

From: Matt Hodges <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 03 March 2019 23:01
To: NIEnquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER TR010035 A585 WINDY HARBOUR TO SKIPPOOL

Dear Planning Inspector,

A585 WINDY HARBOUR TO SKIPPOOL IMPROVEMENT SCHEME PLANNING ACT 2008 DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER TR010035

During the consultation I raised issues and objections to some detailed aspects of this scheme while not objecting to the constructing of the bypass as a whole. I got an automatic acknowledgement of my email but nothing since.

I did not receive any notice that this scheme had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate or details of how I could raise issues with you regarding the design as submitted. I have only recently become aware that this scheme is with you and have looked at the scheme on your website. I would like to raise objections to the scheme as submitted. Even though this may be rather late I think it is only right that I, as an initial objector, should be able to submit further details as I am only late because Highways England did not notify me that they had submitted the planning application.

For information I am attaching a copy of the comments I submitted to Highways England on 24/9/2018 which drew attention to several areas in which the scheme did not comply with the requirements of Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network or the Highways England Cycling Strategy.

Objections to the Application as submitted.

Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network (IAN 195/16) states at 1.1 :-

Purpose and required actions

The purpose of this document is to ensure SRN infrastructure facilitates the convenient and safe movement of cycle traffic crossing or travelling along the SRN, where cycling is legally permitted.

This IAN document sets out how SRN infrastructure will support Highways England's objectives for cycle traffic.

And at 1.3 :-

Implementation

This document shall be implemented forthwith, except where:

- a. The procurement of works, at any stage from conception through design to completion of construction, has reached a stage at which, in the opinion of Highways England, use of this document would result in significant additional expense or delay progress (in which case the decision must be recorded in accordance with Highways England's procedures).

Since this scheme was still subject to consultation in 2018 it should comply fully with IAN 195/16 which was issued in October 2016.

It should also comply with the more general provisions of the Highways England Cycling Strategy which includes "Ensure that wider network investments incorporate cycling facilities. For example, when we invest in road network improvements, the needs of cyclists will be considered, both during construction and as part of any completed scheme."

It should also comply with Government policies to increase cycling and walking and also the use of public transport.

In so far as it does not comply fully with these requirements you should be applying conditions or requiring changes to ensure it is compliant when constructed.

IAN 195/16 lists "five design criteria":

- **Coherence:** Cycle networks shall link trip origins and destinations, including public transport access points and shall be continuous and easy to navigate.
- **Directness:** Cycle networks shall serve all the main destinations and shall seek to offer an advantage in terms of distance and journey time.
- **Comfort:** Infrastructure shall meet design standards for alignment and surface quality, and cater for all types of user, including children and disabled people.
- **Attractiveness:** Aesthetics, noise reduction and integration with surrounding areas are important.
- **Safety:** Cycle networks shall not only improve cyclists' and other road users' safety, but also their feeling of how safe the environment is.

While IAN 195/16 does say "Where all-purpose trunk roads are upgraded with new routes being provided, the original route corridor and adjoining local road network can provide a suitable opportunity for compensatory cycle route provision", this is only appropriate where the original route corridor complies with and will continue to comply with the five design criteria.

While TA 91/05 says

3.20 Footways should normally be provided within the highway boundary or in another location in the form of an OCR. In urban situations, footways should normally be provided on both sides of the carriageway, **while in rural situations footways should normally be provided on at least one side of the carriageway**, to connect to most key destinations.

Specific areas in which this scheme as proposed does not comply with IAN 195/16 and the still current parts of TA91/05:-

In failing to Provide a cycle track and footway or a shared path along the side of the new bypass carriageway. -

The proposal is to send cyclist and pedestrians up the otherwise closed off old road. This old road will also be used for agricultural access. While at first sight this may appear suitable it fails to meet the IAN 195/16 design criteria.

- **Coherence:-** For cyclists not familiar with the area tracks that wander away from the signed motor road to their destination are not easy to use and so are generally ignored. They tend to be badly maintained and damaged signs are not replaced resulting in getting lost. In strange areas cyclists will follow signed motor roads.
- **Comfort:-** While this may initially be OK it will soon deteriorate and will soon be unsuitable for many types of users. Used for agricultural access the surface will very soon be covered in layers of mud from tractor wheels. Hedges and trees will grow out over the path and if the

hedges are trimmed the hedge flailings will not be removed and will be a hazard. Rotting leaves will form leaf-mould and slime on the surface. Any cracks or other faults will not be repaired. Several old rural roads that are no longer through routes for motor vehicles but used by cyclists have been neglected so they are now very difficult for both cyclists and pedestrians. The combination of agricultural debris and poor surface maintenance means this will not be suitable for cyclists commuting in clothes suitable for any type of office or retail job. For the same reasons it will not be suitable for many pedestrians.

- **Safety:-** While this old road will be safe from traffic it does not meet the Safety Criteria. It will be very isolated and for many ladies, both cyclists and pedestrians, it will not feel safe. Also many parents will not want their children to use such an isolated lonely route.

TA 91/05 also draws attention to the need for personal security.

8.31 Designers need to take account of personal security issues when designing an NMU route. OCRs within or adjacent to the highway verge will bring about a degree of perceived and actual personal safety if a sufficient visual and physical connection with the carriageway can be maintained.

Also the A585T from Skippool to Fleetwood was constructed without cycle or pedestrian paths along most of its length. This has proved to be a mistake and plans have now been prepared for the construction of a shared path on the east side all the way from Skippool to Fleetwood. Some sections have been constructed but others are still awaiting funding. This being so it is utterly absurd to construct this new section without a path on the east side. To add one later will be far more expensive and disruptive than constructing one as part of the initial construction.

In allowing this planning application please apply a condition that there must be a shared path along the whole of the east side of this bypass.

The cycle and pedestrian route from Mains Lane to the Breck Road Service Road:-

This also fails to meet the IAN 195/16 criteria for both **Coherence and Directness**. Please require Highways England to study this again and to adopt the suggested alternative unless they can show it is not workable.

Here are the problems I have identified:-

The pedestrian/cycle crossing of this junction is also confusing and multi-phase.

The shared path on Mains Lane is on the north east side. For cyclists or pedestrians to cross to the Old Breck Service Road the following stages are required.

1

Cross to the SW side of Mains Lane with no Assistance. Mains Lane has been widened to 3 lanes and is subject to fast traffic at all times.

2

Wait for the traffic lights to cross the left turn slip for traffic from Mains Lane onto the A585 eastbound.

3

Wait for the traffic lights to cross the two right turn lanes for traffic from Mains Lane onto the A585 westbound.

4

Wait for the traffic lights to cross the right turn lane for traffic from the A585 westbound into Mains Lane.

5

Wait for the traffic lights to cross the two eastbound lanes of the A585.

6

Wait for the traffic lights to cross the two westbound lanes of the A585.

This latter stage 6 requires an extra disruption to westbound traffic on the A585. Without this Cycle /Pedestrian crossing west bound traffic on the A585 would only be stopped when Westbound traffic from Mains lane was being allowed into this section. This crossing is therefore an extra disruption to A585 westbound traffic.

It should be remembered that this crossing is two way so any phasing that may mean one crossing rapidly follows another won't work for people crossing the other way. This will be a very slow crossing with long waits.

There is a better solution that was suggested in my consultation response. This would require only three stages for cyclists and pedestrians to cross this junction and would not require any extra disruption to traffic flow on the A585.

1 Cross to the SW side of Mains Lane just near the junction with Old Mains Lane. This should be a Toucan as this will still be a fast and busy road.

2 Cross the eastbound carriageway of the A585 just east of the entry for traffic from Mains Lane. This crossing should coincide with the phase allowing traffic from the west bound A585 to turn right into Mains Lane so both the eastbound A585 will be stopped and the flow out of Mains Lane will be stopped. It would require the Left turn flow out of Mains Lane to only flow when the right turn traffic is also allowed to flow. That should not be a problem as the volume is less.

3 Cross all three lanes of the A585 westbound in a single stage. This should coincide with traffic from Mains Lane being allowed to flow onto the A585 both east and west bound as this will require the westbound A585 to be stopped. This may require the stop lines on the A585 westbound to be moved back a little but it will avoid an extra disruption to westbound traffic on the A585. It will require a short extension of shared path on the SW side of the A585 from this new crossing point together with a safe crossing of the entrance to YENSE Field but it will avoid the messy paths across the junction islands. It is also compatible with a continuous Shared path on the NE side of the A585 all the way from Windy Harbour.

As part of this better scheme for the Skippool Bridge junction it would also be better for the shared path on Mains Lane to cross the realigned Old Mains Lane at the junction and continue beside the A585 between the A585 and Old Mains Lane.

This rough sketch that was part of my consultation response shows the general layout on the background of the earlier consultation scheme. It is rough as since retiring I don't have a proper drawing package but it shows the basic requirements for the better crossing that is compatible with IAN 195/16

Skippool Junction

I am very concerned by the poor and convoluted routes for pedestrians and cyclists at and near to this junction. This fails to meet the criteria for Coherence, Directness and Comfort. It is far from continuous with no less than EIGHT separate traffic light controlled stages to get from Breck Road to the eastbound shared path. Even though both the eastbound and westbound flows on the A585 west side of the junction will both be stopped when the Straight across flow from Breck Road to Skippool Road are running the offset in the cycle/pedestrian crossing will mean that there will be congestion in the centre refuge and many cyclists and pedestrians will be trapped in the centre and have to wait for the next straight across flow from Breck Road. All the while if it is raining they will be sprayed with

dirty water by the East West flows on the A585 carriageway. This is hardly conducive to the comfort criteria. A similar situation will occur in the crossing of Skippool Road.

You need to ask Highways England for a detailed phasing of the traffic Lights and a maximum time it will take a pedestrian to cross from the West Side of Breck Road to the shared path on the diagonally opposite corner to head east beside the A585 if obeying the green and red man signals. My experience at a similar multi stage crossing with only six stages leads me to believe it will be a minimum of SIX minutes. This is not acceptable when the cars which cause the problem are being rushed through in seconds.

The lights need to be set up so Pedestrians and Off Carriageway Cyclists can press a button and get a clear single stage crossing of the A585 after a wait of no more than one minute then press another button and get a clear single stage crossing of Skippool Road after another wait of no more than one minute.

Dangerous side roads between Skippool Junction and Skippool Bridge.

Between Skippool Junction and Skippool Bridge there are two minor junctions and the possibility of a third on earlier drawings that show a development marked Key Worker Housing. These junctions fail to meet the criteria in that they are dangerous. They are swept entries allowing vehicles to turn in at speed. Cyclists on the shared path are expected to give way. At busy times this involves looking back 180 degrees and deciding if any of the half dozen cars approaching at speed is going to swing into the entry without signalling as some will. This is not possible to do with certainty. The first junction at present leads to a field. It would appear this is in preparation for some planned development.

There is also a problem with the second junction for cyclists the other way heading westward. Their view of any vehicles approaching on this side road is very poor so they will not be aware of any such vehicles. The drivers of a vehicle approaching to exit onto the A585 will have a good view of vehicles approaching on the A585 carriageway and will be looking that way to his right, and if there is a gap will drive straight out without looking to the left so will not see any cyclists approaching on the shared path. These are accidents waiting to happen. These junctions need to be made safe. The best way would be to close the junctions to the A585 and connect them to either Old Mains Lane or Wyre Lane as a condition of any further development. Minor developments should not have direct access onto the strategic road network. If these cannot be diverted onto a service road they should be combined into one junction without a high speed swept entry and with a priority crossing for the Shared path.

Further considerations.

There are a number of other issues to consider that impact on the use of the cycle ways on this stretch of the A585.

The future development of the shared path between Skippool and Fleetwood: This is likely to significantly increase the number of cyclists using these facilities for commuting.

There is a major housing development on the A586 east of Windy Harbour at Great Eccleston. This is likely to increase the number of cyclists wanting to commute along this line to Poulton, Blackpool or Fleetwood.

Government policies to encourage Cycling and Walking will also increase the use of these facilities.

It is therefore vital that these cycling facilities should be well designed and comply with the design criteria in IAN 195/16.

Conclusion

As currently proposed this project does not comply with the requirements of Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network or the Highways England Cycling Strategy. It should either be sent back for redesign or conditions should be applied as suggested above to make it comply.

Here is a copy of the consultation response I sent to Highways England on 24/9/2018.

Regards

Matt Hodges

Right to Ride Representative, Cycling UK





PATH NO LONGER
REQUIRED

SHARED PATH

RAISED TABLE

A585 MAINS LANE

TOUCAN

NEW TOUCANS

MOVE STOP
LINE BACK

NEW SHARED
PATH WITH
RAISED TABLE
A GARAGE ENTRY

COMPLICATED
CROSSING
NO LONGER
REQUIRED

008

008

I am responding to the consultation on the proposals for the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Scheme in the letter dated 23 August 2018.

My name is Matt Hodges

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I am a local campaigner with Cycling UK (formerly CTC)



I was involved with the earlier consultations on plans for cycling and walking improvements on the Amounderness Way section of the A585 between Skippool and Fleetwood of which a small part has been implemented and the rest is awaiting available funds.

I support the general principle of the Southern Bypass Route but I have a number of concerns over the design as far as it can be seen in the drawings accompanying this recent consultation and on the web including those drawings I downloaded in May from the earlier consultation. I would welcome the opportunity to look at and comment constructively on further drawings as they become available.

My main interest is in the safety and convenience of the design for cyclists and other vulnerable road users. I do not pretend to look at the environmental issues.

1. Overall Scheme Design.

I am concerned that the drawings supplied do not show cycle or pedestrian facilities beside the main length of the new bypass. For consistency and continuity with the Amounderness Way section of the A585 there should be at least a shared path on the northeast side of this new section all the way to Skippool. Kier acting for Highways England prepared plans for the next section west in 2015. These show a new shared path on the NE side West of Skippool. This scheme is still awaiting funding.

CLIENT		AREA 13 MAC A585 WEST DRIVE TO SKIPPOOL CYCLING	
		GENERAL ARRANGEMENT DRAWING NORCROSS ROUNDABOUT TO SKIPPOOL ROUNDABOUT - SHEET 3 OF 3	
		DWG No. 1260012 / 012	
AGENT	AREA 13	SCALE:	AS SHOWN Original drawing size : A1
		CAD REF:	REV. A
		S:\Projects\LNMS - Cycleway Schemes\1260012\Section 7	

I recognise that the plans for Windy Harbour to Skippool allow for cycling and walking along the old route and that this is one of the alternatives listed in DMRB TA 91/05 but it is also clear that directing cyclists onto redundant roads like the closed end of the old road and onto other local roads like Mains Lane and A586 Garstang Road causes many problems. In a new green field construction provision should be made within the new highway boundary

since non-motorway strategic roads are all purpose roads. Adding provision for vulnerable road users later in order to get cyclists off the main carriageway is much more difficult and expensive as is now the case with the section of the A585 from Skippool to Fleetwood.

While use of the old road and mains lane looks at first a reasonable route there are a number of problems that will deter many cyclists from using it.

The old dead end will not be properly cared for. It will be just an access route to various fields and will become covered in mud from tractor wheels and even a place for fly-tipping and traveller encampments.

As there will be no surveillance from passing traffic many women cyclists will consider it a security risk particularly on dark evenings.

While it could be a good route to the Shard Bridge (A588) and Skippool it will be less satisfactory as a route to Poulton and Blackpool because of difficulties at the proposed Poulton Roundabout (see below).

While it may be used by cyclists familiar with the route, visiting cyclists, and those potential cyclists who are only familiar with the motor route, will be reluctant to use a path diverting from the main road. As a touring cyclist myself I will not follow signed cycle paths that divert from the route on my road map because I have so often found them to be devious, poor quality, or just difficult to follow when they end up on minor unsigned roads. Visiting cyclists heading for Blackpool or Fleetwood will tend to stick to the motor road as this will be well signed.

I am also very unhappy with the proposal to close the old road for other reasons see “9” below.

2. Skippool Junction

I am very concerned by the poor and convoluted routes for pedestrians and cyclists at and near to this junction. The Proposed Combined

Footway/Cycleway on the north side is shown as ending at this junction.

Crossings of the junction are shown only as Proposed Footway. What is a westbound cyclist supposed to do at this point? Get off and carry their bike across one of the convoluted pedestrian routes to the A585 westbound carriageway or the southbound Breck Road carriageway?

For the many cyclists from Breck Road heading towards Mains Lane and the Shard Bridge the off carriageway crossing of this junction is terrible. It consists of EIGHT separate steps between islands, each potentially waiting for traffic lights. Experienced cyclists WILL NOT DO THIS. They will ride through the junction on the carriageway and will probably stay on the carriageway at least as far as the Mains Lane slip road to avoid the two badly designed junctions just east of the bus stop.

Pedestrians needs have also been subordinated to the fast movement of motor traffic which seems to dominate the thinking of so many highway designers. Mere pedestrians must wait on little islands being splashed with dirty water by passing motors until those motors are stopped for other important motors. If they weren't scum they would be in cars not piddling around on foot.

Crossing any one arm of a junction should never need more than TWO steps. If it weren't for the obsession with corner cutting left turn slip roads this could easily be accomplished. The stop lines and crossings would simply be a little further back allowing all the approaching traffic to be crossed in one phase.

The slip lane for vehicles from Amounderness Way into Skippool road appears to come very close to the highway boundary by the corner of Barton House prejudicing the planned shared cycle path on this side of the A585 from Norcross Roundabout. The construction of this junction **MUST** include the construction of the this end of the shared path from Norcross as far as the extent of the work on this junction so that it does not have to be altered when that path is constructed. The slip lane into Skippool will take very little traffic because, for vehicles from the Fleetwood Direction, Thornton and Little Thornton are better accessed from the Victoria Road or Norcross junctions. This being so it does not need a slip lane to start so early and should be replaced by a properly radiused corner from the left lane after a moved back stop line. This would allow pedestrians to cross the east bound carriageway in one step instead of three. There should be adequate time while the traffic is being allowed out of Breck Road as all eastbound traffic on Amounderness Way will be stopped for this phase.

3. Skippool Junction to Skippool Bridge.

There are three serious problems on this section.

At the bus stop the path and shelter need to be properly designed so it is not a hazard to cyclists and so cyclists are not a hazard to pedestrians stepping out of the bus shelter. At present the location of the bus shelter at this point is hazardous for both particularly in poor light.

The entry just after the bus stop. It is not clear to me what this entry is for. At present it goes nowhere but presumably there is some development planned on the field. The design of this entry is totally unacceptable. It is contrary to all guidance for crossing a cycle route beside a main road and is very dangerous. Cyclists are expected to stop and look back 180 degrees and ensure that no vehicle is about to turn in at high speed before they cross. When there is heavy traffic this requires them to determine whether any of four or five approaching vehicles is going to swing in without signalling. A totally impossible task.

For this off carriageway route to meet cycleproofing quality it must either be a raised priority route across a slow speed right-angle junction or the shared path should follow a straight line to cross the side road on a raised priority table about two car lengths from the main carriageway without any sharp changes of direction. Cyclists riding along here at about twenty miles per hour cannot be expected to stop, turn round, study the approaching traffic then start again then repeat the whole procedure at the next junction. They won't do it. They will ride on the carriageway where they have priority.

The next junction has the same problem but it also has a problem for west bound cyclists. The view for them of traffic on the minor road approaching this junction is very limited. And drivers on this minor road approaching the junction will be looking for traffic on the main road approaching from their

right not for cyclists approaching from their left. This is a serious collision waiting to happen.

I am also puzzled by the item marked as **Keyworker Homes** on the downloaded plan. Is this to have another entry across the shared cycle path?

The question of how vehicles from the east will access these entries.

At present they can go right round the Skippool roundabout. With the new traffic light junction will they be doing a “U” turn which will put them in conflict with pedestrians crossing the eastbound carriageway? The alternative is to go right on to the Norcross Roundabout or turn up Breck road and reverse into a side road to turn round.

The best solution would be for both these entries to be replaced by a service road from Old Mains Lane but this would be expensive as it would require a bridge over Main Dyke. At the very least the two entries should be combined into the first entry and land provided to bend the cycle track in with a priority crossing set back from the main road. This should be a condition of any development of this site. Or possibly all these places could be served by a service road from Skippool Road again as a condition of any development. These sites shouldn’t access the strategic road directly.

4. Skippool Bridge to Mains Lane Junction

The shared path crossing of Old Mains Lane (OML) should be a priority crossing on a table. It would be much better to cross OML close to where it joins Mains Lane where a footway crossing is shown on the plan. It could then continue between the Mains Lane slip road and OML where just a proposed footway is shown now. There would then be no need for the proposed shared cycleway on the north side of OML shown on the drawings

The Mains Lane Junction itself may work for people who know it but It looks very confusing for strangers who are not familiar with it. This is important as it is the route to and from the A588 and the Shard Bridge, the only all-purpose bridge over the river Wyre downstream of St Michaels. (Cartford Bridge is weight and width limited and is a toll bridge.)

The pedestrian crossing of this junction is also confusing and multi-phase. It would be better to set the Westbound A585 stop line back a little and construct a controlled crossing across the whole westbound carriageway at this point when the Mains Lane exit is running. They could then cross the Eastbound A585 when the Mains Lane entry from the westbound A585 is running, then cross Mains Lane itself in a single stage toucan just west of the OML junction. This should be a shared cycle route as far as the Breck Road service road entry giving a better route for cyclists between Mains Lane and Breck Road. This will also allow more time for westbound traffic on the A585 as the crossing point of the A585 just east of the service station won’t be required saving an extra phase stopping the traffic. There is no time when the other phases on these lights would have to stop both the Mains Lane westbound and the A585 westbound at the same time. It will also remove the need for the tortuous crossings of mains lane entry and exit but will require a toucan on Mains Lane just east of OML.



5. Poulton Roundabout.

The proposals for Poulton Roundabout are very unsatisfactory for both cyclists and pedestrians. The traffic on the A585 will be almost continuous at busy times. Any gap in westbound traffic on the A585 will be filled by vehicles coming out of Garstang Road. For a pedestrian or cyclist waiting to cross the westbound A585 exit it will be impossible to tell whether a vehicle is going to take that exit or continue round the roundabout. It will be almost impossible to cross this exit without taking a risk and hoping the vehicle will stop. I found this same problem myself when I tried to cross the westbound exit from the Skippool Roundabout at about 17:30 one evening. It was impossible. Whenever there was a slight gap in the west bound A585 traffic it was filled by vehicles rushing out of Breck Road. It was impossible to tell whether they were going to race round across my path or go round the roundabout and east.

Crossing the A585 eastbound entry to the Poulton roundabout will be little better. Crossing will depend on a driver in the first lane stopping to let you cross in front of him then waiting between the lanes for a driver in the next lane to let you cross. This is unacceptable. This MUST be a priority crossing or a toucan or the roundabout replaced with a signalised junction.

Alternatively the drawing appears to show the road on an embankment. If so an underpass should be possible and would be the best solution for both pedestrians and cyclists using Garstang Road.

If I were cycling either way on Garstang Road as shown I would not attempt to use the crossing point shown. I would cycle round the roundabout in the middle of the outer lane signalling as necessary. As stated above I have found from wide experience that crossing busy roundabout exits can be almost impossible without a controlled or priority crossing. Bad enough with a single lane exit but with a two lane exit it is hopeless.

6. Lodge Lane Bridge

I am opposed to a land bridge at this point. While it may be attractive from an environmental point of view it will amount to a dark tunnel even if lit. In bright sunny weather when drivers are wearing sunglasses they will have very poor vision entering this tunnel. There is a serious danger of any cyclist or other slow moving vehicle being hit from behind particularly as in daylight they will not be showing rear lights..

7. Grange Footbridge

How much use does this footpath get now or in the future? If as little as I would suspect wouldn't it be better and cheaper to put in a controlled crossing. On a busy route I would normally prefer a bridge or underpass but for a light use footpath or bridleway a controlled crossing is suitable.

8. Windy Harbour Junction.

The drawing key appears to show the dashed green on grey on the corners of this junction as existing footpath but from memory and from the consultation drawings for the alteration of this junction in 2013 I believe these are shared cycleways though possibly of substandard width.

Since you are proposing not to have cycling facilities on the south side of the A585 Garstang New Road it is important that the crossing of the A586 Garstang Road is of high quality for cyclists and pedestrians and there are good signs explaining the cycle route ahead. It is not acceptable to expect cyclists from the east to cross the A585 Fleetwood Road then to cross back over the A585 Garstang New Road to proceed towards Little Singleton. The crossing of the A585 Garstang New Road is appropriate for those cyclists and pedestrians who have come up the A585 Fleetwood Road. Again clear signing of the cycle routes ahead are needed. The crossing of the two eastbound carriageways of the A585 Garstang New Road should be accomplished in one step without a chicane and wait in the island between them. Both these carriageways will be stopped when the right turn traffic from A585 Fleetwood Road is running so this should not be a problem.

9. **Stopping up of the Garstang New Road where the Bypass leaves it.**

There are a number of reasons to reconsider this decision and to provide a limited junction between the bypassed section of the Garstang New Road and its continuation east. One reason given for stopping this up was that if open it could result in some drivers rat running through Mains Lane to Skippool. That is most unlikely if Mains Lane is subject to a lower speed limit than the Bypass and it is enforced by average speed cameras.

Stopping up this road will result in Rat Running Through Singleton.

Traffic from the A588 Shard Bridge and wanting to go South on the A585 to the M55 or beyond will come up Mains Lane to Little Singleton and then use the B5260 and B5269 to join the A585 at the Thistleton junction. This would be avoided if they could access the A585 via the Garstang New Road. The reverse flow will also occur.

The effect on Public Transport.

Stopping up will stop busses between Garstang and Blackpool (Route 42) serving the residential areas around Little Singleton.

The busses will have to go round the bypass before continuing along the A586 this means passengers or potential passengers for the Little Singleton Area and the Mains Lane area will have to walk to or from the Windy Harbour Junction or the bus stops west of Poulton Roundabout. That is over a mile on top of however far they would have to walk anyway from Little Singleton junction. This will strongly deter the use of public transport to or from Garstang, Lancaster and Blackpool. Enabling busses to use Garstang New Road to Little Singleton will encourage use of public transport which is in line with Highways England policies.

If you do persist in stopping up Garstang New Road then you should construct bus stop laybys on each carriageway of the Bypass near Lodge Lane Bridge with a path from each up to Lodge Lane. This would give a shorter walking route to Little Singleton and Mains Lane and would be simple to construct if the stops were placed to give a straight DDA compliant gradient up to Lodge Lane.

When there is an accident on the Bypass or at the Poulton Roundabout.

There surely will be an accident or other incident closing the Bypass from

time to time. The ability to divert traffic round the old route through Little Singleton would be an advantage easing the consequences.

Adding to Mileage and Global Warming.

Forcing traffic from Shard Bridge and the residential areas around Little Singleton to go west before returning east adds to mileage and therefore to fuel consumption and global warming.

To keep Garstang New Road Open.

This only requires traffic movements out of Garstang New Road to the East bound carriageway and into Garstang New Road from the West bound carriageway. This would require minimal infrastructure. For eastbound traffic a simple slip lane would suffice. For west bound traffic entering Garstang New Road there would need to be a turning lane within the centre reservation and a traffic light control to allow crossing the eastbound carriageway of the bypass. This would have minimal effect on the traffic flow on the route as a whole and would reduce the number of vehicles turning right at either Poulton Roundabout or the complex Mains Lane junction near Skippool Bridge.

An alternative to the right turn for west bound traffic to enter Garstang New Road would be for a slip road from the westbound A585 up to Lodge Lane. This would allow busses to serve Little Singleton and provide a more direct route to the Shard Bridge. However this would increase the traffic on Lodge Lane and is, in my view, inferior to a light controlled right turn into Garstang New Road.

Please think again and keep Garstang New Road open to through traffic as outlined here.

Highways England Cycling Strategy.

Remember the Highways England Cycling Strategy includes the aim *Ensure that wider network investments incorporate cycling facilities. For example, when we invest in road network improvements, the needs of cyclists will be considered, both during construction and as part of any completed scheme. Also, as we invest in network maintenance, we will consider opportunities to improve cycle provision.*

Remember also the “five design criteria” see Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network:

- Coherence: Cycle networks shall link trip origins and destinations, including public transport access points and shall be continuous and easy to navigate.
- Directness: Cycle networks shall serve all the main destinations and shall seek to offer an advantage in terms of distance and journey time.
- Comfort: Infrastructure shall meet design standards for alignment and surface quality, and cater for all types of user, including children and disabled people.
- Attractiveness: Aesthetics, noise reduction and integration with surrounding areas are important.

- Safety: Cycle networks shall not only improve cyclists' and other road users' safety, but also their feeling of how safe the environment is.

While TA 91/05 says

3.20 Footways should normally be provided within the highway boundary or in another location in the form of an OCR. In urban situations, footways should normally be provided on both sides of the carriageway, **while in rural situations footways should normally be provided on at least one side of the carriageway**, to connect to most key destinations.

Where cycle tracks or shared paths are provided only on one side of a carriageway it is important that they remain on the same side for very long distances and this is well signed. Tracks or shared paths that change sides are unsatisfactory. The plans for a shared path from Fleetwood to Skippool are on the NE side of the A585 so paths or tracks should continue on this side to Windy Harbour junction and beyond.

Matt Hodges