

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool](#)  
**Subject:** A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Project  
**Date:** 12 July 2019 17:06:48

---

[REDACTED]

I was concerned at the very low attendance at the open floor hearing on 3/7/19, which is due to the poor publicity given to the proposed "improvement" scheme especially when this scheme will cause grave problems for thousands of unsuspecting residents in the Fleetwood, Norcross, Thornton, Cleveleys, Poulton, Singleton areas and will only move the traffic problems from one area to another, as raised recently by Lancashire County Council. It is imperative that another open floor hearing is convened with proper publicity so that ALL affected residents have the opportunity to comment on this scheme as clearly more people will then be able to see that rather than the best scheme being identified and budgeted for accordingly, the budget is being made to fit the scheme.

One of my friends' grandchildren who is at primary school asked what pictures I was looking at, so I told her about one lane of traffic going into two lanes and back into one to "improve traffic flow". She told me that she had been learning about fractions and that 2 into 1 =  $\frac{1}{2}$  and therefore the road would only be half as good as it is now! If a child can see the problem then I think it is clear that the scheme is flawed.

As an employee of the [REDACTED] ALL decisions had to be evidence based and value for money when using tax payers money. This scheme cannot be value for money at a cost of £140million to save approx. 1.5 minutes travelling time. Imagine the comments that would follow in the media and public scrutiny committees had the NHS decided to fund an equivalent scheme.

The use of traffic lights instead of roundabouts make no sense whatsoever as traffic lights cause congestion whilst roundabouts increase traffic flow. The proposed junctions are over complicated and will not improve congestion.

My property is situated on [REDACTED] and looks out on to [REDACTED] I am concerned at the proximity of the road to my home and the unnecessary removal of trees and shrubs which provide us with privacy and both noise and pollution barriers. I am also concerned about wildlife as there are [REDACTED] in the fields adjacent to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the vicinity. I am also concerned about the detrimental effect to the health of residents as this scheme will cause more congestion due to the number of traffic lights resulting in increased emissions from standing traffic. As you will be aware, this is already a factor being considered by a London Coroner following the recent death of a young child which is potentially being linked to traffic emissions.

One of my greatest concerns is when turning right out of Old Mains Lane onto Mains Lane I have to cross only 2 lanes of traffic which can be difficult. I was appalled to see that the proposed junction for Old Mains Lane on to Mains Lane will have me turning right across 4 lanes of traffic. How can this be sensible or safe and is a recipe for disaster and must be reconsidered from a health and safety perspective.

No evidence has yet been presented to show that this scheme will actually deliver any

improvement in traffic flow. At the next open floor hearing it is imperative that Highways England actually present their factual evidence, especially as in recent press articles HE have admitted that 95% of their schemes were not value for money and did not actually improve traffic flow. This is borne out by Lancashire County Council confirming that HE had used out of date models in their submissions.

It is imperative that HE show evidence of similar schemes that they have been responsible for where one lane of traffic going into two lanes and back into one lane has actually worked in practice and been classified as value for money. They should also be asked to show any such reference in National Audit Committee reports of schemes of this nature actually improving traffic flow in order that residents can assess their track record in actually delivering traffic improvement using tax payers money.

Whilst the remit of HE is to improve traffic flow along the A585, it is ridiculous that it is proposed to close off Garstang Road between Singleton Lights and Windy Harbour. Currently, traffic travels up Mains Lane to Singleton lights on to Garstang Road to Windy Harbour and then straight on towards Little Ecclestone/Great Ecclestone/Larbreck/St. Michaels/Lancaster and the Lakes. All this traffic will then be forced to join the already congested bypass (especially with the thousands of houses which both Wyre and Fylde Councils are being forced to build) travelling away from Windy Harbour and then have to come back on itself. Similarly, it is ridiculous that traffic from Over Wyre wishing to travel to the motorway or Lancaster will be forced to turn right from Shard Bridge on to Mains Lane to join the bypass and again cause more congestion. Again this will cause more traffic for residents of Old Mains Lane to contend with on a daily basis. The only logical way to reduce congestion is to leave Garstang Road open for use by traffic wishing to travel towards Lancaster, especially when millions of pounds was recently spent upgrading Windy Harbour junction.

I think a very grave concern is the problems that will arise when there are accidents on the new bypass as to have closed off Garstang Road will remove one way of re-routing traffic and reducing hold ups and gridlock.

In addition, emergency vehicles will have restricted access due to the severe congestion that the closure of Garstang Road will cause. At the next open floor hearing, it is imperative that HE present evidence of consultation with all the individual emergency services and their comments.

Please confirm who will be held personally responsible by the residents when this scheme does not provide value for money, does not improve traffic flow, causes increased congestion and pollution, causes more accidents and perhaps fatalities due to the emergency services having their response times extended unnecessarily, and causes damage to the health of residents from increased emissions as it only appears to be the residents that are able to foresee these problems and will require redress when their valid concerns are not considered by the public bodies involved in this scheme.

Whilst all the residents are in agreement that the problems of traffic on the A585 need addressing, and have been waiting for in excess of 20 years for improvements to the traffic flow from the M55 to Fleetwood, they would be happy to wait a few more years to ensure that a scheme that is deemed fit for purpose is identified and funded rather than a not fit for purpose scheme being implemented just because it fits the budget allocated. The name Highways

England, rather than Highways NW or Highways NE etc. appears to imply that their remit is to look at traffic management in its entirety via forward planning, not just looking at putting sticking plasters on problems piecemeal which is what residents feel is happening with the disjointed manner in which the traffic problems from Fleetwood via Norcross Roundabout on to the A585 towards Windy Harbour and the M55 are being treated.

Valerie Milligan

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]