

A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme

TR010035

7.16 Comments on Further Representations Received at Deadline 1

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 7

May 2019

Page Left Intentionally Blank

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme

Development Consent Order 20[]

COMMENTS ON RELEVANT REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 1

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010035
Application Document Reference	TR010035/APP/ 7.16
Author:	A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	May 2019	Deadline 2 Submission

Page Left Intentionally Blank

CONTENTS

1 COMMENTS ON FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1:Comments on further representations received at Deadline 12

Page Left Intentionally Blank

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations contained within this document are listed below with an indication of their meaning in the context of this Scheme.

Abbreviation	Meaning
AMCB	Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits
BCR	Benefit to Cost Ratio
DCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine Licence
EA	Environment Agency
ES	Environment Statement
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
LPA	Local Planning Authority (either Fylde Borough Council or Wyre Council)
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MOVA	Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TUBA	Transport User Benefit Appraisal

1 COMMENTS ON FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's comments on the Further Representations received at Deadline 1 from the interested parties.
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Table 1-1 below.

Table 1-1: Comments on further representations received at Deadline 1

Reference Number	Comment from Further Representation	Response to Further Representation
REP1-015	Emma Allonby	
REP1-015.1	<p>I wish to object to the proposed Windy Harbour Bypass. I objected at the last consultation and wish to do so again.</p> <p>Whilst I do understand the frustration that the current layout causes, the proposed new route is offering a reduction of 3-4 minutes, which in real terms is very little when considering my daily commute.</p> <p>I truly feel that the issue of traffic will simply be shunted to the other end of the road and whilst the first part of the 5km will run fairly freely, the traffic will come to an abrupt blockage when it meets the junction, just as it does now.</p> <p>Please take a moment to look at the new bypass at Broughton, which I use daily also. The true traffic problem has not been solved in any way, it has simply been moved to a road parallel to the initial problem route, which is what will happen with this new bypass proposal.</p>	<p>As detailed in the Transport Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/7.4) travel time savings of between 2 and 4.5 minutes per journey are forecast to be saved by road users due to the Scheme. Time savings were considered within the Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR), although they were not the only benefit considered. The Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (AMCB) brings the user benefits and Scheme costs together with the accident, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, where they can be quantified to generate the measures of economic worth, including the Scheme's Initial BCR. The BCR indicates how much benefit is obtained for each unit of cost, with a BCR greater than 1 indicating that the benefits outweigh the costs. The initial BCR of the Scheme is 1.26. Including weekend benefits, journey time reliability and wider impacts to provide an adjusted BCR increases the BCR to 2.02. Therefore, it is concluded that the Scheme is worthwhile to proceed with in economic terms as presented in Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance Section, 2.9 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1).</p> <p>As defined in Highways England's Road Investment Strategy (RIS) 1 Delivery Plan, the Scheme requirements were to assess the A585 from Windy Harbour Junction to Skippool Junction to address the congestion and safety concerns at the junctions along this stretch. The Scheme proposed will still generate economic, operational and environmental benefits without any extension to the M55 or towards Fleetwood as presented in the Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1) Section 2.9. In addition, the Highways England Operations Directorate is conducting investigatory studies for the A585/B5269 (Thistleton/Mile Road) and the M55 Junction 3 along Fleetwood Road that are separate from the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme. A sensitivity test was undertaken by the Applicant that considered the impact of other Operations Directorate schemes on the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme which showed that when including the capacity improvement upgrades of adjacent potential Operations Directorate schemes along the A585 route it remained economically worthwhile (based on an assessment of Transport User Benefits only) to proceed with the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme. The impact of the Scheme on traffic distribution across the highway network has been assessed and can be found in the Scheme Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12) Appendix F and H.10035/APP/7.1).</p>
REP1-015.2	<p>Secondly, this road will be next to my property, which has previously enjoyed a quiet rural aspect. My family will suffer personally from increased noise levels, pollution and unsightly traffic. What measures are going to be taken to reduce these changes? Are acoustic barriers being considered for both sides of the road? How will the visual impact of this road be lessened? There should be adequate compensation for this made to all properties directly impacted by this.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (document reference TR010035/APP/6.11) provides an assessment of noise and vibration impacts as a result of the Scheme. Increases in road traffic noise levels generated by the Scheme would be mitigated to an acceptable level. They are below a level where significant adverse effects on health would occur. Noise mitigation measures comprise low noise road surfacing, noise barriers and earth bunds. Barriers and earth bunds are presented in the Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.19 – Rev 1). Noise barriers are not provided both sides of the road but only where necessary.</p>

Reference Number	Comment from Further Representation	Response to Further Representation
		<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Air Quality (document reference TR010035/APP/6.6) presents an air quality assessment based on detailed air quality modelling which was undertaken for a number of worst-case receptor locations, including properties close to the Scheme. All predicted air quality concentrations at these locations were below the air quality objectives, and the assessment determined that the Scheme would not have a significant effect on local air quality.</p> <p>Visual impacts of the Scheme have been assessed within the Environmental Statement Chapter 9: Landscape (document reference TR010035/APP/6.9). Landscape and visual mitigation proposed for the Scheme is presented in the Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.19 – Rev 1).</p> <p>Compensation will not be payable in all cases. An entitlement to compensation will only arise where there has been a compensatable loss. The measures proposed as part of the Scheme effectively mitigate its impacts to acceptable levels in most cases.</p>
REP1-015.3	Thirdly, I am concerned about the water drainage. The area is situated within the flood barrier and my property sits just on the edge of this. I wish to know that the water table will not be disturbed and my property subject to possible flooding. I have already noted an increase in the water level in the stream abutting my property since building work was granted by Wyre council and has now commenced on the fields opposite my property.	A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (document reference TR010035/APP/5.2 – Rev 1) has been undertaken together with an assessment of effects on the water environment as a result of the Scheme (Environmental Statement Chapter 12: Road Drainage and the Water Environment (document reference TR010035/APP/6.12). Both documents show a reduction in river flood risk upstream of the proposed crossing of the Main Dyke during operation of the Scheme as an existing flow restriction would be removed, and a local reduction in tidal flood risk during the present day 0.5% chance event.
REP1-016	Graham & Heather Evans	
REP1-016.1	We are concerned that the proposed plans to replace the old roundabout with the new signalled junction will bring traffic closer to our house leading to increased noise and devalue our property.	Figure 11.5 within Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (document reference TR010035/APP/6.11) shows that in the short-term there would be a perceptible reduction in noise at this property's location. In the long-term Figure 11.6 of Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (document reference TR010035/APP/6.11) shows that there would not be a perceptible change in noise levels at this property.
REP1-016.2	In particular the proposed new "slipway" from Skippool Road onto the Amounderness way-will it be constructed nearer to us?	The new slipway would be marginally closer to the property. Please refer to the General Arrangement Plans (document reference TR010035/APP/2.5) and Land Plans (document reference TR010035/APP/2.2) for the location of the improvement works to the junction.
REP1-016.3	Will the house <i>Throstles Nest</i> be demolished to use its land?	The property, Throstles Nest will not be demolished as part of the Scheme.
REP1-016.4	Would you let me have detailed plans of the proposed new junction-the plans I can see online are not detailed enough.	Details of the proposed Skippool Junction can be found within the General Arrangement Plans (document reference TR010035/APP/2.5) and the Engineering Section Drawings (document reference TR010035/APP/2.6) on the Planning Inspectorate website, https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/North%20West/A585-Windy-Harbour-to-Skipool-Improvement-Scheme/
REP1-017	John Ballie	
REP1-017.1	For the attention of the Planning Inspectorate and Mr Gareth Symons, Chair of the	Noted, no further response required.

Reference Number	Comment from Further Representation	Response to Further Representation
	<p>Preliminary Meeting held today, Tuesday 9 April 2019, at Wyre Council Civic Centre. I would like to request that I am updated with ongoing information following that meeting. Please see below the document upon which my verbal statement was made at the meeting.</p> <p>A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme Observations prepared by Poulton-le-Fylde resident John Bailie, for submission and presentation to the Planning Inspectorate at the Preliminary Meeting at Wyre Council Civic Centre on Tuesday 9 April 2019</p> <p>I wish to outline my observations and concerns with regard to this proposed scheme, as follows: The aim of this scheme appears to focus on the bypassing of Singleton Junction (traffic lights) and Mains Lane by means of a 4.85km (3 miles) 2-lane dual carriageway stretching from Windy Harbour junction at the easterly end and the River Wyre / Skippool junctions to the west. This will obviously alleviate congestion within that area but I would respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate consider the broader view:</p>	
REP1-017.2	<p>A fundamental compromise of this scheme is the fact that at each end the new road merely connects with lengthy stretches of existing 2-lane single carriageway roads that will not receive the benefit of modification. Indeed the stretch from the M55 to Windy Harbour is in fact narrower than Mains Lane (which will be rendered redundant to through traffic). Furthermore, this section contains direct access at around 50 points to residential property and fields etc. It will therefore continue to generate congestion and pollution, and is a stretch of road that is in itself most in need of upgrading or bypassing. The same scenario applies at the Skippool end, where the new road will once again connect with several miles of unmodified, single carriageway road all the way to Fleetwood. <i>(The distance from M55 junction 3 (near Kirkham) to Fleetwood is 19km (11.87 miles). The new road will therefore result in improvements to around only 25% of the total route).</i></p>	<p>Refer to the response to RR-001 in the Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference TR010035/APP/7.9) and also responses to REP1-015 above.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Air Quality (document reference TR010035/APP/6.6) presents an air quality assessment based on detailed air quality modelling which was undertaken for a number of worst-case receptor locations, including properties close to the Scheme. All predicted air quality concentrations at these locations were below the air quality objectives, and the assessment determined that the Scheme would not have a significant effect on local air quality.</p>
REP1-017.3	<p>Consider the scenario from the point of view of a motorist travelling from M55 junction 3 to Fleetwood: Having negotiated several miles of the relatively narrow 2-lane A585 road from the motorway and through Esprick, they will encounter traffic signals at the Windy Harbour junction. Any frustration they have experienced will presumably then be relieved when they embark upon the new "super highway". However, after just 2.4km (1.5 miles) on this road (which cuts across rapidly diminishing green fields and necessitates a tunnel-like underpass at Lodge Lane near the historic Singleton Hall) they will encounter further traffic signals where the new road crosses the current Garstang Road (A586). After a further 1.5km (less than a mile) they will hit another forest of traffic signals at the complex Skippool Bridge junction, and then after a mere 0.4km (440 yards) yet another set of traffic signals at what is currently a roundabout near the River Wyre public house, then on to Fleetwood via the single carriageway, 2-lane, unimproved Amounderness Way. All this will surely create a "stop-start" experience that is likely to generate frustration,</p>	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the traffic would be slowed. By having the junctions all signalised, the Scheme introduces standardisation of junctions and continuity to the road user, the effect of which would be to facilitate the free-flowing of traffic and prevent slowing. All the junctions will be operated using a Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) system, including the existing Windy Harbour junction. This will enable further control of traffic flow and reduce bottle necks.</p>

Reference Number	Comment from Further Representation	Response to Further Representation
	<p>increased congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, further inconvenience will be experienced by traffic from Over Wyre that will need to negotiate a zig-zag course from Shard Bridge and Shard Lane in order to access the new road.</p> <p>The same effect will apply to residents living on Mains Lane (some of whom, if wishing to travel to Great Eccleston and Garstang, will have no choice but to suffer the inconvenience of having to travel eastwards to the current Singleton junction, then double back westwards to the new Poulton Junction before gaining access there onto the new road to progress eastwards once more on their journey to Windy Harbour and onwards). All of these scenarios will surely result in most erratic traffic flows.</p>	
REP1-017.4	<p>The new scheme will indeed create more problems, potential congestion and frustration than it aims to resolve. Similar concerns to those stated above were also raised by a number of people during the consultation events that I attended.</p> <p>In summary, I maintain that this is a fundamentally compromised scheme and, with a budget of at least £150million, a colossal waste of money and with limited benefit. (A potential journey time saving of just a few minutes has been stated by Highways England).</p>	<p>As detailed in the Transport Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/7.4) travel time savings of between 2 and 4.5 minutes per journey are forecast to be saved by road users due to the Scheme. Time savings were considered within the Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR), although they were not the only benefit considered. The Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (AMCB) brings the user benefits and Scheme costs together with the accident, noise, air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, where they can be quantified to generate the measures of economic worth, including the Scheme's Initial BCR. The BCR indicates how much benefit is obtained for each unit of cost, with a BCR greater than 1 indicating that the benefits outweigh the costs. The initial BCR of the Scheme is 1.26. Including weekend benefits, journey time reliability and wider impacts to provide an adjusted BCR increases the BCR to 2.02. Therefore, it is concluded that the Scheme is worthwhile to proceed with in economic terms as presented in Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance Section, 2.9 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1).</p>
REP1-017.5	<p>Furthermore it will necessitate the destruction of swathes of green fields to the detriment of birds, wild life and the very environment that we are continually being encouraged to preserve; it will also cause considerable inconvenience and upheaval during its construction.</p> <p>I would therefore respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate look closely at all these factors from the broad perspectives stated and seriously consider the rejection of this scheme and seek an alternative.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Chapter 8: Biodiversity (document reference TR010035/APP/6.8) presents an assessment on biodiversity receptors including birds and protected species. Biodiversity mitigation proposed as part of the Scheme is outlined within the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (document reference TR010035/APP.7.3 – Rev 1), the Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP.6.19 – Rev 1), Appendix B: Bird Mitigation Strategy (within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2 – Rev 1)) and Appendix C: Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2 – Rev 1)). It should also be noted that a net biodiversity gain can be also be demonstrated as a result of the Scheme (Environmental Statement Appendix 8.9: Biodiversity Metric Calculations (document reference TR010035/APP/6.8.9)).</p>
REP1-018	John Ballie	
	<p>Further to my previous email, I am writing to confirm the concerns that I made verbally at the meeting with regard to the compromised manner in which Highways England have conducted the consultation process and in particular in relation to today's Preliminary Meeting.</p> <p>This is a monumental and clearly fundamentally flawed proposed scheme. It will create serious disruption whilst it is constructed; it will have a major impact on the environment</p>	<p>The consultation process was carried out under Sections 42, 43, 44, 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008. Section 42 letters were sent in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008, a Section 46 notification letter was sent to the Planning Inspectorate and four public consultation events were held in March and April 2018 in accordance with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008. Refer to section 4 of the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1) for further details.</p>

Reference Number	Comment from Further Representation	Response to Further Representation
	<p>and the overall character and perception of the area; it has a current mammoth budget of £150million.</p> <p>Today's was a "Public Meeting". It was attended by approx only 50 people. The reason is that the meeting was not effectively publicised in advance. The level of genuine concern that is evident was reflected by the fact that not one of the speakers spoke in favour of the scheme as a whole. Several of those present who were opposed to the scheme were residents of Mains Lane, the very road that is supposed to benefit!</p> <p>I wish to respectfully request that a second Public Meeting is held, and one which is effectively publicised in all media with a considerable period of advance notice.</p>	<p>As part of the statutory requirements to publicise public events and hearings, the Applicant advertised the Notification of Hearings in accordance with Rule 13(6) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010. Rule 13(6) requires the Applicant to publish the date and location of the hearings and where members of the public can view hard and electronic documents relevant to the application (Draft Development Consent Order). The notices were advertised in the following local newspapers on the 13th and 20th March 2019;</p> <p>Fleetwood Weekly News Blackpool Gazette Lancashire Evening Post</p> <p>Five notices were also placed along Windy Harbour Junction, Mains Lane and Breck Road between 13th March and 9th April 2019.</p>

Page Left Intentionally Blank