Dear Sir,

Please see the attached letter from Superintendent Crowe, Lancashire Constabulary dated 11 November 2021.

In it, Superintendent Crowe was asked, "The approach roads to the prisons are country lanes. A LCC survey shows 4000 cars travel along Ulnes Walton Lane on working days. Currently at peak times it is extremely busy. MoJ anticipate that to increase by 2000 vehicles. The Moj acknowledge there will be issues however they and Lancashire County Council have not provided any tangible evidence on how the traffic will be managed.

The reply was, "*During our consultation with the MoJ we have expressed a view that we believe that the local road infrastructure would be inadequate for the consequential increase in traffic*." (See extract below, taken from the attached letter.)

- The approach roads to the prisons are country lanes. A LCC survey (attached) shows 4000 cars travel along Ulnes Walton Lane on working days. Currently at peak times, it is extremely busy. MoJ anticipate that to increase by 2000 vehicles. The MoJ acknowledge there will be issues however they and Lancashire County Council have not provided any tangible evidence on how the traffic will be managed.

  During our consultation with the MoJ we have expressed a view that we believe that the local road infrastructure would be inadequate for the consequential increase in traffic. Responsibility for road engineering does however lie with Lancashire County Council (LCC).

The roundabout at the junction of Ulnes Walton Lane and Southport Road proposed by the MoJ only partially addresses some of the issues (ie. it makes it a little easier for larger vehicles to negotiate the junction). The proposal fails to address anything else and I suggest the Superintendents view remains valid, ie. the police/emergency services state that the local road infrastructure would be inadequate for the increase in traffic the third prison would bring.

Yours faithfully,

David Williams

9 Wray Crescent, Leyland PR26 8NH

On Monday, 18 March 2024 at 11:09:09 GMT, David Williams <david_john_williams@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Sir,

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/D2320/W/22/3295556

This regards the public inquiry about the proposed third prison at Ulnes Walton, Lancashire.

Today (18 March 2024), we received notification through the post of the public inquiry to be reopened on 25 March 2024. It is disappointing that this is to be a "virtual" event. Given the significant impact this proposed development will have on locals lives, I would much prefer to see the white of the eyes of the Ministry Of Justice (MoJ) representatives.

I am a regular cyclist (last year, I cycled some 8,500 miles). I choose not to cycle at "peak" times because of the increased risk of an accident due to the much higher volume of traffic on the roads

however sometimes it is unavoidable. Peak "working" times is one time to avoid however I have noticed during weekends through traffic significantly increases during the day along Southport Road, Ulnes Walton Lane, New Lane, Lydiate Lane and Leyland Lane.

There are numerous aspects to road traffic safety in Ulnes Walton. Making significant changes to one junction may impact other junctions. The proposed roundabout at the junction between Ulnes Walton Lane and Southport Road is likely to increase the flow of traffic at the junction. This may be detrimental to traffic traveling along Ulnes Walton Lane particularly at the junction between Ulnes Walton Lane and Moss Road. Pedestrians and cyclists at both junctions will be exposed to greater risk of an accident because they will be exposed to an increase in traffic volume plus at the roundabout no "escape" (ie. pavement) has been proposed around it.

All the road safety issues identified during the first inquiry remain extant and the proposed roundabout can only exacerbate traffic issues at other, close by junctions and fail to improve traffic issues along Ulnes Walton Lane.

If permitted, this prison will be a direct neighbour of ours (ie. over our garden fence). At all times through this process, The Ministry Of Justice has failed to act in a reasonable neighbourly manner. (Eg. At the initial virtual consultation, our concerns were whitewashed.) Further, it is disappointing that the Government are opting to force this matter through without proper, informed discussion or consultation with its neighbours about the consequences of such a scheme. The government ought to reconsider alternative sites that are probably more cost effective and have less of an impact on local infrastructure.

Your sincerely,

David Williams

9 Wray Crescent, Leyland PR26 8NH