

(SIDE ROADS) ORDER 2020

SUPPLEMENTARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE

OF

GUY PERFECT

FOR

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

ON TRANSPORT PLANNING MATTERS

DFT REFERENCE: NATTRAN/SE/HAO/229

July 2021

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION1
- 2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE.....1
- 3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME1
- 4. CONCLUSION2
- 5. APPENDIX DOCUMENTS2

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My name is Guy Parfect and I currently hold the position of Senior Planner at West Sussex County Council ("the Council"), working in the Transport Planning and Policy team.
- 1.2. My qualifications and experience are as stated in section 1 of my main and summary proofs of evidence.
- 1.3. I can confirm that the contents of this supplementary proof of evidence are my professional opinion and are true to the best of my knowledge and belief and are gained from either my own direct involvement or my colleagues' direct knowledge.

2. SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1. I am submitting this in this supplementary proof solely to note and comment on the most recent Outline Transport Business Case which was prepared for the Scheme. This supplementary proof therefore updates Section 4 - Need for the Scheme of my main proof of evidence, notably in relation to the latest estimated costs and benefits of the Scheme.

3. NEED FOR THE SCHEME

- 3.1. The Lyminster Bypass Transport Business Case has been updated to secure funding from the Department for Transport (DfT). This funding, capped at £11.729m was approved on the 7th June 2021, as stated in paragraph 11.4 of Mr Martin's proof.
- 3.2. The latest Outline Business Case (OBC) was submitted in January 2021¹. This includes all relevant updates to DfT TAG guidance and updates to the scheme cost to the end of 2020 at which time the cost stood at £21.634m, as stated in paragraph 1.5.1. and table 1-2 of the OBC. I note that my main proof contains a typographical error at paragraph 4.4.4. in stating this value as a current cost of £21.364m.
- 3.3. The new OBC forecasts benefits worth £53.177m, including £9.7m of safety benefits in its core analysis. This is lower overall than in the 2015 OBC, due to downward revisions to the values of travel time used in DfT TAG, although safety benefits have risen.
- 3.4. I note also here that my main proof draws on the November 2015 issue of the OBC but the referencing points to document 27 to the Statement of Case, which is an earlier issue of the OBC from November 2014. I am adding the Summary section of the November 2015 OBC as appendix document Z to cover this point.
- 3.5. The new OBC provides an initial BCR of 3.7 as shown in table 4.19 of the OBC. When wider economic impacts are included, the adjusted BCR rises to 3.8 as shown in table 4-22 of the OBC.
- 3.6. A sensitivity test also including estimated benefits from the off-peak (weekday 7pm to 7am) and weekend periods was also run, resulting in an initial BCR of 5.8 and an adjusted BCR of 6.0.

¹ [Appendix Document Y](#) to this supplementary proof.

- 3.7. This range of BCR values shows the scheme as resulting in high value for money when assessed on the modelled weekday periods or very high value for money when the additional off-peak and weekend time periods are included.
- 3.8. Since the new OBC was completed further design work has been undertaken and the scheme cost has further risen to £27.334M as stated in paragraph 11.1 of Mr Martin's proof. Work on preparing a full transport business case (FBC) is now starting. This will further update the BCR for the scheme with latest costs and values of benefits.
- 3.9. It should be noted that the present value of cost (PVC) used in these calculations excludes sunk costs which will have risen from £3.7m in the OBC to a likely value of £4.5m in the FBC, so reducing the net uplift in cost by approximately £0.8m.
- 3.10. I have produced for information an indicative calculation of the revised BCR when the increase in overall cost and in sunk cost are taken into account. Based on the values in tables 4-1 and 4-19 of the new OBC I have estimated that the revised present value of costs (PVC) would be approximately £17,847,000. Comparing this to the adjusted present value of benefits (PVB) stated in table 4-22 of the new OBC gives a revised value for adjusted BCR of 3.0 for the core analysis and of 4.8 when off peak and weekend benefits are also included.
- 3.11. On this basis, I am confident that the scheme will still represent high value for money for the public purse on the core analysis and very high value for money when additional time periods are taken into account.

4. CONCLUSION

- 4.1. The updated Outline Business Case shows that the Scheme continues to demonstrate a high to very high level of value for money, despite recent increases in cost and revisions to the DfT's values of time.
- 4.2. On the basis of the evidence provided in my proof of evidence including this supplementary proof evidence and the proofs of evidence of my colleagues, I continue to contend that it has been demonstrated that the public interest case for the scheme is compelling from a transport planning point of view.

5. APPENDIX DOCUMENTS

- 5.1. The following documents are appended to this supplementary proof (in addition to those in the composite appendices for the Council and to those appended to the Statement of Case):
 - Y. [Lyminster Bypass \(North\) Outline Transport Business Case January 2021](#)
 - Z. [Lyminster Bypass Transport Business Case: Transport Business Case, November 2015 \(extract: Section 8. Summary\)](#)