

Public Document Pack

THE "CALL IN" PERIOD FOR THIS SET OF MINUTES ENDS AT 12 NOON ON WEDNESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2010. MINUTE NOS. 71, 76, 77, 78, 79, 87, 88 AND 89 ARE NOT SUBJECT TO "CALL IN"

SOUTHPORT AREA COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, LORD STREET, SOUTHPORT ON WEDNESDAY 6TH OCTOBER, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Hands (in the Chair)
Councillors Booth, Byrom, Lord Fearn, Glover,
Jones, McGuire, Pearson, Porter, Preece,
B Rimmer, D Rimmer, Shaw, Sir Ron Watson and
Weavers
Local Advisory Group Members:
Mr J Fairhurst and Mr S Sugden

ALSO PRESENT: Inspector Fairbrother and Sergeant Riding,
Merseyside Police
72 Members of the public in attendance

67. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brodie-Browne, Dodd, Preston, Sumner and Tattersall and Local Advisory Group Member Mrs. M. Pointon.

68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were received:

Member	Minute No.	Interest	Action
Councillor Hands	70 - Presentation by the Southport YMCA	Personal – a family member is employed at the Southport YMCA	Stayed in the room, took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon
Councillor Booth	80 - Update on the former Southport Sandwinning site, Marine Drive, Southport	Personal - he is a member of the RSPB	Stayed in the room, took part in the consideration of the item and voted thereon

69. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

70. PRESENTATION - SOUTHPORT YMCA

The Committee received a presentation from members of the Southport YMCA Youth Department on the activities delivered by the group and the positive benefits to the Southport community.

Some of the activities undertaken by the Youth Department were as follows:

- musical theatre group
- street dance classes and the performance of shows and displays for charity
- cheerleading
- climbing group
- youth club
- skating in the gym
- money raising activities for charity
- community activities such as litter picking in Hesketh Park and Southport Beach and helping out at Queenscourt Hospice

Youth Department members also detailed that helpful and friendly staff fostered an enjoyable atmosphere in the YMCA; that great friendships had been generated amongst Youth Department members; that members fitness levels had improved due to the many physical activities undertaken; and that they had received presentations on many topics including anti-smoking advice, disability awareness and homelessness.

Youth Department members concluded that they now had representatives on the YMCA board; that one of their main aims was to dispel the negative media view of the association of young people with anti-social behaviour; and finished their presentation with a rendition of the song 'Lean on Me'.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Southport YMCA Youth Department members be thanked for their excellent and entertaining presentation; and
- (2) media representatives in attendance at the meeting be requested to highlight the positive activities undertaken by the Southport YMCA Youth Department.

71. PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE THIRD MERSEYSIDE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

RESOLVED: That

- (1) consideration of the above matter be deferred until the next meeting of the Area Committee to be held on 17 November 2010; and
- (2) Members be urged to complete and return their copy of the public consultation document.

72. BUDGET MONITORING

Further to Minute No. 63 of 1 September 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director indicating that the balance of the budget available for allocation during 2010/11, including sums set aside for the provision of litterbins and street signs, was as follows:

Ward	Available Funds £
Ainsdale	12,325.83
Birkdale	19,741.98
Cambridge	8,412.08
Dukes	19,678.53
Kew	9,404.54
Meols	10,716.50
Norwood	24,568.09
Town-wide	15,088.75
Total	119,936.30

Details of the allocations made by each ward against the general provision in the current year were set out in the report.

Steve Honess, Area Co-ordinator, updated the Area Committee on schemes that had now been approved since the preparation of the report.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the remaining balance of £119,936.30 of the budget available for further allocation for the rest of the year be noted;
- (2) allocations from the 2010/11 Ward budgets agreed to date and indicated in paragraph 2.1 of the report, be noted; and
- (3) the Leisure and Tourism Director be requested to submit a report to the Area Committee providing details of the football training sessions funded from the devolved budgets.

73. SOUTHPORT TOWN CENTRE - DEEP CLEANSING AND REMOVAL OF CHEWING GUM FROM PAVEMENTS

Further to Minute No. 135 of the meeting held on 3 February 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on the deep cleansing and removal of chewing gum on pavements in Southport Town Centre.

The report provided details on the costs associated with the purchase of a hot washing machine to remove gum from pavements; the utilisation of litter bins equipped with "stubbers" to accommodate cigarette butts and chewing gum; and the views of town centre businesses to contribute towards deep cleansing operations.

The report concluded by requesting funding from the Committee's devolved budget as a contribution towards the deep cleansing and removal of chewing gum from Chapel Street, Corporation Street, Cambridge Arcade and part of Nevill Street in November 2010.

RESOLVED:

That the cleansing and removal of chewing gum along Chapel Street, Cambridge Arcade, Corporation Street and part of Nevill Street in November 2010, at a cost of £4,910.10, be approved and the cost be allocated as follows:

Ward/Town-wide Provision	£
Town-wide	2910
Dukes	2000

74. DOG FOULING/LITTER ENFORCEMENT PROJECT

The Committee considered the report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director seeking consideration of funding from the Area Committee's devolved budget, for enhanced targeted enforcement in key locations in Southport to more effectively tackle dog fouling/littering offenders outside normal hours of operation.

The report indicated that based on the success of projects undertaken elsewhere in Sefton and in order to have maximum impact, it was proposed to carry out four enforcement weekends centred around litter and dog fouling within the Southport Wards over a two month period. This could be arranged during the months of October and November 2010 should the Area Committee wish. This would involve direct engagement with the residents and target offenders.

The report detailed the objectives and scope of both "Operation Collar" and "Operation Litter"; and that the full four weekend enforcement

programme and signage as detailed in the report would cost approximately £6,000.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) individual Ward Members be requested to contact the Public Health Manager, Environmental and Technical Services, to ascertain further information on the operation of the enforcement project within their Wards; and
- (2) it be noted that both Birkdale and Norwood Wards had agreed to allocate £800 from each of their devolved budgets towards the dog fouling/litter enforcement project.

75. WINTER SERVICE

Further to Minute No. 58 of the meeting held on 1 September 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Environmental and Technical Services Director responding to points raised at the previous meeting relating to winter service provision.

The report indicated that the initial cost for the provision and placement of a grit bin was £200 and that to refill a grit bin on an ad hoc basis would cost £100; that with regard to alternative gritting methods, investigations were currently ongoing with a solution being closely anticipated; that the Strategic Director, Children, Schools and Families had liaised with schools to offer to provide grit bins outside schools at the schools' expense; and that so far one request had been received.

Mr. J. McConkey, Assistant Director (Technical Services) advised that the Council was planning to trial a product called Safethaw (which was a de-icing liquid) on some footways which were currently included in the winter policy. This would be trialled over the coming winter and a report submitted to Cabinet Member - Technical Services. The results would determine whether it be recommended to revise the policy.

RESOLVED:

That the report on winter service provision be noted.

76. PRESTON NEW ROAD, SOUTHPORT - EFFECTIVENESS OF SPEED MANAGEMENT SCHEME

Further to Minute No. 28(a) and (b) of the meeting held on 16 June 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director advising of the effectiveness of the speed management scheme, undertaken in 2008 on the A565 Preston New Road.

The report indicated that in the three year study period prior to the introduction of the scheme, there had been a total of 17 recorded injury accidents between the Plough Roundabout and Balmoral Drive. Of the 17 accidents that occurred, two accidents resulted in serious injury whilst the remaining 15 accidents resulted in slight injury. A total of 24 recorded casualties were a result of the 17 accidents; that within the 18 month period since the introduction of the scheme, there had been a total of five recorded injury collisions resulting in seven slight injuries; and that this equated to a three year collision record of 10 collisions.

With regard to the speed of traffic on the road, automatic traffic counts had been undertaken that showed a reduction in the average 85% speed from 36.3 mph before introduction to 34.4 mph 18 months after the scheme was completed.

The report also responded to two questions raised at the meeting on 16 June 2010 from Ms. A. Owen and Mrs. M. Brown.

The report concluded that the main purpose of the scheme was to reduce the number of recorded injury collisions and to reduce vehicle speeds and that from the 'before' and 'after' data, it would appear that the desired outcomes had been achieved.

RESOLVED:

That the report on the effectiveness of the speed management scheme on Preston New Road, be noted.

77. CEMETERY ROAD / EASTBOURNE ROAD, SOUTHPORT - PROPOSED LOCAL SAFETY SCHEME - ACCIDENT AND SPEED REDUCTION - RESULTS OF CONSULTATION

Further to Minute No. 44 of the meeting held on 28 July 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director advising of the results of the public consultation on traffic-calming proposals and extended waiting restrictions for Cemetery Road and Eastbourne Road, Southport; and recommending the way forward to progress the scheme.

The report indicated that it had previously been agreed to introduce traffic calming measures in the Cemetery Road/Eastbourne Road area in the form of road narrowing hatching, refuges, improved signs and road markings at junctions and improvements to existing zebra crossings; that the route was initially identified through the LTP Urban Safety Management, Local Safety, Speed Management and Pedestrian Crossing Review; and it was also agreed that as part of the proposals existing waiting restrictions would be extended at three junctions to improve visibility on the exit of the minor roads.

A total of 354 consultation packs were delivered to residents and 126 completed questionnaires were returned (33.6%); and that of the

respondents, 101 (80.2%) were in favour of the proposed schemes whilst 25 (19.80%) were not in favour.

The report also indicated that some of the proposals included the extension of 'no waiting at any time' restrictions by 10 metres on each leg of the junctions as shown on the plans in Annex A. These proposals had been advertised separately to the consultation on the traffic calming proposals; that the end of the 21 day objection period for the proposed restrictions was 17 September 2010; and that there had been no objections to the proposed extension of the 'no waiting at any time' restrictions.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) due to the positive response in favour of the proposals, the traffic calming measures proposed for Cemetery Road and Eastbourne Road as detailed in the report be approved; and
- (2) the extended waiting restrictions as detailed in the report be progressed.

78. LIVERPOOL ROAD BIRKDALE - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EXISTING TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

The Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on a proposed Traffic Regulation Order, the effect of which would replace free parking with a daytime waiting restriction and 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions with limited waiting on Liverpool Road, Birkdale. The amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order would improve turnover of parking for local businesses on Liverpool Road.

It was proposed to introduce an individual Order for the road incorporating all the existing restrictions.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Traffic Regulation Order as shown on the plan in Annex A and as detailed in the report, be approved; and
- (2) the Traffic Services Manager be authorised to undertake the necessary legal procedures, including those of public consultation and advertising the Council's intention to implement the Orders.

79. VIRGINIA STREET/HODSON STREET/MILL STREET/HARGREAVES STREET SOUTHPORT - PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

The Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on a proposed Traffic Regulation Order, the effect of which would:

- (i) amend the existing residents' privileged parking bay on the bend in Virginia Street and replace it with 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions; and
- (ii) introduce 'At Any Time' waiting restrictions on Hodson Street and Mill Street to prevent parking, thus maintaining emergency vehicular service access into these roads.

It was proposed to introduce individual Orders for the roads incorporating all the existing restrictions.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Traffic Regulation Orders as set out on the plans in Annex A and as detailed in the report, be approved; and
- (2) the Traffic Services Manager be authorised to undertake the necessary legal procedures, including those of public consultation and advertising the Council's intention to implement the Orders.

80. UPDATE ON THE FORMER SOUTHPORT SANDWINNING SITE MARINE DRIVE, SOUTHPORT

Further to Minute No. 149 of the meeting held on 31 March 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director on the current situation at the former Sandwinning compound, Marine Drive, Southport.

The report indicated that the Director considered that the lack of progress was frustrating but not surprising given the current economic climate; that the material removed thus far had been used on other projects in the borough and the surrounding area, which was the Council's preferred approach rather than material being deposited in landfill; and that the operator had shown his continued commitment to the site restoration by completing work on the 'Haul Road'.

The Chair advised the meeting that the Planning and Economic Development Director had provided him with the following updated information:

Discussions had been held with RSPB and Council departments about a new lease which would include the haul road and that it was hoped that the lease could be completed in the next couple of months.

RSPB also wished, with the Council's support, to be granted an extension to their lease to include the land which was occupied by the sandwinning plant once it had been cleared.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report be noted; and
- (2) the Planning and Economic Development Director be requested to submit a further progress report in six months time.

81. FEEDBACK FROM THE ORANGE DAY PARADE IN SOUTHPORT - 12 JULY 2010

Further to Minute No. 38(2) of the meeting held on 28 July 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director that provided an overview of the policing and cleansing costs associated with the Orange Parade on 12 July 2010 and the views of local retailers on the impact of the Parade on their businesses.

The report indicated that the policing costs for the event was £3,600 and that this was a Merseyside-wide cost rather than specific to Southport; and that following contributions from the Orange Lodge, the net cost to the Council for toilet and skip provision and street cleansing for the event was £657.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report on the feedback on the Orange Parade be noted; and
- (2) the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director be requested to submit a further report to a future meeting of the Area Committee providing more detailed information on the views of local retailers on the impact of the Parade on their businesses.

82. REVIEW OF DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE SOUTHPORT AREA COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director seeking determination of a proposal to bring forward the deadline for the submission of Public Forum questions from 15 minutes before the start of meetings (or 3.00 p.m. for fax or on-line submissions) to noon on the Tuesday on the day before the meeting.

The report indicated that the proposal would allow more time for officers to provide answers prior to the meeting to questions raised by members of the public.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) for a six month trial period, the deadline for the submission of Public Forum questions be brought forward to 12.00 noon on the Tuesday immediately prior to the day of the meeting on the Wednesday; and

- (2) the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director be requested to submit a report on the outcomes of the revised arrangement.

83. AREA MANAGEMENT UPDATE

The Committee considered the report of the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director on the area management activities that had taken place in Southport since the last meeting.

The report indicated that the Neighbourhoods Division provided a co-ordination role for dealing with area issues. Queries were forwarded to the Neighbourhoods Division in a number of ways, via a number of different sources; and that in order for Members to be aware of progress made on these issues the area management report had been compiled.

Partner Agencies would also be included in this report in the future to update Members as to how other agencies were working on area issues. The provision of this information would enable better co-ordination and would feed into future neighbourhood plans.

RESOLVED:

That the Area Management Update report be noted.

84. PREVIOUS QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE OPEN FORUM

The Committee considered correspondence relating to the above.

RESOLVED:

That the correspondence be noted.

85. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Neighbourhoods and Investment Programmes Director be requested to submit a report on the future arrangements for Southport Town Centre management; and
- (2) further to Minute No. 26 (1)(ii) of 16 June 2010, the Planning and Economic Development Director submit reports on:
 - (a) parking issues in Hawkeshead Street, Southport, between Kestrel Court and Zetland Street; and
 - (b) parking issues in York Road, Southport, between Weld Road and Bickerton Road;

where parking of vehicles on both sides of the road in both locations can cause problems for through traffic.

86. POLICE ISSUES

Members of the public/Councillors raised the following issues:

- how many arrests for arson had been made in the Southport area? Inspector Fairbrother indicated that he did not have this information available to him at the meeting
- did the Police make recommendations to the Council about street lighting blackspots and designing out crime? Inspector Fairbrother advised that he did and that the Police undertook environmental investigations to aid crime reduction
- what activity had been undertaken to target people driving their vehicles whilst using hand held mobile phones. Sergeant Riding advised of Operation Spotlight, an operation to combat driving offences that resulted in a number of fixed penalty notices being issued
- had any arrests been made relating to several burglaries that had occurred in the Dunbar Road / Ryder Crescent area? Inspector Fairbrother indicated that there had been a small increase in burglaries in defined areas and such areas had been targeted by the Police to highlight crime prevention measures that could be taken
- where do the people arrested at weekends in Southport Town Centre live? Inspector Fairbrother indicated that 80% of offenders arrested lived within a 5/6 mile radius of the Town Centre
- where any policing problems experienced in relation to the recent Flower Show, Air Show and Fireworks event in Southport? Inspector Fairbrother indicated that a de-brief to discuss this matter would take place shortly. However, he was aware of traffic congestion problems due to the events
- information was sought on the number of youths involved in crime. Inspector Fairbrother indicated that the number of young people involved in crimes in Southport was consistently low.
- did ASBO's work? Inspector Fairbrother advised that many interventions took place before an ASBO was introduced; that 96% of young people complied with such interventions and no further action was required; and therefore, that 4% of young people who came into contact with the Police were subject to the introduction of ASBO's. 40% of the ASBO's were breached and this resulted in

approximately 98% of the interventions taken by the Police being successful.

RESOLVED:

That Inspector Fairbrother and Sergeant Riding be thanked for their attendance.

87. PUBLIC FORUM

During the Public Forum, the following questions/comments/petitions were submitted:

Questions (a) to (p) all relate to the Southport Cycle Town Proposed Cycle Track - Birkdale to Ainsdale.

(a) Mr. R. Ayres indicated that it was with some considerable concern that he placed on record to the Area Committee the failings of the Applicant, Sefton Council, in the manner of progression of this project in its failure to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (England and Wales) 1999 and subsequent revisions. There was a statutory requirement for the applicant, or the Planning Department or the Secretary of State to assess the environmental impact of this project through the Ainsdale and Birkdale LNR via a formal Screening Opinion and for the Opinion to be within the Public domain as part of the planning process. Throughout the Borough, where the cyclepath had been developed within the area of the SSSI and the Sefton Coast Natura 2000 no Officer of the applicant's team or the LPA had been able to provide any evidence that the statutory requirement had been complied with. This was a fundamental breach of the officers duties. He noted that the impression given to Members in the report to the Area Committee failed to provide any indication of these failings on their part and that it was economic and biased with the information provided to Members. Our coastline and dune habitat was one of the most internationally important and recognised areas in Europe and Members failure to respect this would be challenged. The proposed development would by many learned persons and bodies have a significant impact on the natural environment and hence in any independent assessment of the proposed development it should be subject to the rigors of an Environmental Impact Assessment. If Members felt committed to permit this project to proceed would they direct the applicant and Officers to undertake a full Environmental Impact Assessment in accordance with the published guidelines of Natural England and the accepted survey methodology for completing the required habitat, environmental, wildlife and ecology surveys that would satisfy the requirements of the EIA Regs. In so doing they should allow the public to understand the financial commitment that this would place upon the Council, publish the availability of this funding which an independent 3rd party estimated would exceed that currently left as a balance from expenditure to date by the Cycle Team. Were Members truly able to commit and justify the need of this project taking account of the

requirements or did they wish to continue the previous practices of breaching their need to comply with the EIA Regs?

Mr. D. McAleavy, Head of Coast and Countryside Service, indicated that there were two parts to this in that the Council was the applicant and Local Planning Authority and an EIA was something that the Planning Authority would advise an applicant was required. As yet the application had not been submitted and the Planning Authority had not yet advised that an EIA was required. On this basis an EIA had not been undertaken.

(b) Mr. A. Blackburn asked could Councillors assure him that building would never, ever, be allowed on this last remaining area of natural sand hills within the coast road? This area was easily accessible to residents of Southport and Ainsdale on foot.

Councillor Weavers indicated that provided the site remained as a SSSI, then yes.

(c) Mrs. L. Hilton asked why had the officers gone against some of the key design features Cycling England recommended in their Toolkit for Cycle Towns? In this Technical Support document supplied to all cycle towns, it clearly stated that they should "consider last the conversion of footways/footpaths to shared-use for pedestrians and cyclists".

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that the guidance was aimed at urban routes, not leisure routes, as was the case in this instance. Such leisure routes were already used in Southport and had been designed in consultation with Cycling England.

(d) Mr. D. Phipps asked had the following technical and financial matters been adequately considered and if so, where may the resulting reports and information be found? (a) The process appeared to be driven by the availability of grant monies. However, the grant was for capital expenditure only. If there was any over-run on construction costs which budget had been identified to support such expenditure? (b) Given the natural instability of the sand substrate what were the estimated maintenance costs over a 5, 10 and 25 year period if the project went ahead? (c) it was suggested that Adpave25 might be suitable as a re-inforcing material. The information in Adpave's brochure did not seem to support this. What trials and/or consideration of previous long term use on similar ground conditions had been considered? (From Adpaves web site: Adpave25 would help provide protection to grassed surfaces from light traffic. However, it would not compensate for weak ground conditions where more structural solutions were necessary. To determine whether Adpave 25 might be appropriate for your application, try this simple test; Test To determine suitability: If you can drive a vehicle onto the area in test without significant rutting occurring after a period of heavy rain, then Adpave 25 should be suitable.

http://www.adpsurfacesolutions.co.uk/adp_tech_litpdfs/adp16_25.pdf

Accessed 05/10/2010 (d) What guarantee was given for the lifetime of the proposed (or similar) polymer net support. Particularly, what would be the rate of embrittlement which might lead to fracture and premature failure?

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that maintenance costs had been factored into the proposal; and that guidance and information from other areas where such proposals had been introduced showed that maintenance costs were minimal.

Mr. Phipps asked a supplementary question that had a track been introduced elsewhere on exactly the same surface conditions as those in the Birkdale to Ainsdale sand dunes.

Mr. Marrin indicated that he was unaware of a track being introduced on exactly the same surface.

(e) Mrs. A. M. Willets asked with regard to the Birkdale to Ainsdale cycle track, how many consultation responses were from postcodes within the area sent consultation packs and how many outside? How many responses were made online and how many by post? How many of the online responses included the respondents name and address as well as the postcode, how many included postcode only? How many were from the same individual ip addresses and what precautions were put in place to prevent the corruption of the consultation process by a single respondent completing the online form multiple times?

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that names and addresses were used in the collation of responses.

(f) Dr. R. Hamilton asked when many hundreds of local people took the time and effort to become involved in Sefton Council consultation exercises, such as the Birkdale to Ainsdale Cycle Track, what assurances did local Councillors give to the people of Southport that the balance of voices of those participating in these consultation exercises would be acted upon.

The Chair indicated that Councillors would make their views known during the consideration of the report later in the meeting.

(g) Ms. H. Goadsby asked had Natural England given their formal assent to the scheme, and if so, what had they based their decision on, as there had been no recent comprehensive reports carried out on rare species such as sand lizards, natterjacks and great crested newts and she believed a bat survey had not been conducted either.

Mr. D. McAleavy, Head of Coast and Countryside Service advised that surveys and assessments had been carried out in respect of Natterjack Toad, Great Crested New and Sand Lizard and that advice on whether a bat survey should be carried out was sought. In this instance it was felt that the proposed path would not have an impact on bats and a survey was not carried out.

Ms. Goadsby asked as a supplementary question whether surveys were funded by Cycling England grant or the Council.

Mr. McAleavy indicated by both.

(h) Ms. M. Pope asked if wheelchair and mobility buggy users were to be provided with access to the proposed cyclepath, how would motorcycles be prevented from using the same access?

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that access controls would be incorporated into the scheme at both entrances/exits to the track.

(i) Mr. A. Percy stated that with regard to the proposed Cycle Track - Birkdale to Ainsdale, the proposed cycletrack cellular material was Adpave 25. The manufacturers said on their website that Adpave 25 would help provide protection to grassed surfaces from light traffic. However, it would not compensate for weak ground conditions where more structural solutions were necessary. They also recommended that a test should be carried out to determine suitability. Why was Adpave considered suitable, when the existing path surface was sand not grass and sand dunes were a weak ground condition, also was a test carried out on the dunes as recommended by the manufacturer?

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that site meetings had been held with the manufacturer and the ground conditions had been discussed.

Mr. Percy asked as a supplementary question whether long term testing had been undertaken.

Mr. Marrin responded that it had not.

(j) Mr. I. Thompson asked on what basis and criteria did the Council think Netpave 25 was suitable to be used and laid on to freshly disturbed sand?

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that site meetings had been held with the manufacturer and the ground conditions had been discussed.

(k) Ms. S. Brown stated that the initial discussions focused on a proposal to move the route a few metres into the dunes adjacent to the Coastal Road, to follow the line of the original Trans Pennine Trail footpath and to use a cellular paving material for the route.

Funding of £250,000 was subsequently confirmed by Cycling England.

Therefore, why had the Council stated that the money had to be used on this particular route through the heart of the dunes and why would the Council not go back to the original proposal?

Mr. D. McAleavy, Head of Coast and Countryside Service, indicated that there would be no additional benefit by resorting to the original route; whilst the proposed route would provide access for all through the dunes.

(l) Mr. D. Irving stated that on the 22 February 2010 a meeting took place between Ocean Parcs Pontins Southport Holiday Park, Local Community/Business Representatives, and members of Sefton Council. A question was asked at this meeting if there were plans to incorporate cycling within the development.

Minutes were taken of this meeting and Paragraph 6 K of the minutes stated that JB (John Barnes of Fitton Estates acting on behalf of Ocean Parcs) responded to this question by stating that the cycle access was being addressed by Dave McAleavy of Sefton Council.

Mr. Irving stated that he presumed a meeting took place and his question was were there any minutes of this meeting between Dave McAleavy and Ocean Parcs and could he see them.

Mr. D. McAleavy, Head of Coast and Countryside Service, advised that he had attended numerous meetings with Ocean Parcs Pontins and that at no time was he asked about cycling issues. If he had been he would have referred it to his colleagues.

Mr. D. Irving asked as a supplementary question what Mr. D. McAleavy considered would constitute as inappropriate use of the dunes.

Mr. McAleavy indicated that inappropriate use would be motorcycling, camping and setting fires.

(m) Ms. Y. Irving asked if the proposed track was designed for Multi Use, what safety factors would be in place to protect walkers, toddlers and disabled people from those misusing the path? She had a personal reason for asking this and had first hand evidence of her own that put into question the remotest possibility of any form of safety measures working.

Mr D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that no specific safety measures had been incorporated into the proposal.

Mr. Irving asked a supplementary question that as there was a law against cyclists sharing the pavement with pedestrians, why was this scheme proposed.

Mr. Marrin advised that the proposal was not a pavement and that there were many 'shared use' facilities in Southport.

(n) Ms. M. Horridge asked could the Council reassure her that Adpave pieces would not be turning up, in a protected site for decades ahead.

Mr. D. Marrin, Traffic Services Manager, advised that this technical matter had been discussed with the manufacturer and that the material was used elsewhere in the Country

Ms. Horrridge stated as a supplementary comment that the track at Portland Street was breaking up.

Mr. Marrin advised that it was a very different material in use in Portland Street and that building contractors using heavy plant had been crossing the surface.

(o) Ms. I. Parry asked could the Council reassure her that there would be zero damage to the protected site?

Mr. D. McAleavy advised that the planning process would determine this matter following site assessments and surveys.

(p) Mr. R. Worden indicated that he would like the area to remain as it was. There were no houses in view and no traffic noise. Why should a lovely, serene place like this be opened to noise and thereby spoil the existing amenities.

(q) Mr. J. Baguley stated that earlier this year, there was a major pot hole repaired near to the level crossing at Aughton Road and Upper Aughton Road in Birkdale but, however, this appeared to have been a temporary fix and was now looking dangerous again. Mr. Baguley asked was the Council going to resurface the roads properly as they were main B roads, bus routes and had large volumes of traffic using them.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning and Economic Development Director be requested to respond in writing to Mr. Baguley.

(r) Councillor B. Rimmer, asked on behalf of S. Caunce, whether the Area Committee was aware of the disruption of traffic and parking that was occurring in Market Street during the present renovation process?

The businesses in Market Street were heavily dependant on passing trade, but because of the present restrictions they were suffering badly.

Numerous parking bays had already been removed to assist in the renovation and the demand for the remaining spaces had increased further both by contractors parking, personal traffic and extra traffic generation during Farmers Market and similar events.

Business indicators had been blocked to such an extent that visitors were not aware of the traders' existence.

Would the Area Committee support the following suggestions:

- (1) that contractors/sub contractors be instructed to park their personal transport elsewhere during the renovation period;
- (2) that as a temporary measure, appropriate signs be erected to indicate the presence of existing businesses
- Note: This was done during the closure of St. Lukes Road Bridge;
and
- (3) that an officer of the Council be made available to co-ordinate between the contractors and existing business.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning and Economic Development Director be requested to respond in writing to S. Counce.

- (s) Ms. C. Edlin asked:
 - (1) what was the exact progress on cycle lanes and speed table plans for Wennington Road?
 - (2) what was the start date for any works;
 - (3) what was being done about the flooding outside her property, on the road, before any works commenced;
 - (4) a "Norwood Focus" leaflet stated ... "The rest of the scheme got the go-ahead from most residents". What constitutes "most" and when was the second round of consultation?
 - (5) when was the next meeting re: Wennington Road to be held as several residents, opposing speed table plans, wished to attend.
 - (6) If there was no structural damage potential to having a speed table outside her property then she assumed the Council would bear the cost of a full structural survey of her property before and after any speed tables were put in.

Ms. Edlin concluded that she was very unhappy about the flooding outside her home and the proposed speed tables.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning and Economic Development Director be requested to respond in writing to Ms. Edlin.

- (t) Ms. L. Keith stated that she understood that a major planning application by Sainsburys Ltd, in Crosby had recently been turned down for reasons that were not altogether clear and in opposition to the clear recommendation of the planning officer.

If the applicant appealed and was successful, she also understood that the costs of the appeal could well be awarded against the Council and might well be of the order of £150,000 to £200,000.

Ms. Keith concluded that if the Council were to lose, would the costs of the Appeal be borne by the individual Councillors who voted against the proposal or would they have to be paid, in part, by Southport Council Tax payers?

RESOLVED:

That the Interim Head of Corporate Legal Services be requested to respond in writing to Ms. Keith.

(u) Mr. T. Dawson asked whether the Councillors present could tell him roughly how many individual complaints they had received about the principles of the Alternate Weekly Collection system during the month of September and what they had they done as a result of those complaints?

All Members responded to Mr. Dawson and from the responses, one Member had received one complaint.

Mr. Dawson asked as a supplementary question that given that the last costing of the re-introduction of a weekly collection of 'grey' waste produced by the Director of Finance was approximately £7 million per annum, which vital services provided by the Council would the Councillors like to cut in order to re-introduce such a system - or would they prefer to clobber the Council Tax Payers instead?

88. SOUTHPORT CYCLE TOWN PROPOSED CYCLE TRACK - BIRKDALE TO AINSDALE

Further to Minute No. 6 of the meeting held on 26 May 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director advising of the current position regarding the Southport Cycle Town Proposed Cycle Track - Birkdale to Ainsdale.

The report indicated that the consultation exercise on the cycle track had now been completed and that of the 956 responses received to the exercise, 604 (63%) were in favour of the proposal, whilst 352 (37%) were opposed. Annex C to the report provided details of the responses received.

The report concluded that the Cabinet Member - Technical Services had to resolve whether or not to proceed with the Planning Application for this proposal; that the many benefits of the scheme had been set out in the report, but the scale of local concerns raised was recognised; and hence the views of the Area Committee would inform the Cabinet Member in deciding a way forward.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report on the proposed Southport Cycle Town - Birkdale to Ainsdale Cycle Track be noted;
- (2) the Cabinet Member - Technical Services be recommended to not proceed with the proposal.

(In accordance with Rule 18.5 of the Council and Committee Procedure Rules:

- (i) Councillors Glover, Hands, Jones, Pearson, Porter, Preece, B. Rimmer, D. Rimmer and Sir Ron Watson requested that their vote in support of the above resolution be recorded; and
- (ii) Councillors Booth, McGuire and Weavers requested that their vote opposing the above resolution be recorded.)

89. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:

That in accordance with the agreed programme of meetings for this Area Committee, the next meeting be held on **Wednesday, 17 November 2010, at the Town Hall, Southport, commencing at 6.30 p.m.**