

**From:** Emma Tristram [<mailto:emma.tristram@dsl.pipex.com>]  
**Sent:** 11 November 2014 09:12  
**To:** 'letters@theargus.co.uk'  
**Subject:** Arundel bypass

Sir, your article 'Residents oppose plans for town bypass' (8 November) is welcome but needs adding to.

The proposal to build an Arundel bypass has, as you say, sparked concerns among residents of Walberton and Binsted, but you don't give the reason: a new new route has been proposed (Option B) through those two villages.

The meeting about the bypass at St Nicholas' church, Arundel, on 3 November was organised by the local group, Arundel SCATE, not SCATE itself (which covers the whole south coast). These were concerned residents, not activists from outside.

You say 'a study by A27 Action wants to see the road upgraded - actually it is 'A27 Action', led by MPs and councillors, who want the road upgraded. The A27 Study was set up by the Department for Transport. 'A27 Action' are trying to make the Study recommend what they are pushing for.

Since Nick Herbert MP has now said, in a letter to Walberton and Binsted residents, that he does not support Option B, this leaves him only able to support Option A, the old Pink/Blue route, which now goes through the National Park. Gary Robson's cartoons about road rage may let off steam but do not help solve the controversy about whether to sacrifice National Park countryside to the needs of the car.

Whatever the Chancellor decides to announce in his Autumn Statement, the controversy is set to continue.

Emma Tristram