

Public Document Pack



www.sefton.gov.uk

Town Hall
Trinity Road
Bootle
L20 7AE

Date: 28 June 2022
Our Ref:
Your Ref:

Contact: Ruth Appleby /
Ian Barton

Contact Number: 0151 934 2181/2788

e-mail: ruth.appleby@sefton.gov.uk /
ian.barton@sefton.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 29TH JUNE, 2022

I refer to the agenda for the above meeting and now enclose the following report(s) which were unavailable when the agenda was published.

Agenda No.	Item	
8	Late Reps	(Pages 3 - 10)

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Ian Barton".

Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee: 29th June 2022 Late Representations/Information

Appendix 4

Item 4A

DC/2021/01929: 1-3 Crosby Road South, Waterloo L22 1RG

(a) As a point of clarification, the application proposes to use matching materials for the extensions.

(b) Amend condition 7 to read:

No development shall commence above slab level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The materials shall match those on the existing building and development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: These details are required prior to external construction to ensure an acceptable visual appearance to the development.

Item 4B

DC/2021/00924: Land Off Bankfield Lane, Churchtown Southport

A further letter of objection has been received from a resident on Bankfield Lane raising the following:

- Proposal is on total contradiction to the Government Planning Inspectors stipulation that there must be only one entrance.
- No reason provided to justify deviation from policy.
- Previous proposal for one access was challenged by residents on safety grounds but to no avail, with the Council reiterating that additional access points would be contrary to policy. Why is this application any different?
- New access would be located just over brow of a hill which regularly sees speeding vehicles. Speed control measures have no effect in slowing down vehicles.
- Highway analysis showed vast majority of vehicles passing were speeding. Also shows between 8am and 9am on weekdays, one vehicle every 3 seconds passed over - question how it can be safe to create a new entrance.
- The new access would create 5 junction on a very busy road within 35 yards of each other
- Previous fatality which proves this stretch of road is very dangerous. No justifiable reason to approve this planning application.

The committee report acknowledges that the new access would be contrary to the Local Plan in relation to the site specific requirements associated with this allocated site. However, the report has assessed the harm of the proposed access to highway safety, having regarding to technical data

Agenda Item 8

submitted in support of the application and in consultation with the Highways Manager. In this instance, it has been concluded that the access proposed for the 6 houses (the other 3 being accessed from the wider residential development) would not give rise to highway safety concerns.

Item 4C

DC/2021/01848 Land adjacent to 16 Moorhouse's Hightown

An additional condition is considered necessary to prevent overlooking to the neighbouring properties.

The roof area of the house hereby permitted shall not be used at any time as a storage area, balcony or similar amenity area and no window or door to the dwelling roof shall be installed or otherwise adapted to afford such use.

Reason: To ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers/land users is retained at all times

Appendix 5

Item 5A

DC/2022/00087: Land At Crosby Coastal Park, Crosby

(a) Amend condition 2 to read:

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

Drawing No. DES/JA1353/100/01 Location Plan - Route Extents
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/100/02 Scheme Information Board
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/100/03 Works Areas
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/100/04 Location Plan
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/01 Site Clearance Details 1 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/02 Site Clearance Details 2 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/03 Site Clearance Details 3 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/04 Site Clearance Details 4 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/05 Site Clearance Details 5 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/07 Site Clearance Details 7 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/200/08 Site Clearance Details 8 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/01 rev A Construction Details 1 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/02 Construction Details 2 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/03 Construction Details 3 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/04 rev B Construction Details 4 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/05 rev B Construction Details 5 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/06 rev A Construction Details 6 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/07 Construction Details 7 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/08 Construction Details 8 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/09 rev A Typical Details 1
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/10 Typical Details 2
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/11 Typical Details 3
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/12 Glenwood Bollard Detail
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1100/13 Typical Bench Detail
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/01 rev A Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 1 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/02 rev A Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 2 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/03 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 3 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/04 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 4 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/05 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 5 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/06 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 6 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/07 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 7 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1200/08 Traffic Signs and Road Marking Details 8 of 8
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/SIGNS/01 rev A Sign Schedule (submitted 17 June 2022)
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1300/01 Street Lighting Details 1 of 3
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1300/02 Street Lighting Details 2 of 3
Drawing No. DES/JA1353/1300/03 Street Lighting Details 3 of 3
Ecological Assessment Appendix C Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment 8790.001 September 2021

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Agenda Item 8

(b) Additional Comments from Flooding and Drainage Manager

The Flooding and Drainage Manager has provided the following comments in response to further details submitted for the soakaway design detail:

The applicant has made further submissions in support of additional measures proposed to be taken to mitigate against potential flooding at the Blucher Street car park area.

The Submissions include the proposed typical construction detail drawings and a Technical Note-2 which reviewed the scheme proposals around the Blucher Street area in relation to the existing ponding issues within the park.

The Lead Local Flood Authority reviewed the submission and find the drawings and the proposed additional measures outlined in the Technical Note-2 acceptable and, if implemented, will reduce the residual flood risk in this section of the Cycleway and Footpath in the Blucher Street area.

Letter received from the Seafront Residents' Action Group (attached).

Seafront Residents' Action Group
2 Beach Lawn
Waterloo
L22 8QA

27 June 2022

Dear Councillor,

**Seafront Residents' Action Group Comments for the resumed Planning Committee hearing of the application for a new Alternative Inland Multi-use Path in Crosby Coastal Park.
Ref: DC/2022/00087.**

The application is back on the agenda for the next meeting of the Planning Committee which is on Wednesday 29 June at 6.30pm, at Bootle Town Hall. The Chief Planning Officer has repeated his recommendation that the application should be granted subject to conditions. We requested a copy of the 'Note for Petitioners' referred to in paragraph 181 of Sefton's Constitution, which explains procedures for public speaking at Committee Meetings. Mr McKenzie replied that it has been overtaken by events and is not available, but he tells us that we have no right to speak again at the meeting. We shall however be attending.

We are relying on the common sense and independent judgement of the Planning Committee. We hope you have not lost sight of our submissions, are persuaded by them, and will refuse this application.

We have looked at the material uploaded to the Planning website since the meeting on 1 June 2022 and make the following points for the Late Representations Report.

Mr. Dunsmore's Response to the points raised by the Planning Committee.

Paragraph 2, bullet point 1. The scheme may aim to improve safety around the junction with South road where usage is anticipated to be higher, *but it is the scheme itself and its proposed route which would significantly increase usage by vehicular transport here.* The shared paths around the junction and its concourse do not at present have cycles and other forms of transport cutting across the entrance to the Marine Park travelling south to north and vice versa.

Traffic would increase. The application is partly predicated on reducing carbon emissions on the roads by increasing cycling by commuters and others on an extra dedicated route through the Park.

Paragraph 2, last bullet point could lead the Committee into error. The funding for the scheme is *not* a material planning consideration.

Paragraph 5 states that the consultation process was as robust as possible. However it did not suggest a Path 4m (13') wide.

We have previously said "Consultation should be genuine, timely and transparent. Sefton takes the trouble to plan its consultations, but does not fully implement its consultation plans. It cuts short the time apparently available to the public for responses. It plans years ahead, keeps its plans under wraps, ignores any feedback prior to formal consultation, then rushes out the consultation metaphorically at the last minute." We have provided chapter and verse to substantiate our statement in relation to this consultation and to others in recent years. The result has deprived the Council of expertise in the community on which they could have drawn at an early stage.

Please note that SRAG does not appear on the Stakeholder List. That implies that the Sefton residents who live along the seafront are not stakeholders in the area in front of their homes, the

Agenda Item 8

land of which was conveyed subject to conditions to the Council's predecessors in title, by them or by their predecessors in title.

Technical Note 1: Safety Concerns at the South Road Concourse.

The original route was shown as running straight through the concourse. This is the route that was 'supported' in the consultation. Fortunately, following repeated submissions, the route was improved for the planning application to sweep in a circle and cross the three principal paths a little further west.

Technical Note 1 has now improved on the drawing for the planning application. It sensibly widens the paths and includes give-way markings and cycle tramline paving for the cyclists to give way to pedestrians. It will include yet further signage at the beginning and end of what is now called the Circulatory Route. *However, whether cyclists would obey these markings or be required to obey them remains in doubt.*

We said at the outset that bringing the route through the entry points to the Park required pinch points and stop lines and were told that they were not compatible with legislation and guidance. To some extent, wiser counsels have now prevailed due to concerns shared by the members of the Planning Committee.

The statement at the outset that there are excellent sightlines in all three directions for pedestrians and for cyclists is correct, but misleading. Firstly, the concern is that potentially some of the pedestrians will be heedless of their surroundings and will not avail themselves of the visibility. Secondly, the drawing on the website (though not when it is downloaded and printed) still appears to show that a suite of three public toilets will be sited opposite the kiosk, and so cycles approaching from the south may be obscured behind them, and pedestrians will be obscured from the view of the cyclists.

As for turning right at the northern corner of the wall of Marine Garden, it is true that there is no signage or road marking at present, but the Sun Terrace is very rarely used as a path by cyclists. Were it to become a level useable path the proposed mitigation would be needed.

Technical Note 2: Drainage issues.

Technical Note 2 improves the application. However the weep holes on the revetment would still be blocked by accumulated sand for about a distance of 700m. Approximately 1.27 acres of grass are to be replaced by 2.4km of new hardstanding. Drainage issues would persist at various points along the route, and not just near the compound and Blucher Street car park.

Heritage Issues.

The decision takers are the Planning Committee, not the applicant or the Chief Planning Officer. The latter are entitled to their views and no doubt it is proper for the Chief Planning Officer to make a recommendation. Whether there are heritage concerns is a matter for decision by the Committee. The Heritage Statement is not an effective Heritage Impact Assessment, and affords the Committee little assistance as it is subject to the criticisms we have made of it.

Bio-diversity.

We repeat that the part of the Park affected by the application would lose an area of about 1.27 acres of grass to create a length of 2.4km of new hardstanding. The biodiversity calculations were made in September 2021 before the width of the proposed path was increased by 25%. The improvement in biodiversity that is claimed for the entire Park is a smokescreen, obscuring the local impact. Without the proposed path and with the enhancements suggested locally and further

north in the park, biodiversity would not be reduced locally, and would be increased more significantly overall.

General.

The dice are heavily weighted against petitioners who object. Not least is the difficulty of making a meaningful oral submission in 5 minutes, when ten minutes would generally suffice.

We rely on all the points we and others have previously made against this controversial and unpopular proposal.

Chris Wolstenholme.

Chair. Seafrost Residents' Action Group.

This page is intentionally left blank