

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A585 WindyHarbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme.
Date: 26 August 2019 09:22:40
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Reference TR010035

I attach further representations which I seek to make following the decision of the Examining Inspector not to hold a further Issue Specific Hearing.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of them and confirm that they will be considered and taken into account.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Buckley

The Planning Inspectorate,
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2, The Square,
Bristol BS1 6PN

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

26th August 2019

My reference: **TR010035**

Dear Sir,

Re Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool Improvement Scheme.

I am writing to express my initial disappointment at the decision not to hold a further Issue Specific Hearing. However, on the basis that I am permitted to make the following written representations based on evidence and arguments from earlier hearings, I am content:

1. I applaud the Applicant's proposal to convert the A585/A588 junction from a roundabout junction to a traffic light junction. It will provide much needed safety especially for the elderly and disabled.
2. I also do not object to the proposal to create a slip road from the A588 on to the A585 which will assist the flow of traffic North out of Poulton-le-Fylde.
3. While both the above-mentioned proposals are, therefore, in the public interest, they will have a detrimental effect upon my property and home at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In particular,
 - a. The slip road will bring traffic some three to four metres closer to my open Easterly boundary. The road is at the top of a three metre steep embankment, and moving it nearer to my property will inevitably cause not only additional noise and noxious fumes from an increase in traffic stopping and starting, but also will create significantly more light pollution from traffic due to the new road layout and junctions, traffic lights and the removal of trees, hedges and bushes from the area.
 - b. The light pollution will be intensified by the creation of a forty-four stick traffic light junction together with the proposed re-routing of the approach, entrance and exit to the River Wyre restaurant and public house which is directly opposite the Easterly boundary of my property.
4. I accept that while any detrimental effect on the land can be addressed by way of compensation (which is outside the scope of this inquiry), the adverse effect of the

development can and should, first, in my submission, be mitigated and ameliorated by screening or fencing along the top of the easterly embankment. This could be by way of two metre high close board solid fence and appropriate landscaping. Bearing in mind that there will be an obligation on the Applicant to repair and restore likely damage to part of the present fence inevitably caused by the proposed work, and that there would be a reduction in the amount of monetary compensation payable, I submit that it makes both environmental and economic sense to take these steps.

5. In my submission, my argument is fortified by the fact that the Applicant proposes, when the current roundabout is removed, to replace the culvert or dyke running presently under the roundabout from the River Wyre into Horsebridge Dyke (and out again) with a new modern culvert which will then be connected to the existing dyke. The Applicants assure me that this will be safe and feasible despite my concerns.. However, the present free flowing tidal dyke at the foot of the embankment constitutes in itself a hazard or a trap. At the foot of the steep four metre drop embankment flows Horsebridge Dyke which is tidal, itself up to eight feet deep, the ebb and flow of the tide being controlled by a sluice gate located at the other side of the roundabout culvert. From time to time adventurous unsupervised youngsters can be seen climbing over and through the present rotting inadequate barrier, and putting themselves into significant danger. I have complained in the past to Lancashire County Council that the current situation constitutes an allurement to children, akin to railway embankments. A duty of care is owed to those who stray on to the embankment and I refer to the House of Lords decision in *British Railways Board v Herrington 1972 AC 877* which imposes liability upon occupiers towards trespassers especially where these are children and the site constitutes an allurement. It is my strong submission that simply by connecting the new culvert into Horsebridge Dyke, the Applicants are themselves adopting responsibility for the dangerous situation which exists and which breaches Health and Safety guidelines. At the very least and for safety reasons, there needs to be a strong firm barrier in the form of a high fence preventing access to this dangerous area.
6. In summary, the high point of my case is that the Development Consent Order should impose a requirement upon the Applicant to cover and culvert that part of Horsebridge Dyke which borders on to [REDACTED]. At the very least, however, I would seek that there be an Issue Specific requirement that, as part of the Order granting Development Consent, a two metre high close board fence with landscaping is erected at the top of the embankment rising up from the East boundary of [REDACTED].

Dated this 26th August 2019.

Michael E Buckley