

FAO Case Team  
National Infrastructure Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN



30<sup>TH</sup> March 2019

[A585WindyharbourtoSkippool@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:A585WindyharbourtoSkippool@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

**Request to attend the Preliminary Meeting**

Dear Mr Symons,

Please accept this letter as a request to attend the A585 Windy Harbour to Skippool preliminary meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April. I have been asked by a group of residents who are resident at both ends of the proposed scheme. I would like to speak at the meeting at Item 3 on the proposed agenda which covers the points set out in Annex B. I have noted the specific points I would like to make in Annex B appended to this letter.

In addition I would like to attend the open floor hearing on the same day at 2pm.

I look forward to your confirmation of this letter and any further instructions for the day.

Best Regards,

Rodney A Barnes

## Appendix - Annex B points for raising

<p>1. Compulsory Acquisition (CA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for the land proposed to be compulsorily acquired and/or temporarily possessed.</li> <li>• Effects on those affected by compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession, including statutory undertakers/infrastructure.</li> <li>• The case for CA.</li> <li>• Adequacy and security of funding for compensation.</li> </ul>	
<p>2. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The structure of the dDCO.</li> <li>• The appropriateness of proposed provisions.</li> <li>• Relationships with other consents.</li> <li>• Whether the dDCO is satisfactory in all other respects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed Amounderness Way roundabout improvements is not linked</li> <li>- The consultation has not been adequately consulted.</li> <li>- The DCO regime is for National Strategic Infrastructure Projects. This road has 'technically' qualified in order to benefit from the powers afforded under the DCO and cannot realistically be considered alongside HS2, Crossrail, Nuclear power stations as a true NSIP</li> </ul>
<p>3. Biodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• European and National designated sites.</li> <li>• European and National protected species.</li> <li>• Change in hedgerow and deciduous woodland habitats.</li> <li>• Other biodiversity effects.</li> <li>• Mitigation.</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on designated and non-designated heritage assets.</li> <li>• The proposed strategy for dealing with archaeological remains, including archaeologically significant peat deposits.</li> <li>• Cumulative and in-combination effects on and with other major projects and proposals.</li> </ul>	
<p>5. Landscape and Visual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect on landscape and townscape character.</li> <li>• Short and long-term visual impacts.</li> <li>• Grange footbridge.</li> <li>• Effects on the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Cumulative and in-combination effects on and with other major projects and proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inconsistent messages from Highways England as to what landscaping is being committed to and where</li> </ul>
<p>6. Transportation and Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative routes/solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The consultation has not been adequately consulted</li> <li>- first consultation presented just two</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for and benefits of the scheme.</li> <li>• Effects on the existing road network during construction and after.</li> <li>• Cumulative effects.</li> <li>• Scheme context – A585 corridor from the M55 to Fleetwood, strategic vision and objectives for national networks.</li> </ul>	<p>‘options’ only one of which was a bypass. No alternative bypass routes have been put to the public for consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Travel time savings of between 2 and 4.5 minutes per journey are forecast to be saved by road users due to the Scheme.” This is a negligible saving and given that this is an estimate there must be the possibility that this could make no difference</li> <li>- The scheme will not achieve its objectives as the congestion is only moved to a different location on the A585 and overall not reduced.</li> <li>- The solution has been designed to a cost, instead of being designed to solve the congestion problem</li> </ul>
<p>7. Water Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface and groundwater effects.</li> <li>• Drainage.</li> <li>• Marine Environment.</li> <li>• Flood Risk.</li> </ul>	
<p>8. Socio-Economic Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community consultation.</li> <li>• Economic/regeneration effects.</li> <li>• Effect on BMV agricultural land.</li> <li>• Effects on living conditions of surrounding residents – during construction and after.</li> <li>• Effects on local businesses.</li> <li>• Effects on potential delivery of land for housing.</li> </ul>	
<p>9. Emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise.</li> <li>• Vibration.</li> <li>• Air quality.</li> <li>• Light.</li> <li>• Cumulative and in-combination effects on and with other major projects and proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inconsistent messages from Highways England as to what mitigation is being committed to and where</li> </ul>