

A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme

TR010035

7.25 Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 5

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[19]

RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 5

Regulation Number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010035
Application Document Reference	TR010035/APP/7.25
Author:	A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	August 2019	Deadline 6 Submission

Page Left Intentionally Blank

CONTENTS

1 RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1: Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 52

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
AAP	Area Action Plan
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine License
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examiner appointed by the Secretary of State
FCHT	Fylde Coast Highways and Transport
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
HE	Highways England
HM	Her Majesty's
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MCAA 2009	Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
PA 2008	Planning Act 2008
Rev	Revision
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TP	Temporary Possession

1 RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AT DEADLINE 5

- 1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the responses to representations received at Deadline 5.
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Table 1-1 below.

Table 1-1: Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 5

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP5-025	Cadent Gas Limited	
REP5-025.1	Cadent has set out its status as the licensed operator of a gas distribution network in submissions to date, and has identified the importance of maintaining the integrity of its gas distribution network in its Deadline 1, Deadline 2 and Deadline 3 submissions.	Noted
REP5-025.2	<p>Cadent's position, as set out at Deadline 3, is that it is not satisfied that the tests under section 127 of the PA 2008 can be met unless and until it has appropriate protective provisions in place. Until that time, Cadent is not satisfied that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. its land can be purchased and not replaced, or that any rights over its land can be acquired, without serious detriment to the carrying on of Cadent's undertaking; 2. (where its land is to be purchased) it can be replaced by other land belonging to, or available for acquisition by, Highways England without serious detriment to the carrying on of Cadent's undertaking; <p>or</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. (where rights over its land are to be acquired) any detriment to the carrying on of Cadent's undertaking, in consequence of the acquisition of the right, can be made good by Highways England by the use of other land belonging to or available for acquisition by them. 	<p>As Cadent's representation notes, the protective provisions are substantially agreed save for two points: insurance and security, in respect of which discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>The Applicant has otherwise accepted all of Cadent's preferred protective provisions. Pursuant to the protective provisions, the Applicant commits to not interfere with Cadent's interests otherwise than by agreement; not extinguish Cadent's rights until alternative apparatus have been constructed and are in operation with sufficient rights and facilities provided to Cadent's reasonable satisfaction; and where the Applicant secures for Cadent facilities and rights in land for the operation of alternative apparatus in substitution for apparatus to be decommissioned or removed, this is qualified by the requirement for such facilities and rights to be granted on such terms that are no less favourable to Cadent. Cadent is also afforded control of the plans, methodology and specification for 'specified works'. These assurances are also underpinned by a commitment to meet Cadent's expenses and to indemnify Cadent in respect of any losses arising in consequence of the construction of the works authorised by the protective provisions. The protective provisions place sufficient qualifications on the exercise of the Applicant's powers under the dDCO so as to render the protective provisions compliant with section 127 of the PA2008. If an agreement with Cadent cannot be reached, the Applicant will set out its case on s127 in full as requested by the ExA.</p>
REP5-025.3	For the purpose of section 127 of the PA 2008, land includes any interest in or right over land. Therefore, the Applicant's statement at Deadline 4 that it is not acquiring any of Cadent's land is not correct in the context of section 127 of the PA 2008.	Noted.
REP5-025.4	Cadent will not be satisfied that the tests under section 127 and 138 will be met until such time as appropriate protective provisions are put in place.	The Applicant refers to its comments in respect of REP5-025.2 in respect of the tests under section 127 of the PA 2008. As to section 138 of the PA 2008, given that the only aspects of the protective provisions that remain in dispute relate to insurance and security, it does not follow from this that there is no need for the extinguishment or removal of Cadent's rights or apparatus to carry out the authorised development. The rights secured by the dDCO are necessary to facilitate the delivery of the authorised development. The Applicant has demonstrated in the Statement of Reasons that the tests in s.122 of the PA 2008 and the CA Guidance are met in relation to the powers sought by the dDCO.
REP5-025.5	<p>Protective Provisions Update</p> <p>By way of an update to the ExA, the protective provisions are in substantially agreed form between Cadent and Highways England save for two points: insurance and security. Cadent's position on these points, and the need for insurance and security to be included within the protective provisions, is set</p>	The Applicant is in ongoing dialogue with Cadent regarding protective provisions. The two points in dispute are correctly identified by Cadent.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	out below.	
REP5-025.6	<p>Insurance Cadent's standard asset protection agreement and protective provisions include a requirement for the relevant undertaker (in this case, Highways England), and any contractor(s) working near Cadent's assets, to hold third party liability insurance for the period of the works, with sufficient coverage on a per-claim and aggregate basis as is relevant to the nature of the activities and the risks to Cadent.</p> <p>This is a fundamental requirement for Cadent, to ensure that it is properly protected against any damage caused by Highways England or its contractors, and in particular to provide a guaranteed credit line during the entire period of construction of the works.</p> <p>This is particularly important in circumstances where Cadent's gas distribution network will need to be diverted as part of the Project.</p> <p>Although Cadent accepts that Highways England benefits from certain exemptions with respect to its requirement to provide commercial third-party insurance, Cadent still requires further comfort as to the appropriateness of the insurance provision being offered.</p>	<p>The Applicant is a company limited by shares (with the Secretary of State for Transport as the sole shareholder). In fulfilling its duties, it is bound by the guidance set out in the HM Treasury handbook "Managing Public Money". The Applicant is a self-insuring body and benefits from a Certificate of Exemption for Employer's Liability Insurance. Its response to any indemnity provided under the Protective Provisions will not be reduced in any way and any claim shall not be prejudiced because of its self-insuring strategy.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Applicant considers that Cadent has sufficient comfort that it is properly protected against any damage caused by the Applicant or its contractors. For this reason, it does not consider that third party liability insurance needs to be secured as part of the protective provisions.</p> <p>The Scheme will come forward as part of the Applicant's Regional Delivery Partnership, for which there are standardised contractual provisions, including those in respect of third party liability insurance. Without prejudice to the above, the Applicant has proposed alternative insurance provisions reflecting the requirements of the Regional Delivery Partnership.</p>
REP5-025.7	<p>Security Cadent's standard protective provisions also include a requirement for the undertaker to provide appropriate security (by way of parent company guarantee or bond) to cover their liability to Cadent. This is required to give meaningful effect to the indemnity and as a way to secure Highway England's overall performance. This principle is commonplace, as security provisions ensure that the indemnity provisions have meaningful effect.</p> <p>In this instance, Cadent accepts that a parent company guarantee is not appropriate given that Highways England does not have a parent company, and that funding from HM Government may be available to cover various liabilities.</p> <p>However, liability arising from accidental damage to the gas distribution network as part of the Project is a wider issue, and potentially a larger liability not specifically addressed in the Funding Statement. The Funding Statement identifies the costs to deliver the Project (including capital expenditure, compulsory acquisition costs and compensation claims). The Funding Statement does not address potential liability under the protective provisions.</p> <p>Therefore, until Cadent has full comfort on how its financial position is to be protected, the provision of a bond or letter of credit from an acceptable credit provider remain appropriate, as it is essential that Cadent is comfortable that Highways England is in a financial position to deliver on any liability arising under the indemnity provisions.</p>	<p>The Applicant was appointed as a strategic highways company by the Secretary of State by way of an Order in accordance with section 1 of the Infrastructure Act 2015. It is incorporated under the Companies Act 2006 as a company limited by shares (with the Secretary of State for Transport as the sole shareholder). The Applicant is a separate legal entity from the Crown but, for national accounts purposes, is classified to the central government sector. It is funded from the public purse by grants-in-aid from the Department for Transport. Given the nature of the Applicant (and its backing from the Department for Transport) the performance of the Applicant's obligations under the protective provisions is sufficiently secured without the need to adduce a bond or letter of credit from a credit provider.</p>
REP5-025.8	<p>Cadent considers that it is important that the powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession can be transferred to it pursuant to the DCO. Therefore, Cadent is satisfied with Article 8(4).</p>	<p>The following text has been added to Article 8(4) of the dDCO: 'provided that any transfer or grant under this paragraph (4) shall not include the transfer or grant of any benefit of the provisions of Part 5 (powers of acquisition and possession) of this Order without the consent of the Secretary of State'. This is to ensure that the power to transfer to Cadent in</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
		Article 8 is limited to certain works and excludes the transfer of any CA or TP powers associated with those works without consent. The Applicant shall exercise the powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession on behalf of Cadent.
REP5-026	Marine Management Organisation	
REP5-026.1	<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 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.</p>	Noted.
REP5-026.2	<p>Responses to the ExA's further Written Questions</p> <p>The MMO notes that question 2.2.23. is directed to both the applicant and MMO. As detailed in section 3.0 of this response, MMO is awaiting an updated DML containing co-ordinates prior to signing off the SoCG & DML. It is the understanding of the MMO that this will be submitted as part of the Applicants Deadline 5 submissions.</p>	An update to the DML was included as part of the Applicant's submission at Deadline 5 and co-ordinates are now included within the dDCO (document reference TR010035/APP/3.1).
REP5-026.3	<p>Revised/updated Statement of Common Ground</p> <p>The MMO noted as part of the Deadline 3 & 4 response a number of requirements prior to sign-off of the SoCG. This included an updated DML containing co-ordinates. An updated DML has not yet been received.</p> <p>The MMO also noted as part of the Deadline 3 & 4 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.</p> <p>Given the above, the MMO is unable to fully agree an updated SoCG at this stage.</p>	The SoCG with the EA has been agreed and signed at Deadline 4. The Applicant is in ongoing discussions with Natural England, with a view to agree a SoCG.
REP5-027	Natural England	
REP5-027.1	At the time of writing, we are still in ongoing discussions with Highways England regarding the Requirements contained within the draft DCO	A response to Natural England regarding their queries on the dDCO was sent on the 9 August 2019. To date no response has been received.
REP5-027.2	Our last email response to Highways England was sent on 09.07.19 and we are still awaiting a response.	A response to Natural England regarding their queries on the dDCO was sent on the 9 August 2019. To date no response has been received.
REP5-027.3	We hope to resolve these issues soon to allow Highways England to issue their revised draft DCO	Noted, no further response required.
REP5-027.4	We have reviewed the Outline CEMP (TR010035/APP/7.2, July 2019, Rev 2) and, in particular Appendix B, Bird Mitigation Strategy (October 2018, Rev 0).	Revision 1 of the Bird Mitigation Strategy which forms Appendix B of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (document reference TR010035/APP/7.2) was sent to Natural England for review and comment on the 9 August 2019. To date no response has been received.
REP5-027.5	We have previously provided comments on the Outline CEMP and Bird Mitigation Strategy which have not yet been actioned by Highways England	See above.

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP5-027.6	Highways England has confirmed that some amendments will be made in the 'next' version of the Outline CEMP to be submitted at Deadline 5.	See above.
REP5-027.7	We will therefore provide additional comments on these amendments at Deadline 6 once we have seen the new versions of the Outline CEMP and Bird Mitigation Strategy	See above.
REP5-028	Edward Greenwood – Fleetwood Renewable Energy Enterprise 2007	
REP5-028.1	At our meeting in Manchester on 23 November 2018 with David Hopkins, Layla Beckett, Sucha Panesar and Helen Batey, we raised several items that we were told were outside the Remit for the bypass. Although it was not minuted Dr Powell and I were advised to submit these matters as a Representation to the Planning Inspectorate as an Interested Party. This we did but were later advised that Norcross Junction etc were not part of the examination and we did not submit the above as a Representation in Deadline 4. To cover the wider issues please would you include the following as our Deadline 5 Representation?	The Applicant responded to Mr Greenwood following the meeting held on 23 November 2018, and the further information which was requested was provided. Mr Greenwood / Fleetwood Renewable Energy Enterprise have made numerous representations via the Planning Inspectorate, to which the Applicant has provided responses on all occasions.
REP5-028.2	<p><u>Norcross and Skippool Junctions</u></p> <p>Highways England's preference for traffic lights causes delays whilst larger roundabouts can keep traffic flowing even at peak periods. This can be seen at numerous traffic islands and Junctions 3 and 4 on the M55 Motorway are good examples. Junction 4 takes heavy traffic to and from Blackpool with minimal delays throughout the year. At peak periods after traffic has entered the A585 from Junction 3 congestion arises as a consequence of traffic lights at Windy Harbour; beyond this point the slow moving queue is further impaired by Little Singleton junctions traffic lights.</p> <p>The size of a roundabout relative to the volume of vehicles is a critical factor in optimising traffic flow at junctions. If Amounderness Way is clear of standing traffic the delays that occur between Windy Harbour and Little Singleton are not repeated at Skippool traffic island. Traffic flows freely round this junction even though more vehicles have joined the A585 from Shard Road than leave it at Little Singleton.</p> <p>Is it possible that if Highways England's analysis had included the cost of more land for a larger roundabout their programme would have confirmed the generally accepted view that traffic islands improve traffic flow?</p> <p>The analysis of the proposed Skippool Junctions on Sketch No 2 that I gave to David Hopkins based on a 190 cycle period is disruptive to traffic flow and will cause a tailback beyond Norcross. Highways England's cycle period of 125 seconds creates a worst case scenario and will result in tailbacks to Victoria Road. On the other hand the traffic island in Sketch No 5 will improve traffic flow for all roads to and from Skippool Junction and avoid a complex "U" turn shown on the attached Arcadis drawing modified in December 2018.</p> <p>Our sketches are drawn on Google maps and therefore can be scaled using the Programme Ruler. Sketch No 10 shows an alternative Norcross Junction. With this arrangement over 90% of the work can be completed</p>	<p>The points raised by Mr Greenwood have been responded to by the Applicant on previous occasions throughout the examination period. Refer to the following responses made by the Applicant which addresses all the comments raised;</p> <p>RR-010 in Comments on Relevant Representations (document reference TR010035/APP/7.9)</p> <p>REP2-063 in Comments on Written Representation (document reference TR010035/APP/7.18)</p> <p>REP3-016 in Comments on Written Representations Received at Deadline 3 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.21)</p> <p>REP4-025 in Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 4 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.23)</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>whilst vehicles on the existing roads continue to flow as normal enabling the work to be done more efficiently. The major disruption anticipated by Highways England for the modified traffic island would not occur.</p> <p>Norcross Vets land used for the new road could be compensated with land acquired surplus to requirements north of the existing carpark.</p> <p>If manually operated traffic lights are installed at road crossings for the small number of non-motorised users; unnecessary 24/7 stoppages of motorised traffic can be avoided.</p> <p>The smallest road radius shown on our sketch is significantly greater than that on the attached Arcadis drawing of Skippool Junction. The extra cost of land and property to achieve this would be money well spent in preventing delays at this junction.</p> <p>Given the location of Walkies Thornton on Sketch N0 10 it would appear that the business will not be affected by a larger traffic island. If the larger traffic island is on the field used for exercising dogs the worst case is that an alternative nearby field may have to be used. This is a minor inconvenience if improving Norcross Junction reduces journey times for almost 50% of the commuters in Wyre Borough.</p> <p>Turning to the proposed bypass there is an argument that the A585 beyond Skippool should have been included in the Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Unfortunately the bypass and improvements beyond Skippool are considered as separate items defeating the goal of reducing gridlock and boosting the economy which was the aim of the Masterplan.</p> <p>It is 8 months since we submitted the attached Sketch Nos 6 and 7 which clearly shows that Amounderness Way can be made into a 4 lane road with land to spare for a cycle way. To date there has not been a rational argument why this improvement cannot be made.</p> <p>A new Norcross roundabout can be made as shown on Sketch No 10 that would improve traffic flow to all roads at this junction and Amounderness Way made into 4 lanes as set out above. As this work is not included in the Remit for the bypass; Highways England are unable to coordinate the work to improve road network across the whole area.</p> <p>The Fleetwood and Thornton Area Action Plan (AAP) included minor alterations to several junctions to handle increased traffic from housing developments. If the work had been completed as planned in 2008 this would not have significantly reduced A585 congestion.</p> <p>The attached documents listed below are based on existing junction traffic light cycle times and the pros and cons of the different arrangements.</p> <p>Sketch No 2. The proposed traffic light cycle time of 125 seconds and the</p>	

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>complexity of these junctions will make delays greater than the Shard Road Junction creates with a tailback from Skippool to beyond Norcross Junction every day of the week.</p> <p>Sketch No 5. A large traffic island similar to this arrangement with traffic light control at peak periods would improve flow rates 24/7.</p> <p>Sketch Nos 6 & 7. These views from Google maps are to scale and show that the designers of the road over 50 years ago had the foresight to arrange that the land for a future road was wide enough for a 4 lane highway.</p> <p>Sketch No 10. Norcross junction can be arranged to cope with additional traffic to and from the coast at Fleetwood, Cleveleys and Bispham.</p> <p>U Turn Modifications. This arrangement will cause gridlock when a number of large vehicles arrive from the east to make a "U" turn.</p> <p>A Shard Road extension to the bypass would avoid the inevitable delays that will arise due to the complex Skippool Bridge Junction.</p> <p>Garstang Road can be modified to cope with all the traffic movements without the expense and environmental disturbance of the bypass under Lodge Lane.</p> <p>There is an argument that in considering the options for road improvements the wider aspects of the areas problems and opportunities should be taken into consideration.</p>	
REP5-028.3	<p>Objections to Regeneration by improving the A585</p> <p>We were unable to hear [REDACTED] response at the Oral Hearing on 5 July 2019 that the bypass did not meet the aims of the Fylde Coast Highways and Transport Masterplan (FCHTMasterplan).</p> <p>Having listened to the recording, [REDACTED] referred to the ten objectives listed by Highways England in their 4.1 Statement of Reasons for the bypass Scheme. This interpretation has resulted in a different view of the priorities to those envisaged by Lancashire County Council and the South Pennines Route Strategy document.</p> <p>The aims of the FCHT Masterplan are set out in the link and attached below https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strategies-policies-plans/roads-parking-andtravel/highways-and-transport-masterplans/fylde-coast-highways-and-transport-masterplan. The first paragraph states: "Lancashire County Council and Blackpool Council have unveiled a Masterplan which outlines plans to transform the road, rail, tram and cycle networks on the Fylde Coast. The proposals aim to boost the economy, reduce gridlock on the roads and support healthy lifestyles over the coming decades in Blackpool, Wyre and Fylde".</p>	<p>Lancashire County Council has indicated that it is satisfied that the Applicant has accurately identified the Development Plans and Transport Plans currently in place for each of the local authorities against which the proposed development falls to be assessed.</p> <p>It should be noted that the planning status and quantum of future developments were provided by Fylde Borough Council and Blackpool Council in November 2017. However, Wyre Council was unable to provide the planning status and quantum of future developments within the Wyre Council area and suggested that the Applicant prepare this information based on the Wyre Local Plan. Assumptions were therefore made by the Applicant regarding the level of certainty, timing, quantum, land-use and trip rates of the developments included in the Stage 3 A585 Uncertainty Log in the Wyre Council Local Authority area. Furthermore, the Applicant carried out a review of the Wyre adopted plan and has now satisfied Wyre Borough Council's requirements (refer to the SoCG with Wyre (document reference TR010035/APP/8.4)).</p> <p>Refer to responses to REP4-038 and REP4-033.1 in Responses to Representations Received at Deadline 4 (document reference TR010035/APP/7.23).</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>The FCHT Masterplan is set out in this link and attached below https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/media/768230/Appendix-A-Fylde-Coast-Highways-and-Transport-Masterplan.pdf.</p> <p>The bypass will result in gridlock increasing from Skippool to beyond Norcross Junction and contribute to Fleetwood being the only town across the Fylde in decline. Can it be that the A585 improvements are based on misconceptions set out in the Masterplan Priority Analysis? This is contrary to the aims set out on page 20 of the Masterplan which envisages sustainable economic growth for the whole of Lancashire.</p> <p>The submission by Wyre Council on page 9 of the FCHT Masterplan gives a false impression of prosperity in Fleetwood. As a result the need for improvement was ignored in preparing the Remit for the bypass.</p> <p>The plan devised by Wyre Council and Highways England for the 2009 A585 improvement scheme was to alter 12 junctions. The Windy Harbour Junction alteration was one of the 3 junctions that were modified and in its present form it is widely thought to be a death trap. At the above Hearing John Ditchfield clearly expressed the hazards at this junction.</p> <p>A holistic view of the A585 should include the road beyond Skippool and Norcross Junction if a realistic view is to be taken of economic development of the coast.</p> <p>Throughout the Country it is widely agreed that large traffic islands including those adjacent to motorways controlled with traffic lights at peak periods work better 24/7 than crossroads with traffic lights. Highways England published articles to this effect but the A585 is to be encumbered with crossroads. Can it be that the A585 junctions were designed before Highways England realized that crossroads cause delays? Having spent so much money on the consultant's fees to produce plans is there a reluctance to modify and improve the Scheme?</p> <p>The bypass is intended to reduce gridlock between Windy Harbour and Skippool. If, after spending £150 million plus and ruining large areas of our countryside; a longer traffic queue between Skippool and Victoria Road is formed; the project will be a failure for most of Wyre's residents.</p>	
REP5-028.4	<p><u>Flood Risk Assessment Report</u></p> <p>Item 2.4.1 on Page 5 of the Arcadis Flood Risk Assessment states: "The report has been informed by a number of data sources which Arcadis believe to be trustworthy. Arcadis is unable to guarantee the accuracy of information provided by others. The report is based on information available at the time of writing. Further details regarding the modelling assumptions and limitations are included in Section 7.7."</p> <p>In Table 8 of Tidal Flood Levels, the road east of Skippool Junction shows water level during a 1 in 200 year storm as 100 mm deep and reaching a height of 6.5 metres Above Ordnance Datum. This includes an allowance for</p>	<p>During preparation of the Flood Risk Assessment (document reference TR010035/APP/5.2 – Rev 1), the Applicant has been advised by several Technical Officers with different specialisms at the Environment Agency. Our central contact has been Mr Alex Hazel, Planning Advisor Sustainable Places – Cumbria and Lancashire. Email: CLPlanning@environment-agency.gov.uk</p> <p>The Environment Agency has advised on allowances for the effects of climate change on tidal flood conditions. The methodologies of assessment, conclusions of the Flood Risk Assessment and the flood risk mitigation measures proposed, have been reviewed and agreed by the Environment Agency, as detailed in the Statement of Common Ground (document reference TR010035/APP/8.3).</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>climate change but Arcadis or their advisers have not allowed for a tidal surge.</p> <p>The National Oceanographic Centre Model shows that there can be a tidal surge of 2.5 metres along this coast. In 1977 there was a tidal surge of 1.7 metres and if this is added to an estimated spring tide in 100 years the road would be flooded to a considerable depth. A severe storm now could flood the road by over a metre.</p> <p>Sketch No SSA 2100C shows that with global warming and a tidal surge at Skippool Junction the bypass will be flooded to a depth of over 2 metres.</p> <p>Can this be one reason that Arcadis are not confident about the information provided by their “trustworthy” advisers but whose advice appears to us to be founded on incomplete information?</p> <p>We have repeatedly requested the names and contact details of the sources on whose information Arcadis relied but this information has not been provided. We repeat this request.</p> <p>Fleetwood Dockside is over a metre higher than the road at Skippool Junction but it has been flooded in the past. When sea levels rise new houses on the Dock will be flooded as indicated on Sketch No SSA 2102A.</p> <p>With rising sea levels several points along the River Wyre embankments will not be high enough to prevent flooding during a 1 in 200 year storm. The Environment Agency has said that they could not prevent Pilling flooding without a barrier across the river at Fleetwood.</p> <p>The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 30 years ago through its chairman Sir John Houghton predicted the heavy rainfall that we are now experiencing. It is inevitable there will be heavy rainfall during a high tide will result in a tidal lock flooding vast areas. The 2 to 3 metres of flood water shown on Sketch No 2100C should be considered the minimum levels in assessing sea defences along the River Wyre.</p> <p>To deal with this risk Wyre Council have produced a Multi-Agency Flood Plan so that where possible people and property at risk will be protected. This procedure is included in the FRA but experience has shown that predicting tidal flooding along our coast is almost impossible.</p> <p>High tides occur at or near weekends with biggest tides usually about midnight when hundreds of people are not on hand to carry out rescues. Clearly the flood plan is and expensive and unreliable arrangement.</p> <p>The best and most effective method to avoid this risk is to ensure that the river banks are not over topped. This can be achieved with a flood barrier at Fleetwood which will be self - funding and create a reliable method of saving lives and property.</p>	<p>It is not within the remit of the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme to provide strategic flood protection measures to serve North Flyde, such as a flood barrier at Fleetwood.</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
REP5-028.5	<p><u>Regeneration and Climate Change</u></p> <p>The IPCC strongly advocated the use of the tides to reduce global warming and Fleetwood is known to be the best location in Europe for a pilot plant to test the latest low head turbine technology.</p> <p>Regrettably Wyre Council is opposed to this concept and relies on anecdotal evidence to support their opposition to a flood barrier which they see as environmentally problematic.</p> <p>Had they accepted the invitation in June 2009 to attend the site inspection and conference hosted by EDF at La Rance; Wyre Officials would have learned that a tidal power plant is not a hazard to wild life. The Local Authority environmental experts gave lectures on their monitoring of the river and the plant and spoke of fish a metre long passing through the turbines unharmed. They also reported that control of water flow through the turbines did not disturb sediment and river water was clear which improved photosynthesis increasing river plant life and hence other wild life. As a consequence EDF's La Rance Tidal Power Plant now supports a greater amount and variety of wild life than any other river in Brittany or Normandy and this could be replicated on the River Wyre.</p> <p>A Wyre Tidal Power Plant could have been built and operated now for at least the last 6 years. It would be producing enough electricity to power 100,000 cars a day and have the ability to prevent flooding from Pilling to Blackpool as sea levels rise, for hundreds of years or more. Apart from flooding from the River Wyre, Cleveleys seawall revetment is over 2 metres lower than the new Rossall seawall making it vulnerable to over topping during storms. If the weather conditions had been slightly worse during the December 2013 storms the seawall was not high enough to prevent Cleveleys being more extensively flooded.</p> <p>Whether it is this year, next year or in 100 years the River Wyre sea defences will not be adequate to prevent flooding.</p> <p>Item 9.1.8 of the Arcadis Flood Risk Assessment predicts that vast areas of Thornton, Cleveleys and Fleetwood will be flooded and we are being led to believe that it will be too expensive to prevent these floods. But this conclusion does not take into account the cost of flood prevention against the value of the assets protected.</p> <p>Wyre Council's policy of a sea defences retreat set out on page 31 of the Wyre Flood and Coastal defense Strategy Plan should be reviewed. It seems that officials and politicians are prepared to accept and implement this advice with no consideration to the potential losses of their rate payers.</p> <p>This situation can be avoided if only a small portion of the value of the tens of billions of pounds-worth of assets that can be lost is invested now by the Government before these monumental losses takes place.</p>	<p>As stated, it is not within the remit of the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme to provide strategic flood protection or energy generation measures to serve North Flyde, such as a flood barrier at Fleetwood or Wyre tidal power plant.</p>

Reference Number	Written Representations	Response to Written Representation
	<p>Unless this flood disaster is averted it will have serious consequences for residents, officials and politicians.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>The A585 bypass scheme has numerous defects some going back to its inception and it should be rejected.</p> <p>The Scheme does not meet the criteria of the of the Masterplan on which it was to be based</p> <p>An alternative road off the peninsula has to be planned.</p> <p>The power of the tides has to be harnessed to contribute to reducing global warming for the benefit of the whole Country</p>	

Page left intentionally blank