

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool](#)
Cc: [A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme - Formal Submission
Date: 11 July 2019 16:10:17

Dear Planning Inspector,

Please find below the comments for your consideration from my wife and I.

The recent hearing you held regarding the proposed scheme was greatly appreciated. I thought the articulation of the concerns from our neighbours and residents was clear and compelling. Whilst described differently by each speaker the consistent and clear points described addressed:

- Limited consideration of alternatives
- Limited benefit of the proposal
- Limited knowledge of the proposed scheme
- Issues specific to individual residents

Obviously there is a formal record of the meeting and no need to repeat the details. Our questions are simple:

- We would like to understand how one developer can have simultaneous road improvements on a single trunk road (considered nationally significant) which is not being delivered in one strategic national process? Put slightly differently, on the basis that the Development Consent Order process is designed for Nationally Strategic Infrastructure projects and the justification for using this consenting tool is that the A585 is a trunk road (and therefore designated as nationally significant) why is the entire A585 not brought into question under the DCO submission? Another slightly different perspective is that given Highways England are performing multiple enhancement projects, all initiated in a similar time window and all on the A585, why has the DCO been allowed to be limited to a subset of the A585 and not consider the entire trunk road that is of strategic national significance. This certainly appears to fail the intent of a Strategic National Infrastructure approach if indeed it doesn't fail in the legal detail as to how this has been applied. It definitely fails any common sense test.
- Only 1 statutory consultation has taken place. Only 2 options were presented for statutory consultation, only one by-pass and one road enhancement. On what basis is this evaluated by the Planning Inspectorate to determine if this was an adequate range of alternatives, developed to a consistent level of detail in order to be compared equally. What test does the consultation have to pass?
- The probabilistic benefit of the proposed scheme is 2-4 minutes with the potential to take longer. Given that any project delay would wipe away this negligible potential benefit, what level of benefit is required to satisfy the planning inspectorate's tests that this scheme has high confidence to deliver a positive benefit?
- The public hearing identified that the communities affected by any modification to the A585 trunk road are those that use it regularly. This includes all the North West Fylde corridor and population from M55 to Fleetwood. What test does the planning inspectorate use to determine the adequacy of consultation for the proposed DCO, given only those in the immediacy of the road works and NOT those who use the road have been consulted?

We would like to thank you for including a further open hearing date and would encourage you to proceed with that session.

You have the unenviable role as the independent regulator of being the last line of defence to ensure the best option, providing the best value for money has been identified. In our view this has not been achieved by the process to date and alternative options are required to inform any decision and commitment to an investment of tax payer funds.

We would dearly love to see a meaningful benefit and not a series of one off projects for the decades to come. I believe the DCO approach is intended to address large projects, of national significance, as a whole to efficiently gain the maximum benefit in the shortest time across our country. We would suggest we are witnessing the opposite currently.

Best regards,

Gary & Helen Shuttleworth

[REDACTED]

From: [A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool](#)

Sent: 16 April 2019 15:38

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme - (TRO10035)

A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme – (TRO10035)

Dear Sir/Madam

Your Reference: 20019135

Please find below a link to the Rule 8 letter giving notice of the procedural decisions made following the Preliminary Meeting about the way in which the proposal for the above project is to be examined. This includes the timetable for the examination of the application and the Examining Authority's initial questions. It also requests Statements of Common Ground and Local Impact Reports, and invites Interested Parties to submit written representations.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TRO10035/TRO10035-000469-Rule%20%20Letter%20.pdf>

If this link does not automatically work, please proceed to cut and paste the link into your browser.

You can also view the letter on the project page of the National Infrastructure

Planning website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/North%20West/A585-Windy-Harbour-to-Skipool-Improvement-Scheme/>

Yours Faithfully,

A585 Windy Harbour Team

Email: A585WindyHarbourtoSkipool@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Telephone: 0303 444 5000

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Please find below a link to the Rule 8 letter giving notice of the procedural decisions made following the Preliminary Meeting about the way in which the proposal for the above project is to be examined. This includes the timetable for the examination of the application and the Examining Authority's initial questions. It also requests Statements of Common Ground and Local Impact Reports, and invites Interested Parties to submit written representations.