

A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme

TR010035

7.23 Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 4

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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

Volume 7

August 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[]

RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 4

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010035
Application Document Reference	TR010035/APP/7.23
Author:	A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	August 2019	Deadline 5 Submission

Page Left Intentionally Blank

CONTENTS

1	RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 4	1
----------	--	----------

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 4	2
--	---

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
ADM	Area of Detailed Modelling
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
AMCB	Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
ASI	Accompanied Site Inspection
BCR	Benefit cost ratio
CPO	Compulsory purchase order
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DfT	Department for Transport
DML	Deemed Marine License
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examiner appointed by the Secretary of State
FBC	Fylde Borough Council
FMA	Fully Modelled Area
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
HE	Highways England
HEMP	Handover Environmental Management Plan
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
MCAA 2009	Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
NPS	National Policy Statement
ORR	Office of Rail and Road
PCF	Project Control Framework
REAC	Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments
Rev	Revision
RIS	Road Investment Strategy
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SPRS	South Pennines Route Strategy
TRIS	Traffic Surveys and Traffic Road Side Interviews
TUBA	Transport User Benefit Appraisal
UKCP18	UK Climate Impacts Programme 2018
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project

RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 4

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the responses to representations received at Deadline 4.
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Table 1-1 below.

Table 1-1: Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 4

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP4-025	Fleetwood Renewable Energy Enterprise	
REP4-025.1	We refer to our letter of 27 th June (copy attached) to which we have received neither acknowledgement or reply.	The traffic model has accounted for pedestrians using the controlled crossings within each cycle, however in reality this is unlikely to occur as frequently and will only be used when required. The total time modelled for each cycle is 120 seconds. Widening Garstang Road was assessed previously following Mr Greenwood's proposal during non-statutory consultation and was found not to perform better than the proposed scheme, refer to Section 5.8 in Appendix M of the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1). In addition, the proposal would require acquisition of frontages of several properties and would have negative effects in terms of noise and air quality.
REP4-025.2	Since that letter was sent there has been a further meeting at which FREE's Mr Greenwood was in attendance and spoke. He reports that it appears that the comments then made acknowledged and would be properly considered.	
REP4-025.3	The meeting centred on the proposed A585 road scheme and Mr Greenwood's representations focused on traffic flow and the comparative effect of roundabouts with manually controlled crossing signals as opposed to programmed crossing signals.	
REP4-025.4	It remains the view of our client that the better outcome- both as regards reducing cost and improving traffic flow would be to widen Garstang road rather than to construct the suggested underpass, and to maintain manually controlled crossing signals rather than pre-programmed controls at pedestrian and cyclist crossing points.	
REP4-025.5	As to the objections to the widening of Amounderness way from Skippool to Norcross- highways England suggest that there is insufficient space, but the A585 was widened at Bourne way to form 4 lanes, and the available space at Norcross Road/ Amounderness Way is no less than that at Bourne Way.	As previously conveyed to Mr Greenwood, the perceived delays along Amounderness Way are not due to the single carriageway as this section is currently operating at around 80% capacity. It is the lack of capacity at Skippool Junction and Norcross Junction which causes the issues. Therefore, the modifications to Skippool Junction as part of the Scheme and the proposed modifications at Norcross as part of Highways England Asset Renewal Programme, will alleviate congestion along this section of highway. The length of Amounderness Way from the western end of the Scheme to Norcross Junction is about 1.6km but is outside the Scheme remit. Upgrading it to dual carriageway would require the existing road embankment to be widened by between 12-18m. The amount of widening to the east and west of the existing road alignment would vary to minimise impacts on existing constraints. The upgrading to dual carriageway would also require widening of the bridge over the unused Poulton to Fleetwood branch line railway. At the northern end of this section, approaching Norcross Junction, the available highway corridor is constrained by properties and screening trees on both sides of the road. Widening the carriageway and associated embankments at the northern extent of Amounderness Way on the approach to Norcross junction would be of concern to the Environment Agency, as around 650m lies within Flood Zone 3.
REP4-025.6	This is without making reference to Mr Greenwood's proposals as regards the changed design for the roundabout at Norcross Road/ Amounderness Way	Noted.
REP4-025.7	However, the wider concerns of FREE relate to flooding (as was highlighted in our letter of 27 th June)	Noted.
REP4-025.8	It is the case (as we understand it) that flooding has, to some extent, been taken into consideration in the proposed layout of the road scheme at Skippool but it is our understanding that the height of floodwater AOD on	As documented in the Deadline 2 submission of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (document reference TR010035/APP/5.2 – Rev 1) tidal floodwater levels for the Wyre Estuary have been supplied by the Environment Agency. The data represents water levels

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	which the scheme is currently based is some way below the level projected by the National Oceanography Centre.	during a 0.5% annual exceedance probability event, inclusive of an allowance for climate change to the year 2120, that is based on the findings of the most current UK Climate Impacts Programme 2018 (UKCP18) research, published in November 2018. The UKCP18 scenario applies an increase of 1.253m on the 0.5% AEP present day tidal boundary in the Wyre Estuary, and this margin of uplift has been agreed as appropriate by the Environment Agency.
REP4-025.9	Our letter of 27 th June requested confirmation that the wider aspects of projected flooding had been fully considered in this A585 scheme and also sought information as to the basis on which the Arcadis report had been prepared.	The Scheme has been subject to a detailed FRA (document reference TR010035/APP/5.2 – Rev 1) that fully defines existing (baseline) flooding from rivers, tides, surface water, groundwater and artificial sources, and quantifies any changes the Scheme causes. The FRA has been prepared using multiple sources of information, including data from Environment Agency reviewed and approved models of the Main Dyke and Horsebridge Dyke and of the Wyre Estuary and the floodplains of these waterbodies. The FRA has been thoroughly reviewed by the Environment Agency and relevant Lead Local Flood Authorities, who have agreed the geographical extent of our study areas and modelling coverage, approved the assessment methodologies as robust, and signed off the findings and conclusions of the assessment.
REP4-025.10	Free accepts that your current remit may not incorporate or extend to the “River Wyre/Fylde Coast” flood protection but it is, surely, inappropriate that the current scheme should be implemented without consideration of the projected flood levels and to the protections that would be provided by the Flood Barrier at the mouth of River Wyre that is and has been the subject of FREE’s previous representations.	A flood barrier at the mouth of the River Wyre at Fleetwood is not a Scheme that has guaranteed funding or planning approval. It is therefore not considered appropriate to include for the effects of such a project on flood levels in the Wyre, as part of the submitted FRA. The FRA has been reviewed and approved by the Environment Agency (the government statutory body responsible for environmental protection in England) as appropriately scoped and technically robust.
REP4-025.11	Please let us know, at your earliest convenience, what considerations have been given to these wider implications and to the protection of the North Fylde against those predicted floods.	It is not within the remit of the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme to provide strategic flood protection measures to serve North Fylde. The Scheme has been designed and would be operated to ensure that its users are safe from all forms of flooding during its lifetime. Several elements of the Scheme design also deliver benefits in terms of reducing existing local flood risk. For example, flooding from the Main Dyke is reduced by replacing a twin culvert with an open span bridge at the A585 crossing. A low flood wall east of Skippool Roundabout benefits 22 existing properties by reducing baseline flood levels at these locations during the 0.5%AEP tidal flood event.
REP4-025.12	In particular we consider that very great weight should be placed on the suggestion that flood prevention measures should be discounted in so far as they affect Thornton, Cleveleys and Fleetwood (page 47 item 9.1.8 of the Arcadis Flood Risk Assessment refers) in view of the fact that a suggested flood barrier at the mouth of the river can save property, businesses and infrastructure- assets with an estimates value of 0.5% of the cost of building the flood barriers.	As noted in the response above, it is not within the remit of the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme to provide strategic flood protection measures to serve Thornton, Cleveleys and Fleetwood.
REP4-025.13	It is not appropriate to burden this letter with further detail, but your early response will be appreciated.	Noted.
REP4-025.14	If you are not in a position to let us have that early response, please let us know the timescale within which that might be expected.	Noted.
REP4-026	Fylde Borough Council	
REP4-026.1	FBC made oral representations at the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH)	The Applicant does not agree that a 10-year rectification period or increasing the frequency

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>indicating that it had met with the Applicant prior to the ISH and, following the discussions at that meeting, had reached a position of broad agreement with the Applicant in respect of the Council's 12 suggested amendments, additions and/or observations to the dDCO set out on pages 40-43 of the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) submitted at deadline 2 (Rev 1.1 dated 7th May 2019, FBC document reference 2.3).</p> <p>There remain two areas of disagreement between FBC and the Applicant</p> <p>The length of the rectification period for planting introduced as part of the landscaping scheme as specified in Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 5 (5) of the dDCO.</p> <p>The Applicant's proposed "minimum bi-annual" (once every six months) frequency for monitoring of the planting during the rectification period which is contained in the updated Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC).</p> <p>In terms of the first issue, FBC consider that the rectification period should be increased from 5 years to 10 years. The Council's detailed reasons for this are set out in response reference 9.3 of FBC document 2.5 (submitted at deadline 2).</p> <p>FBC does not consider the "bi-annual" frequency of monitoring visits proposed during the rectification period to be sufficient for a scheme of this scale. In particular, FBC is concerned that there is potential for significant degradation of the planted areas to occur during the six-month intervals between visits (especially during the initial establishment period) and that the limited frequency of monitoring visits would prejudice the successful ongoing maintenance and effectiveness of the landscaping scheme. Accordingly, FBC considers that the REAC (referred to in Schedule 2, Part 1, Requirement 5 (2) of the dDCO) should be updated to provide for "minimum quarterly" (at least once every three months) visits to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation planting and establish the need for further maintenance and/or replanting. For the reasons given above, FBC maintain that revisions are needed to Requirement 5 of the dDCO – and associated updated commitments within the REAC – to secure appropriate measures for the ongoing maintenance of any landscaping scheme in order to ensure that this will provide proportionate mitigation for the proposed development's significant effects on the surrounding landscape.</p>	<p>of monitoring is required. The proposal by the Applicant is common practice.</p> <p>The Handover Environmental Management Plan (HEMP) will detail the requirements for planting replacement as a result of failure / loss during a 5-year rectification period. Replacement planting for areas of significant loss will be undertaken on a basis of anticipated growth rates for that stock based on its original stock size and time passed as opposed to like for like replacement. Details of planting replacement will be discussed with Fylde Borough Council prior to the HEMP being discharged and will consider the following principles (example for the smallest and largest stock being planted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transplant stock failure in year 1 will be replaced with transplant stock, failure in year 2 and 3 with feathered stock, failure in year 4 and 5 with standard stock • Standard stock failure in year 1, 2 and 3 will be replaced with standard stock of the same or larger size, failure in year 4 and 5 with heavy standard stock. <p>Monitoring of the establishment of the landscape design during the rectification period will be undertaken on a minimum biannual basis to identify any planting failures / areas of replanting required. As part of this monitoring a review of the maintenance regimes being undertaken in accordance with the maintenance and management plan will be undertaken.</p> <p>The above has been included within Revision 2 of the REAC (document reference TR010035/APP/7.3 – Rev 2) submitted at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes the following from other Development Consent Orders, which include either a 2-year or 5-year rectification period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A556 Knutsford to Bowdon Scheme (see requirement 5) • M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway (see requirement 5) • A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme (see requirement 5)
REP4-027	Marine Management Organisation	
REP4-027.1	<p>Notification by the MMO to remain an Interested Party by the ExA</p> <p>The MMO has an interest in this project because the works, as detailed within the Environmental Statement (ES), appear to include construction activities which are proposed to take place within the UK Marine Area as defined by Section 42 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA 2009) – The Development Consent Order (DCO) application includes a draft</p>	Noted.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	Deemed Marine Licence (DML) under Section 65, MCAA. Should consent be granted for the project, the MMO will be responsible for monitoring, compliance and enforcement of DML conditions.	
REP4-027.2	Revised/updated Statement of Common Ground	
REP4-027.3	The MMO noted as part of the Deadline 3 response a number of requirements prior to sign-off of the SoCG. This included an updated DML containing coordinates. An updated DML has not yet been received.	The updates to the dDCO (document reference TR010035/APP/3.1) will be submitted as part of Deadline 5.
REP4-027.4	The MMO also noted as part of the Deadline 3 response that a number of issues remained with Natural England and the Environment Agency. MMO are yet to have sight of agreement with these bodies.	The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was agreed with the Environment Agency as part of Deadline 4. There is ongoing dialogue with Natural England on the SoCG, an update will be available at Deadline 6.
REP4-027.5	Given the above, the MMO is unable to fully agree an updated Statement of Common Ground at this stage.	The updates to the dDCO (document reference TR010035/APP/3.1) will be submitted as part of Deadline 5. The Applicant will be seeking to agree the SoCG with the MMO as part of the Deadline 6 submission.
REP4-028	Natural England	
REP4-028.1	Update on issuing letters of no impediment for bats and great crested newts. We have now issued letters of no impediment for bats (issued on 03 June 2019) and great crested newts (issued on 11 June 2019). Copies of both letters are attached at Annex A and Annex B.	Noted, no further response required.
REP4-028.2	Update on comments on Applicant's first revised draft Development Consent Order.	
REP4-028.3	At the time of writing, we are still in ongoing discussions with Highways England regarding the Requirements contained within the Draft DCO.	Noted.
REP4-028.4	We hope to resolve these soon to allow Highways England to issue their revised Draft DCO by Deadline 5.	Noted.
REP4-029	Angus Blythe	
REP4-029.1	This is now the 3rd time I have put into writing my concerns and disbelief at the continued relentless, clearly flawed and misplaced views of the Transport Planning Inspectorate as regards the proposed A585 Skippool bypass.	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 Section 2.9 of the Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1). In addition, the Highways England's Asset Renewal Programme 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 Highways England's Asset Renewal Programme schemes on the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme which showed that when including the capacity improvement upgrades of adjacent potential Highways England's Asset Renewal Programme 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 Appendix F and H of the Scheme Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12).
REP4-029.2	I have now owned a local property in Singleton for almost 1 year and now have first-hand experience on traveling up and down the existing A585, and roads to and from the M55 and Fleetwood. Plus of course the Little Singleton junction.	
REP4-029.3	It is now clear to me that all my original thoughts and reservations about the proposed new bypass have played out 100% after a year of using local roads.	
REP4-029.4	Namely, the proposed A585 bypass will solve NONE of the local traffic problems; in fact, all it will do is push equivalent or even worse traffic problems to the 2 ends of the bypass at Skippool and Windy Harbour.	

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP4-029.5	The Highways inspectorate keep saying “it’s the best solution to solve local traffic issues” and it is clear to me that these words expose the inspectorates own honest view that the proposed bypass is not a real solution at all to any traffic problems but just a badly conceived scheme from the selection of other poorly conceived options that were available for the proposed bypass.	<p>The Transport Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/7.4) covers a wide area, focusing on the road network to the north of the M55 and to the west of the M6, including the principal settlements as shown in Figure 3.9 of Section 3 of the Transport Assessment. The traffic model consists of two key model areas; the Fully Modelled Area (FMA) and the External Area. The FMA is the area over which the Scheme is expected to have an influence, focusing on the A585 to the north of the M55 and to the west of the M6, including the principal settlements of Fleetwood, Blackpool, Cleveleys, Poulton-Le-Fylde, Singleton and a number of smaller areas as shown in Section 4.2 of Appendix E of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12).</p> <p>The FMA is further sub-divided into the Area of Detailed Modelling (ADM) and the Buffer Area. The ADM is the area over which significant impacts are expected and is characterised by small zones and detailed network. Paragraphs 5.4.11 - 5.4.16 of Appendix F of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12) summarise the network statistics over this ADM for all forecast years which shows a reduction in travel time, an increase in average speed, and a decrease in delays.</p>
REP4-029.6	How on earth the government departments can even consider this ridiculous scheme having any credibility in terms of improved traffic flow solutions and improvements is beyond me.	
REP4-029.7	It is clear to me having used the local roads now that simple improvements to multiple existing roads and junctions will achieve far more improvements in traffic flow and management than the proposed bypass, and at a fraction of the cost of the proposed bypass, and with a fraction of the disruption, and at a fraction of the destruction to local countryside and beauty spots.	
REP4-029.8	If this scheme was being proposed within the high flying, commercial and business environment I operate in day in and day out in my business life then it would never pass the first approval hurdle.	
REP4-029.9	If this scheme was being proposed within the high flying, commercial and business environment I operate in day in and day out in my business life then it would never pass the first approval hurdle.	
REP4-029.10	I hope the Highways Agency/Inspectorate will listen to all the opposition to this proposed bypass but more so take on board the very clear and very logical reservations that are being expressed day in and day out about this proposed bypass, rather than simply ignoring all such objections and belligerently sticking to the weakest of all one-liners and arguments “that this is the best available scheme to improve local traffic flow and management” It’s NOT!	
REP4-030	Brian Sillett	
REP4-030.1	The Decision makers and planners associated with this quango are uncertain to say the least, they have no basic concepts of free traffic flow from A to B. I.e., if you are watering a garden and squeeze the end of a hosepipe the flow ceases and a build-up of pressure occurs. The proposed folly that someone has designed, and others agreed too, will create more Carbon Emissions, more traffic hold ups and people eventually being made unemployed. (refer to the Pandora/Stena line fiasco).	Refer to REP4-029.1.
REP4-030.2	It seems that most locals know that the best solution is a dual carriageway from Fleetwood to Junction 3 of the M55, there is enough land at each side of the present road structure to facilitate this and the cost of widening the bridge between Norcross Roundabout and the River Wyre is not cost prohibitive. However, as certain Councillors et-al live on Mains Lane the simple solution is shelved.	The is often referred to as the “Blue route.” This option of the Norcross to M55 scheme which was being promoted by Lancashire County Council and not the Highways Agency (now Highways England) was ruled out by Lancashire County Council due to insufficient funding for the scheme in 2007. The Blue Route would have used part of the preferred route between the Skippool and Poulton junctions but extended down to a new junction on the M55 running parallel to Main Dyke and the railway. From Poulton Junction to the new junction with the M55, the Blue route would be about 6km long compared with 2.5km

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		between Poulton and Windy Harbour Junctions. The cost of the Blue Route would be significantly more than the proposed Scheme and the additional junction on the motorway between Junction 3 & 4 would cause technical and operational problems.
REP4-030.3	A way forward would be to get the Japanese designers and planners, no doubt they will complete in half the time, at half the cost with a practical solution resolve	Noted, no further response required.
REP4-031	Derek Shuttleworth	
REP4-031.1	With reference to the A585 WINDY HARBOUR BYPASS I would like to express my disappointment at your proposals for the new roadworks.	Noted.
REP4-031.2	I cannot see that all these junctions, roundabouts, etc coupled with traffic controlled lights and crossings will do anything but GREATLY increase delays to traffic flow! How has the benefit been calculated?	Refer to responses to REP4-038.
REP4-031.3	One point that never seems to be considered is that traffic will mainly be from the FLEETWOOD/ CLEVELEYS areas going to the M55 KIRKHAM junction- this total flow will always be restricted by the single carriageway sections of AMOUNDERNESS WAY and the A585 at GREENHALGH. This is the main obstacle to the FREE flow of traffic- regardless of any WINDY HARBOUR/ SKIPPOOL BYPASS scheme.	Refer to response REP2-063.3 and REP2-078.1 in Comments on Written Representations (document reference TR010035/APP/7.18).
REP4-031.4	There does not appear to be any advantage in any of the suggested alternatives, even though there was NO choice of alternative routes- only "WINDY HARBOUR/ SKIPPOOL BYPASS". Why cannot a complete new road layout from FLEETWOOD/ M55 be to be at least considered? I can see a time in the future when this scheme will be inadequate and another alternative solution will be put forward! Why not do it properly NOW- and save an enormous future expense. I would express concerns that the extra newbuild developments in the surrounding areas have NOT been considered in the total scheme? -or have they???	Refer to response to REP4-033.2 below. The inclusion of planned developments within the traffic model has been discussed with the local authorities. Paragraphs 3.3.24-3.3.32 of the Transport Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/7.4) summarise how extra traffic from committed developments is included in the traffic modelling. Paragraphs 3.3.27 to 3.3.32 describe how information from local authorities was collected. Each individual development was then classified as per Table 3.4. Any development that was classed as near certain or more than likely; developments under construction or approved development proposals or developments with a planning application within the consent process; were included in the Core Scenario forecasts. All other developments were classed as reasonably foreseeable and included in the Optimistic Scenario. As stated in the Transport Assessment the Scheme includes future provision for traffic growth year 2037 showing that the Scheme mainline has reserve capacity to support future development in the area.
REP4-031.5	I have worries that the slightest delay anywhere on the AMOUNDERNESS WAY/ A585 due to vehicle breakdown/ accident/ roadworks etc, will literally close down any traffic flow in or out of FLEETWOOD/ CLEVELEYS- has this been considered and alternative routes if necessary planned?	Refer to the Traffic Management Plans (document reference TR010035/APP/7.7) for further details during the construction phase. Any vehicle breakdown / accident / roadworks post construction would be dealt with in a similar manner to the existing arrangement, involving Highways England, the local highway authority and Lancashire Constabulary.
REP4-031.6	I think that this SCHEME is ill conceived and very poorly managed- I hope you will reconsider BEFORE it is too late.	Noted, however the Applicant respectfully disagrees.
REP4-032	Edward Clarke	
REP4-032.1	Having the authority of the above landowner also as a family member and director of the land tenants I would re iterate my concern as noted at the meeting re the correct potential out of sequencing nature of the meeting as titled.	Noted.
REP4-032.2	Having attended the compulsory purchase hearing on 3rd July (CAH1) also having spoken at the hearing I would like to confirm our thoughts re the full	A positive meeting was held with Mr Clarke and his land agent on 01 August 2019. The Applicant explained the extent of land required for the Scheme and that this included the

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	purpose of the meeting by its title before affected landowners offers had been formally fully agreed.	temporary possession of land for possible use as a borrow pit. It was explained that the borrow pit may or may not be required by the contractor delivering the Scheme. In the event that the borrow pit is required, the Applicant will restore the land to the condition it was in on the date possession was taken or such other condition that may be agreed with the owner or as may otherwise be set out in the Borrow Pit - Restoration Aftercare Plan (Article 29(4) of the dDCO). The Borrow-Pit Restoration Aftercare Plan (Appendix N) of the Outline Construction Environmental Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2) will be approved prior to the commencement of the development, as secured by requirement 4 as part of the CEMP.
REP4-032.3	As previously noted the discussions are at an advanced stage re the proposed 10 acre road land acquisition that forms a diagonal strip through our 30 acre arable field. This leaves 8 and 12 acres either side currently defined as "temporary" Borrow Pits . The formal values have not to date been agreed for the borrow pits land rental.	
REP4-032.4	Regarding the proposed 20 acre "borrow pit" land which I understand from the meeting and submitted planning paperwork despite being designated "borrow pits" this land will be returned without exception to its original owners in full and as soon as practically possible after the road construction. We assume the land could be temporarily acquired for up to five years duration .	With reference to Section 29(5) of the Draft DCO – temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development <i>"The undertaker must pay compensation to the owners and occupiers of land which temporary possession is taken under this article for any loss or damage arising from the exercise in relation to the land of the provisions of this article"</i> .
REP4-032.5	We also acknowledge schedule 2 article 29 ? that on road completion the land will be reinstated to a condition agreed with the land owner. Compensation would also be payable for any terminal detriment against its original usage / condition / value . We understand that its a planning pre requisite for the road scheme that any "land not used for road build route reinstatement" document will be fully agreed and must be place before any works commence. This document has yet to be issued.	As detailed in the Borrow-Pit Restoration Aftercare Plan (Appendix N) (document reference: TR010035/APP/7.2) the borrow pits would provide approximately 70,000 cu.m of general material to construct the embankment north of Poulton junction and associated environmental screening mounds.
REP4-032.6	The 'borrow pits' land have been currently valued in our opinion well below good commercial agricultural land expected return values at just basic land rental values. This also in terms of the borrow pit title equates to approximately 1Pence sterling per annum per tone of material removed. I estimate from the planning before and after section documentation drawings that the proposed material removal from the borrow pits is in excess of 400,000 m ³ making the current basic rental offer somewhat derisory. We own the land and understand mineral rights for the land and looking at the borehole material analysis documentation submitted with the planning documentation we believe a reasonable amount of material could have the potential of being classed "quarried" material.	The Borrow-Pit Restoration Aftercare Plan will regulate the materials that are put back to the extent that where there is loss to the landowner because materials of a lesser value are put back, the landowner would be entitled to compensation. As outlined in paragraph 4.2.4 of the Aftercare Plan the intention would be to limit the reduction in long term capability to restore the land. There is a requirement to undertake a 5-year monitoring period following reinstatement.
REP4-032.7	Within the UK "borrow pits" rules and section 17 we object to the fact that quality materials may be present and removed being replaced in part or in full with less quality materials without fair and reasonable rent compensation to the owner.	
REP4-032.8	Can we sell the material to the contractor or will section 17 remove this option.	
REP4-032.9	Can we within section 17 apply for a license and or planning to remove the material, as most but not all objections would similarly apply to Highways England's proposals or under this same section do we have to accept / forced to accept the current derisory offer.	
REP4-032.10	Can any accepted offer of compensation be re visited within the usual six year acquisition period if the removed materials are found to be quarry quality materials, at the meeting it was stated that the acquisition date is the valuation date?	This ought not to be necessary as the prospects for obtaining planning permission in the future should already be taken in account in the statutory planning assumptions underlying the assessment of compensation.
REP4-032.11	Re the safeguarded route / landowners plans for family and the future generation livelihood's. The land is currently farmed by a third generation farming family with proposals for the fourth generation to soon continue. The road proposal will potentially- A remove the landowners rights (restricted	The prospect of obtaining planning permission is taken into account in the statutory planning assumptions underlying the assessment of compensation. Any other matters claimed are subject to receipt of a claim which evidences any further loss or damage arising.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	safeguarded route planning restrictions) to apply to build a farm house / develop the land at the already established smallholding B remove half the current smallholding full acreage thus potentially removing the current smallholding status(insufficient land to sustain a farming income) when applying for a dwelling under domestic / agricultural dwelling status.	
REP4-033	Gary and Helen Shuttleworth	
REP4-033.1	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.	<p>Refer to the drawings produced and included as part of the response 2.1.1 in ExA's Further Written Questions (document reference TR010035/APP/7.22).</p> <p>Highways England is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the Strategic Road Network. The Major Projects schemes, such as the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Scheme, are considered based on a 5-year investment cycle, forming part of the Road Investment Strategy. In parallel local junction improvement schemes are identified by the Highways England Asset Renewal team, which are much smaller scale projects that will address local pinch points in the network. These local junction improvement projects are not Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and as such do not fall into the requirements of the PA 2008.</p>
REP4-033.2	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?	<p>As required by paragraph 4.27 of the NPS, the Scheme has been subject to an options appraisal.</p> <p>In 2015 the Applicant completed the Options Identification Stage (Highways England PCF Stage 1) for this Scheme and subsequently went on to develop the design of various options for the Options Selection Stage (Highways England PCF Stage 2). During the Options Selection Stage a range of 9 possible options were developed in sufficient detail to allow them to be considered, refer to Environmental Statement Chapter 4 Alternative Assessments (document reference TR010035/APP/6.4) for further details on the reasons why options were discounted. As part of the Options Selection Stage and the development of the traffic model, bus occupancy surveys were carried out and results confirmed a low usage which ultimately determined that there were not any viable modal alternatives along the A585 axis.</p> <p>A non-statutory consultation was undertaken in autumn 2016 for 42 days (05/09/2016 to 17/10/2016) and presented two main options, Option 1 (Southern Bypass) and Option 2 (On-line improvements), with two variations of Option 1 (Option 1A and Option 1B). Publicity for the consultation and exhibitions included leaflets to key stakeholders and properties closest to the scheme, flyers distributed to properties within 500m of the A585 corridor from the M55 to Fleetwood, notices published in 3 local newspapers and other documents including the questionnaire on the Highways England website.</p> <p>Public exhibitions were held at two local venues on 16th, 17th and 21st September 2016 attended by in excess of 300 people. A total of 574 completed questionnaires and 37 written responses from members of the public and local residents were received indicating support for improvements on the route with a 78% preference for the bypass to be provided and a general preference for Option 1A. The preferred route announcement for Option 1A was on</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		<p>24th October 2017.</p> <p>A statutory consultation ran for seven weeks from 21st March to 8th May 2018 in accordance with the Statement of Community Consultation as detailed in Section 4.3 of the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1). This included consultation under Sections 42, 43, 44, 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008. This consultation provided more detail of the single preferred route option. A number of consultation events and meetings were undertaken which are summarised in the consultation activities table (Table 2-1: Summary of consultation activities) in Section 2 of the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1). The consultation material was available to view online and at deposit locations around the Scheme. 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.</p>
REP4-033.3	<p>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?</p>	<p>The 2 to 4.5 minute travel time savings per journey are presented from Windy Harbour to Skippool as this shows a comparison of the direct impact of the Scheme along the A585 Improvement. This is based on an average weekday. It is appreciated that there may be some journeys that may take slightly longer as a result of the Scheme but overall the Scheme produces journey time savings and over a 60-year period, this equates to just over £150million saving from journey time improvements. To take into account uncertainty of the future situation, three different scenarios were assessed taking account of estimates of future population, housing and employment forecasts and all of these scenarios forecast a journey time improvement in the future compared to the situation without the improvement. Journey time improvements are also not the only consideration when deciding whether a Scheme is suitable; other impacts such as safety, delays due to maintenance activities, journey time reliability, wider economic impacts, and a range of environmental considerations are also taken into account. The monetised transport user benefits were prepared using the Department for Transport's appraisal software TUBA (Transport User Benefit Appraisal). This estimated the direct user and provider benefits in terms of travel time savings and vehicle operating cost savings using the traffic forecasts output from the Scheme's transport model. The Department for Transport publishes the appraisal and modelling values including the road user values of time and vehicle operating costs to ensure that all proposed schemes are appraised in a standard way. This information is included in the TUBA software in order to calculate travel times and vehicle operating costs, that can then be compared to the travel time savings from the traffic model. This will determine the road user benefit attributable to the proposed Scheme. Traffic management during construction tends to result in changes to journey times and vehicle operating costs. These impacts are appraised within the economic appraisal of the Scheme; therefore, the additional delay to users during the construction period has been taken into account in this appraisal. Part of the Scheme will be constructed along the existing alignment such as the section between Skippool Junction and Skippool Bridge Junction and along Garstang New Road. Highways England policy is to ensure that during peak times a two-way flow is maintained; although they will be subject to speed restriction due to a narrow lane</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		<p>arrangement and hence additional delay may occur at this location. The overall transport disbenefit (including indirect tax revenue and greenhouse gases benefits) during construction of the Scheme is approximately £3.2million (2010 prices and discounted to 2010). Following profiling of the journey time (TUBA benefits excluding weekends) the user benefits it would take approximately 1 year 3 months to get a net benefit considering the disbenefits through the construction period.</p> <p>In addition, a separate assessment of journey time reliability was undertaken to consider the benefits that users may derive from the improved confidence in the reliability of journey times for trips that they make frequently. The Journey time reliability assessment places a user benefit value on the reduction in the variability of journey times. The assessment concluded that the Scheme provides journey time reliability savings in all time periods of just over £22m (2010 prices and discounted to 2010).</p>
REP4-033.4	<p>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?</p>	<p>The Applicant was required to consult on its application in accordance with the requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 (see Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Act). In complying with these requirements, the Applicant had regard to the guidance set out in the guidance 'Planning Act 2008: guidance on the pre-application process' (March 2015). The Examining Authority will have regard to these in determining the adequacy of any consultation.</p> <p>Please refer to Figure 4.3 within the Consultation Report which shows the area of consultation and clearly shows that it was not just limited to those living in close proximity of the Scheme. The areas were listed within the Statement of Community Consultation which was agreed with all local authorities. Approximately 2,400 brochures and 25,200 flyers were distributed including key areas in Skippool, Little Singleton, Singleton, Poulton-le-Fylde, Carleton, Thornton and Fleetwood.</p>
REP4-033.5	<p>We would like to thank you for including a further open hearing date and would encourage you to proceed with that session.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
REP4-033.6	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 Section 2.9 of the Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1).</p>
REP4-033.7	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Scheme qualifies as an NSIP in accordance with the requirement of the Planning Act 2008.</p>
REP4-034	Gary Bullen	
REP4-034.1	<p>With reference to the new scheme, why are flyovers or underpasses not being used to keep traffic flowing and reduce the need for so many traffic</p>	<p>Flyovers and underpasses were discounted prior to Preferred Route Announcement as they</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	signals, this cost effective and time proven solution would be far better and reduce any future congestion ?	<p>have operational, safety and environmental implications. Major factors for discounting these options were the existing constraints and ensuring the proposed bypass ties back in to the existing road network.</p> <p>Grade separated junctions were considered and discounted following non-statutory consultation, refer to Section 5.6 in Appendix M of the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1).</p>
REP4-035	Ian Brooker	
REP4-035.1	Our property at (REDACTED) is adversely affected due to the proximity of the proposed road, we will become effectively “road locked” with the existing (REDACTED) to the front and the proposed new road to the side and rear of our property, a major new junction providing access to (REDACTED) directly opposite our property will also add to the noise, disruption and sound, light and vibration pollution.	The Applicant has assessed environmental impacts as a result of the Scheme in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges and provided mitigation measures accordingly, such as noise attenuation barriers. Construction mitigation measures can be found in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2 – Rev 2) and the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (document reference TR010035/APP/7.3 – Rev 2). Operational mitigation measure can be found within Environmental Statement Chapter 19: Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.19 – Rev 2).
REP4-035.2	Given that our enjoyment of our property will be severely adversely affected should our property be considered for compulsory or discretionary purchase.	<p>The Applicant does not require the property for the Scheme, therefore would not seek to purchase the property by compulsion. In order for Highways England to consider purchasing the property by blight or discretionary purchase, an application needs to be submitted and a number of qualifying criteria need to be met. Please see links to the information booklets on blight and discretionary purchase below. The booklets contain details of eligibility criteria for each option and how we will assess any applications. You can review these to help you decide whether you wish to submit an application and if so, which application would be most appropriate. Please note, we are unable to provide advice in respect of any applications.</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/645174/Your_property_and_discretionary_purchase.pdf</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/645162/Your_property_and_blight_booklet.pdf</p>
REP4-035.3	<p>Following our attendance at the Accompanied Site Visits please could the following be considered We are particularly concerned about the effect that increased sound will have on our enjoyment our home and in particular the garden to the rear of our property, with that in mind may we strongly request that the removal of trees, shrubs and the general hedgerow to the west of our property be left intact, could we also ask for consultation with the environmental representative at their earliest convenience.</p>	<p>Increases in road traffic noise levels generated by the Scheme in this location would be mitigated below a level where significant adverse effects on health would occur through the implementation of low noise surfacing, a 2 metre high noise barrier and earth bunds as presented in Figure 11.4 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (document reference TR010035/APP/6.11).</p> <p>With regard to the existing trees adjacent to the A585 road acting as a noise barrier the DMRB HD213/11 paragraph 4.5 states “<i>the use of shrubs or trees as a noise barrier has been shown to be effective only if the foliage is at least 10m deep, dense and consistent for the full height of the vegetation.</i>” This is not the case at this property.</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.19 – Rev 2)</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		<p>currently identifies a retained tree in this location which was informed by the data available at the time of the document production. This feature is retained in combination with proposed new woodland edge planting (plant ID 003.03).</p> <p>As part of the detailed design stage of the Scheme an arboricultural survey is being undertaken within and immediately adjacent to the draft order limits which will provide more definitive information on the location and quality of existing trees and notable hedgerows. Following this a tree removal and protection drawing will be prepared in combination with the detailed design.</p> <p>It was noted during the ASI that there may be a potential opportunity to retain additional existing vegetation adjacent to the access track (in addition to the mitigation planting proposed), beyond that which is currently identified. This would help provide further visual screening from the residential property dependent upon the detailed design in this location.</p> <p>The Applicant will arrange a meeting with the residents of 195 Mains Lane in due course following the completion of the arboricultural surveys.</p>
REP4-036	John Bailie	
REP4-036.1	1.My concerns regarding flawed communication and uninvolved consultation were reinforced during the Accompanied Site Inspection and the Open Floor Hearing. During the former, it was clear that a number of land and property owners were unaware of the detail of the scheme, several had not received answers to concerns or not received any communication. This is a serious flaw for a scheme of this size, and one which will have such an impact on our living environment. I would ask that Highways England review this process. Please confirm that this will be done.	<p>The format of the Open Floor Hearings is similar to that on all other Development Consent Order projects and is outlined in the Planning Inspectorate guidelines.</p> <p>Refer to the following Advice Note on the Planning Inspectorate website; https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Advice-note-8-5v3.pdf</p>
REP4-036.2	The Open Floor Hearing illustrated the concerns and frustrations of members of the public, but the manner in which the Open Floor Hearing was conducted was open to question. A number of attendees have expressed concern with regard to the layout in the auditorium; it was very difficult, and occasionally impossible, to hear clearly the responses from the applicant.	
REP4-036.3	This was due to a combination of factors:	
REP4-036.4	i) The applicant's representatives were seated in a row at right angles to the audience. This made it difficult to see who was speaking. In the main, they did not project their speech	
REP4-036.5	Speakers from the floor were asked to speak whilst seated with their backs to the audience.	
REP4-036.6	I would respectfully suggest that the future Hearing in September has the Examiner and speakers' locations arranged in a triangular fashion (rather like BBC1 Question Time). <i>See diagram.</i> (I am aware that an early speaker did request that applicant's representatives spoke more clearly, but this did not result in a significant improvement; members of the audience feel a little intimidated at the prospect of having to repeatedly request in such a way). https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR010035/TR010035-000664-John%20Bailie%20response%20to%20Open%20Floor%20Hearing.pdf	
REP4-036.7	Following last week's Hearing a number of attendees have further questions which need to be asked and answered at a future Open Floor Hearing. An early confirmation of the date, time and venue for this could be advised as	There is provision for another open floor hearing if required by the ExA.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	soon as possible.	
REP4-036.8	With regard to replacement of removed (“impacted”) trees, please advise the specific species / quantity / layout of planting / height / density / maturity / ability which will be required to visually screen and noise reduce traffic to the same level as current mature trees. This applies in particular to the two Skippool junctions.	<p>It is important to note that for trees to provide noise attenuation / act as a noise barrier the DMRB HD213/11 paragraph 4.5 states “<i>the use of shrubs or trees as a noise barrier has been shown to be effective only if the foliage is at least 10m deep, dense and consistent for the full height of the vegetation.</i>”</p> <p>The Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.19 – Rev 2) Sheets 1, 2 and 3 of 32 and Appendix R in the Outline Construction Management Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2 – Rev 2) outlines the proposed planting for the Scheme at the Skippool to Skippool Bridge junctions, which has been agreed with the Local Planning Authorities. The dDCO Schedule 2 Requirements Article 5 Landscaping sets out the requirements for further details of the proposed planting which would be developed during the detailed design stage.</p>
REP4-036.9	It is reasonable to presume that traffic currently using the present A585 will instead utilise the new road. Therefore queuing traffic from Poulton at Singleton traffic lights on the current Garstang Road, in an easterly direction, will encounter exactly the same volume of crossing traffic generating exactly the same queuing problem, although this will now occur at the new traffic signal controlled Poulton Junction, and potentially extend back towards the new housing developments. Please explain how you will resolve this problem.	The Applicant disagrees, the Poulton junction queue length results show that all maximum modelled queue lengths are within the expected maximum free-flow value, with the exception of the A586 eastern approach in the PM peak, which exceeds this by 3m. This is not seen as a major issue given that there is very little chance of this queue causing blocking back to the next junction. This is outlined in Appendix H of the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12).
REP4-037	Kristopher Thacker	
REP4-037.1	Having read a Gazette article about the proposed plans, I, along with many other frequent users of this route, feel that the proposed plans will just move the problem of congestion to a different part of the route. In my opinion, there are other changes that could be made without the cost that are potentially more effective. I do agree that something needs to be done regarding the route, as it's regularly a part of the journey I try to avoid at busy times.	<p>The Scheme is one of a number of schemes in the locality being carried out or investigated for the future. The other schemes that the Applicant is currently developing are:</p> <p>Norcross Jct Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is in detailed design with an intention to commence construction in late 2019. • The scheme involves increasing the size of the existing roundabout by extending it in a westerly direction. All arms (except Fleetwood Road South, northbound approach) will be signalised and this will include controlled pedestrian / cycling facilities. • The scheme requires some third-party land, which Highways England is currently acquiring through a CPO. <p>J3 M55 Jct Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is now in detailed design with an intention to commence construction later this calendar year. • The scheme involves full signalisation of the roundabout with traffic in both lanes of the westbound off-slip being allowed to turn northwards on to the A585 trunk road. <p>Cycle Routes</p> <p><u>A585 – Fleetwood to West Drive</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 Currently in detailed design - no dates for delivery in current programme • Phase 2 (Fleetwood Road to Denham Way) completed in advance of Phase 1 in 2015/16 – Shared footway / cycle way along the easterly side of the A585 <p><u>A585 – West Drive to Thornton Roundabout (Morrisons)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing discussions with Lancashire County Council regarding option selection due

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		<p>to limited land availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A585 – Thornton to Skippool • Currently waiting for the feasibility package to be completed before the detailed design can take place. <p>In addition to all of the above, a study is on-going to consider the options for improvements at Thistleton Junction. This is purely at feasibility stage; Highways England does not yet have a preferred scheme option and has no identified funding.</p> <p>A sensitivity test was undertaken by the Applicant that considered the impact of other Highways England's asset renewal schemes (the above schemes) on the Scheme which showed that when including the capacity improvement upgrades of adjacent potential Highways England's asset renewal schemes along the A585 route, it remained economically worthwhile (based on an assessment of Transport User Benefits only) to proceed with the Scheme.</p>
REP4-037.2	<p>The changes already made to the Windy Harbour junction have allowed drivers to overtake or undertake the flow of traffic, causing harsh braking and increased potential for accidents, as merging is something many road users struggle to understand, be it not letting cars in or forcing their way into the flow of traffic. I believe the road layout is at fault here, allowing drivers to make these manoeuvres. It's a very short merge lane in comparison to the lane traffic enters it from. If the lane was extended, there'd be more opportunity to merge, releasing more of the waiting traffic. I feel another issue is the Right turn onto Grange Rd, if a filter lane was introduced, this would mean the flow from Windy Harbour is maintained and not held up for a minute, allowing traffic to block Garstang road.</p>	<p>One of the objectives of the Scheme is to realise the full benefits of the Windy Harbour junction improvement.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken an operational assessment of Windy Harbour junction without and with the Scheme in place in the future years. This shows that the flows in the with Scheme model are increased which generates a similarly proportioned increase in queues and journey times, but this indicates that the junction is still operating within capacity and that the benefits the pinch point realised are still evident. An improvement occurs on the A585 Fleetwood Road left-turn approach, where flows have increased in the AM and PM peak but journey times and queue lengths have on average decreased. This is due to signal optimisation due to decreased demand from the A586 East approach.</p>
REP4-037.3	<p>I also think there's a bigger issue in Amounderness way, yet the proposed roundabout alterations at Norcross will have little impact due to a bottleneck further up the road.</p>	<p>Refer to response to REP4-042.3.</p>
REP4-037.4	<p>Has the speed limit and traffic light phasing been investigated? Could this be done as a trial before work commences?</p>	<p>The proposed speed limits and traffic light phasing have been incorporated into the traffic model and the journey time savings are reported in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12).</p>
REP4-038	Maria Cassidy	
REP4-038.1	<p>I would like to know what evidence you have to prove that traffic signals at a junction reduces congestion and therefore reduces journey time?</p>	<p>Refer to response REP2-056.7.</p> <p>The implementation of traffic signals is not purely a capacity consideration. It also allows safe controlled crossings to be facilitated for pedestrians and cyclists. The modelling undertaken at every stage of the Scheme has determined that the proposed signals will offer journey time savings compared to any existing junctions they are replacing. Once a roundabout becomes over capacity, the risk of drivers taking gaps in traffic that they would not usually take increases and can cause accidents.</p>
REP4-038.2	<p>One of the aims with the so called Windy Harbour Improvement Scheme is to reduce the travelling time from Skippool to Windy Harbour however we have diligently filmed the roundabout at Skippool and the traffic light controlled Singleton junction and compared the number of vehicles passing</p>	<p>The Scheme and its junctions are designed to accommodate future traffic flow rather than existing traffic flows. The base year traffic models were calibrated against observed traffic counts, queues and vehicle behaviour, and validated against independently collected data to ensure their adequacy. Both the existing roundabouts at Skippool and Norcross are</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	through each of the roads. The number of vehicles passing through the non signalled junction is almost double that of the traffic passing through the signalled junction i.e. Singleton traffic lights. Every day of the week there are traffic tailbacks between Norcross and Skippool and the proposed new Skippool Junction will only add to the congestion causing gridlock at and beyond the proposed Norcross Junction.	predicted to be over-capacity in future forecast years. The existing Little Singleton junction is congested because it has reached capacity in its current configuration, not because it is a signalised junction. Likewise, the Skippool roundabout allows more traffic through it in its existing layout than the Little Singleton junction because it has more capacity, not because it is a roundabout.
REP4-038.3	Why do Highways England propose to put 44 traffic lights at the Skippool Junction, more at Skippool Bridge junction and then more at Garstang road junction a distance of less than a mile!!! It is obvious that this will delay traffic and cause much more congestion. Indeed in 2 recent newspaper articles I have read Highways England have admitted that traffic lights at junctions make journey times worse than before they were introduced.	Traffic lights can be linked to improve efficiency and throughput of traffic to minimise delays. There is indeed an inherent delay due to traffic signals compared to roundabouts under non-congested conditions, but it is more adaptable and reliable under congested conditions than a roundabout, which can come to a complete standstill, as is predicted for the existing Norcross and Skippool roundabouts in future year forecasts. Improved journey times are just one of the objectives of the scheme and are not the sole measure upon which decisions are made about junction forms and layouts. A roundabout was previously considered at the Poulton/Garstang Road junction, however when the provision of safe crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists were included in the traffic modelling, it was found that a roundabout layout became severely over capacity, and would not facilitate the safe entry of traffic into the junction from all arms.
REP4-038.4	I will not repeat the many concerns and objections that residents and commuters have with this ill thought out scheme but I urge you to arrange a date for the next Open Forum where the many who were unable to speak can have their say.	Noted, no further response required.
REP4-039	Mr And Mrs Geoffrey Alan Evans	
REP4-039.1	Having attended previous meetings and spoken at one, we wish to reiterate our objections once again to this ill-conceived project which has not at any stage taken into consideration the every day experiences of local people living in this area, nor taken notice of the real issues that have been eloquently and knowledgeably put forward by many local residents.	Refer to response provided to 1.6.1 in Responses to the Examining Authority's Written Questions (document reference TR010035/APP/7.10) which outlines the timeline of engagement and consultation. In addition to ongoing dialogue and engagement, the Applicant carried out formal non-statutory and statutory consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Further details of the consultation undertaken can be found in the Consultation Report (document reference TR010035/APP/5.1). The report further sets out how the Applicant had regard to consultation responses in the design of the Scheme.
REP4-039.2	Our feelings are that all of this frustration, which is taking part at the eleventh hour due to the lack of due diligence by Highways England and by way of not informing from the onset, ALL of Poulton's residents of exactly what plans were being proposed, consequently it is only now that the true impact of this incorrect design of a Poulton area by-pass has hit the local headlines!	Refer to response to REP4-033.2.
REP4-039.3	In every ones opinion, who we and many others have spoken to, this proposed solution to a traffic problem will not solve the many frustrations that local people and visitors experience on the roads in this area. In fact it will most likely create more congestion, albeit in different areas, of the same route i.e. from the M55 motorway to Fleetwood.	Refer to responses to REP4-029.
REP4-039.4	At an open meeting we attended, a gentleman from Fleetwood Environment Agency, I believe his name is (REDACTED) , stated that this project would be a total waste of £150 million pounds or more, when a proposal they spent a number of months advising Highways England about, that would take the traffic straight from the M55 to Fleetwood with run-offs and run-ons to the various destinations along the route and would not cost a great deal more and which would also solve the traffic issues (and include protection from flooding) as you would say "moving forward". Therefore, it would be a more beneficial way of spending hard-earned tax payers money!	The person being referred to was not from the Environment Agency and was from Fleetwood Renewable Energy Enterprise. It should be noted that the Applicant now has agreement with the Environment Agency for the Scheme, refer to SoCG (document reference TR010035/APP/8.3). In relation to a route from Fleetwood to M55 refer to response to REP4-030.2.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP4-039.5	We do agree that a by-pass for this area is greatly needed, but this proposal we hope you will see from all our objections, is totally the wrong plan and that you, as the government official overseeing these proposals, will see that even though there has already been quite a lot of money spent reaching this point, that the 'red light' should be put on this project as it is surely pointless pouring good money after bad.	Noted.
REP4-040	Susan Earnshaw	
REP4-040.1	I missed to public consultation regarding the proposed Windy Harbour to Skippool bypass but I have watched to flyover presentation and want to make my concerns known.	Noted, refer to response to REP4-033.2.
REP4-040.2	As a Poulton resident and regular commuter to the M55 I have to say I don't see this new road being useful. Yes there are delays at the Singleton lights at busy times but this is mostly due to the ridiculous road layout. If the 2 lanes continued from the Windy harbour lights up to the Singleton lights delays would be less and could be done very cheaply. The proposed start of the bypass seems to have the same problem as we have now.	Refer to response to REP4-038.2.
REP4-040.3	Secondly why stop Garstand New Road in a dead end? Why not continue it through the lights as it is now? you are forcing people at the Singleton end to drive back on themselves towards Poulton to get on to the new road to end up a few hundred yards back from where they started.	Refer to response REP2-056.8.
REP4-040.4	On top of that we have 2 very complex looking junctions, which are bound to be bottlenecks, and Amounderness Way, which is THE major hold up, has no proposed improvements at all.	Refer to response REP2-078.1.
REP4-040.5	I can't be the only one stating the obvious. I can only think the people who have planned this new road have never actually travelled this area at busy times at all.	<p>As part of the development of the design, the team have attended the area and witnessed the traffic during peak times.</p> <p>In order to support the development of the Scheme traffic model, and to support the development of forecasts which was used for economic and environmental appraisal, a large set of traffic data was collected during the options stages. This included previous traffic data and traffic models from Local Authorities. Traffic surveys and Traffic Road Side Interviews (TRIS) were then undertaken to calibrate and validate the data.</p>
REP4-040.6	Finally the environmental impact of this white horse is not worth any supposed benefits.	<p>As outlined in the Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1) any adverse impacts to the environment are outweighed by the socio-economic benefits of the Scheme. In addition, any potential environmental impact should be considered and weighed in context of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The avoidance of the route within any statutorily designated sites or areas • For identified heritage and landscape assets (including visual impacts), the mitigation proposed would assist in reducing the level of impact • Environmental enhancements provided in relation to biodiversity including habitat connectivity Environmental benefits, in relation to the de-trunked section of the Scheme.
REP4-041	Stuart Smith	
REP4-041.1	I read that there has been some recent negative comments regarding this	Noted, no further response required.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	much needed improvement to our local infrastructure.	
REP4-041.2	I wish to record my support for your proposals which will improve the lives of many in this area, not just those in the immediate vicinity.	Noted, no further response required.
REP4-041.3	Much industry and many jobs have been lost already due to the difficulties in getting to and from the Blackpool North, Thornton Cleveleys and Fleetwood areas but these improvements may persuade others to remain here and even some others to return.	Noted, no further response required.
REP4-042	Tim Wyncoll	
REP4-042.1	I am writing to express my concern about the so-called A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool <i>improvement</i> scheme. My elderly mother lives near the (REDACTED). She has lived there peacefully since 1980. Being a frequent visitor to her house from Northumberland I am well aware that traffic volume has increased over the years. I visited my mum last week, arriving from the M6 mid-afternoon on Wednesday 3rd July and leaving midmorning on Friday 5th July. I experienced no delays whatsoever.	The Department for Transport (DfT) identified the Scheme in the 2014 Road Investment Strategy (RIS) as one of the routes in greatest need of improvement. The Scheme was included as a priority in the RIS for delivery in Road Period 1 to commence construction by March 2020. This was supported by policy in the RIS which stated its intention for the Scheme to improve all road journeys, enhance connectivity across the region, help deliver environmental goals and boost local economic activity.
REP4-042.2	I have seen tailbacks at rush hour times. But it's all relative! Any traffic delays on the A585 are miniscule compared to what people experience down south on the M25 and in London.	<p>In April 2014, the then Highways Agency produced the South Pennines Route Strategy (SPRS) with supporting evidence and a Technical Annex. The Strategy identified that the 4.5 kilometre section of the A585 between Windy Harbour Junction and Skippool Junction is a severe bottleneck, affecting peoples' journeys between the M55 and the northern part of the Fylde peninsula. Journey times and safety are identified as in need of improvement since it is among the worst 10% of routes in the north west (South Pennines Route Strategy Evidence Report).</p> <p>The South Pennines Route includes the whole of the A585 from the M55 through to Fleetwood. The SPRS reports on the planned growth for the area and the possible new uses for the Port of Fleetwood, implying a significant increase in demand for the A585 route. There is a need therefore to improve capacity on the route to support employment, economic development and growth opportunities, ensuring that the route can accommodate any future growth is recognised as a key priority.</p>
REP4-042.3	I have looked at the fly-through and seen the developers wishing to carve through green fields to produce a new dual-carriageway. However, Amounderness way will remain single carriageway. A new road will be produced with traffic lights giving rise to further delays and the Amounderness Way bottleneck will remain. This is clearly ill-thought out.	Refer to response REP2-078.1 in in Comments on Written Representations (document reference TR010035/APP/7.18). The current bottlenecks being experienced along Amounderness Way are not caused by a lack of capacity along the single carriageway road but a lack of capacity at Skippool Junction and Norcross Junction. Therefore, the Scheme's proposal of modifying Skippool Junction from a roundabout to a larger signalised junction and improvements made by Highways England Asset Renewal Programme at Norcross Junction will alleviate bottle necks along Amounderness Way.
REP4-042.4	The cost of the proposed scheme is massive! I have heard figures between £150 000 and £250 000. I can think of better projects on which to spend money. And there really is no excuse for making new roads as we become aware of the need to limit damaging emissions, whether they be from hydrocarbon combustion in vehicles or similar in power generation (for electric vehicles).	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 Section 2.9 of the Planning Statement and National Policy Accordance (document reference TR010035/APP/7.1).

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP4-042.5	Such a massive project will result in major disruption for the next two years. My mum wishes to remain in her home. (REDACTED). The damage to the environment will be appalling.	<p>The majority of the Scheme will be constructed offline, therefore not disrupting the traffic users. The only potential disruption would be caused at tie in points and Skippool Junction, as these points the road will remain open for use. Refer to the Traffic Management Plans (document reference TR010035/APP/7.7) for further details.</p> <p>The Scheme will be going through a greenfield area however as a result of the Scheme there will be a net benefit in terms of ecology/biodiversity for the area which is outlined in the Environmental Statement: Chapter 8 Biodiversity (document reference TR010035/APP/6.8).</p>
REP4-042.6	I have spoken to local residents and I understand there are alternatives to this project. The best one is to leave it be.	As outlined in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12) a “without scheme” scenario was assessed and compared to a “with scheme” scenario. This showed future year capacity benefits, reduced accident rates and journey time savings.
REP4-042.7	Has this project been audited by the Public Accounts Committee? I would like to see the details and their conclusions. House developers will be interested in the green fields adjacent to the road and deals will be made. I suspect money will be made by some people, but most people will be losers. And we all live on this planet which is very sick at the moment. This project does nothing for the long term survival of the human species on Planet Earth. Please do all you can to call a halt to this madness.	<p>The Applicant is required by its license terms to operate to “ensure that it has in place robust internal arrangements to achieve, and to demonstrate how it has achieved value for money”. This obligation requires the Company to make informed decisions based on robust and clearly communicated assessments of benefits, costs and risks.</p> <p>The Applicant’s Analytical Assurance Framework provides a robust internal arrangement to assure the specification, production and use of analysis throughout the Company and its activities.</p> <p>The National Audit Office (NAO), who are overseen by The Public Accounts Commission (TPAC), carry out audits of the Applicant as an organisation on a regular basis. The NAO’s objective is to look to scrutinize public spending for Parliament. Their public audit perspective helps Parliament hold government to account and improve public services.</p> <p>The 2019 annual report and accounts can be found here; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/highways-england-annual-report-and-accounts-2019</p> <p>Two other bodies that hold the Applicant to account, at an organisational level and on the customers behalf, are Transport Focus (TF), who champion the needs of road users, and the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) monitors the performance of our highways.</p> <p>TF looks at getting the best deal for passengers and road users. With a strong emphasis on evidence-based campaigning and research, they ensure that they know what is happening on the ground. TF use this knowledge to influence decisions on behalf of passengers and road users to secure improvements and make a difference.</p> <p>The ORR’s functions with regards to the Applicant are to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold the Applicant to account, • Monitor performance, • Secure value for money, • Monitor road user satisfaction,

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise and assist the government on road issues. <p>Further details on each of these functions can be found on the ORR's website at https://orr.gov.uk/highways-monitor/economic-monitoring/what-we-do.</p> <p>Project specific assurance is carried out within the organisation via the internal processes. Assessments are carried out and assurances must be provided to senior management that the project is providing value for money and is a good use of the taxpayers' money. The business case for the scheme is reviewed at various milestones, requiring approval at each of these milestones to proceed. This culminates in a review of the full business case, by a committee of senior executives from across the organisation, who scrutinise all aspects of the case to ensure that the project is achieving the set objectives, delivering value for money and that the benefits outweigh the costs.</p> <p>In addition, Independent Assurance Reviews are carried out at various stages of the project by a panel of external reviewers. Through review of project documentation and interviewing the project team members, and subject matter experts, these reviews are undertaken to assure the project is progressed and delivered successfully.</p> <p>The project also goes through a review by the Operations Technical Leadership Group (OpsTLG) where subject matter experts assess the project from a technical perspective challenging various aspects including design, safety and technology to name a few.</p>
REP4-043	Valerie Milligan	
REP4-043.1	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.	<p>There is provision for another open floor hearing to be made if required.</p> <p>Refer to response REP4-033.2.</p> <p>Notification of Hearings under Rule 13(6) of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 and Sections 91, 92 and 93 of the Planning Act 2008 were advertised in local newspapers (Blackpool Gazette, Lancashire Evening Post and Fleetwood Weekly News). In addition to this, copies of the notification were placed in 5 locations near the scheme and local community area.</p>
REP4-043.2	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 = 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.	Refer to response to REP4-029.
REP4-043.3	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.	Refer to response to REP4-042.4.
REP4-043.4	The use of traffic lights instead of roundabouts make no sense whatsoever	Refer to response to REP4-038.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	as traffic lights cause congestion whilst roundabouts increase traffic flow. The proposed junctions are over complicated and will not improve congestion.	
REP4-043.5	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.	<p>It is important to note that for trees to provide noise attenuation / act as a noise barrier the DMRB HD213/11 paragraph 4.5 states “<i>the use of shrubs or trees as a noise barrier has been shown to be effective only if the foliage is at least 10m deep, dense and consistent for the full height of the vegetation.</i>” This is not the case at this property. In addition, a review undertaken by Highways England and Department for Food and Rural Affairs has found that green barriers, such as hedgerow, have little effect on reducing pollution / air quality concentrations https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/library/reports.php?report_id=966.</p> <p>Any visual detriment caused by the scheme has been mitigated through proposed planting which can be found within the Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.19 – Rev 2).</p> <p>A comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Scheme (document reference TR010035/APP/6.1 – 6.17) which outlines the residual environmental impacts of the Scheme following the implementation of mitigation measures. Environmental mitigation measures including for bats, great crested newts and birds are outlined within the Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments (document reference TR010035/APP/7.3 – Rev 2) and within the Environmental Masterplan (document reference TR010035/APP/6.10 – Rev 2). A field adjacent to the Scheme during construction would be used as an area of temporary, alternative habitat to provide mitigation for the disturbance / displacement of pink-footed geese, lapwing and curlew. Refer to Environmental Statement: Chapter 8: Biodiversity (document reference TR010035/APP/6.8) for further details.</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>
REP4-043.6	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.	Currently there is no controlled junction for the movement of joining Mains Lane. However, the Scheme introduces a signal-controlled junction which would allow safer movements to and from the realigned Old Mains Lane.
REP4-043.7	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.	All evidence of improved traffic flows has been outlined in the Combined Modelling and Appraisal Report (document reference TR010035/APP/7.12). The article that is referenced refers to Highways England Motorway Junction Improvement Schemes, in particular ramp metering, and therefore has no relevance to the Scheme. The Applicant undertook surveys in 2015 and the traffic model was calibrated and validated to represent 2015 traffic flows/levels. This model was then used as a basis to forecast future scenarios following Department for Transport Guidelines and local development plans.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP4-043.8	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.	Refer to response to REP 4-042.7.
REP4-043.8	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.	<p>The inclusion of planned developments within the traffic model has been discussed with the local authorities. Paragraphs 3.3.24-3.3.32 of the Transport Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/7.4) summarise how extra traffic from committed developments is included in the traffic modelling. Paragraphs 3.3.27 to 3.3.32 describe how information from local authorities was collected. Each individual development was then classified as per Table 3.4. Any development that was classed as near certain or more than likely; developments under construction or approved development proposals or developments with a planning application within the consent process; were included in the Core Scenario forecasts. All other developments were classed as reasonably foreseeable and included in the Optimistic Scenario. As stated in the Transport Assessment the Scheme includes future provision for traffic growth year 2037 showing that the Scheme mainline has reserve capacity to support future development in the area.</p> <p>Refer to REP3-026 in Comments on Written Representations Received at Deadline 3 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.21).</p>
REP4-043.9	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 designing the Scheme, the Applicant has had regard to a number of factors including management of traffic in the event of an accident on the bypass following closure of access to through traffic on Garstang New Road.
REP4-043.10	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.	
REP4-043.11	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.	<p>Once the Scheme has been constructed and open to the public, Highways England will initially monitor the improvements of the Scheme and management / maintenance will reside with the Highways England Area 13 team.</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>
REP4-044	Angus Blythe	
REP4-044	A further comment from me on this scheme is that the proposed parking lay-bye on the western side of the new bypass in front of the properties at Singleton Hall is both completely unnecessary, unreasonable, poses a potential nuisance to local residents and to be honest is a quite preposterous and very poorly thought through idea given that the whole dual carriageway is only a couple of kilometres long with junctions at either end, hence there is no need for any lay-bye's on the new road.	The location and layout of the laybys have been designed in accordance with DMRB TD69/07.

Page left intentionally blank