

Public Document Pack

THE "CALL-IN" PERIOD FOR THIS SET OF MINUTES ENDS AT 12 NOON ON THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2010. MINUTE NOS. 37 TO 40 ARE NOT SUBJECT TO "CALL-IN"

CROSBY AREA COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD AT THE SING PLUS, CAMBRIDGE ROAD, SEAFORTH ON WEDNESDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 2010

PRESENT: Councillor Hough (in the Chair)
Councillor Veidman (Vice-Chair)
Councillors Barber, Cummins, Dorgan, Gibson, Hill, McGinnity, Papworth, Parry, Tonkiss and Webster
Parish Councillors B. Draper and K. Hounsell

ALSO PRESENT: Inspector N. Turner and Inspector D. Prosser,
Merseyside Police
16 Members of the Public

33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Parish Councillor West.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

35. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

36. POLICE ISSUES

Inspector Turner indicated that this was the last Area Committee meeting he would be attending and he introduced his successor, Neighbourhood Inspector Diane Prosser. He also thanked the Members of the Committee and the public for the support he had received during his time as Neighbourhood Inspector.

Inspector Turner reported on crime statistics for August, 2010, comparing them with the statistics for the same period in 2008 and 2009, as follows:-

	August 2008	August 2009	August 2010
All Crime	232	211	197
Violent Crime	36	23	32
Robbery	2	2	3
Burglary Dwelling	12	22	22
Unauthorised Theft/Taking of a Motor Vehicle	9	3	4

	August 2008	August 2009	August 2010
Theft from a Motor Vehicle	9	14	10
Criminal Damage	58	33	41

Inspector Turner referred to other recent Police activity, including a number of people who had been charged with burglary; Anti-Social Behaviour Orders which had been approved; a forthcoming crime prevention initiative involving an “interactive house” display in South Road, Waterloo; three arrest warrants which had been successfully executed at a “problem address” in Church Ward in relation to illegal drugs and anti-social behaviour; the cessation of Operation Beachsafe on 5 September which resulted in the seizure of alcohol and vehicles which were being driven in an anti-social manner; and plans to increase operations to counteract burglaries, especially in view of the impending darker nights and bonfire period.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Area Committee’s appreciation of Inspector Turner’s contribution to policing in the Crosby area be recorded; and
- (2) Inspector Prosser be welcomed to the area and congratulated on her new role.

37. OPEN FORUM

The following matters were raised during the Open Forum:

- (a) Mr. D. Wallworth referred to a report in the “Champion” newspaper dated 18 August 2010 which stated that the “Iron Men” cost Sefton taxpayers £50,000 a year to maintain and asked if this was true, bearing in mind an email he had received on 30 March 2007 from the Planning and Economic Development Director. This email had indicated that it was intended that no Council resources would be required for the acquisition of the iron men or for their further maintenance. However, the email had indicated that the Council had considered a range of service improvements to the management and supervision of the beach to satisfy the concerns of the Merseyside Coastguard and Natural England.

Mrs. J. Maxwell, the Neighbourhood Engagement Co-ordinator, explained that she had consulted the appropriate departments about Mr. Wallworth’s question and when their detailed comments were received, she would arrange for a written response to be sent to him.

- (b) Ms. A. Peters asked if there were any proposals for traffic calming or even measuring the volume of traffic passing through Moorside Road, Crosby. She added that this road was used as a “rat run” for vehicles trying to avoid Moor Lane at busy times. She stated that

vehicles often travelled up and down the road at over 30 mph which was not acceptable in this sort of residential road. The problem had now worsened in the last few weeks since the traffic calming measures had been put in Brownmoor Lane. She had previously been told that there needed to be some sort of accident before any traffic calming could be considered. She felt that it was only a matter of time before there was a serious accident as there have been a few near misses. She asked if there was any possibility of some sort of traffic count.

Mr. J. Dwyer of the Traffic Management Section had forwarded a written response to Ms. Peters. This explained that residential roads such as Moorside Road, Crosby were identified for potential traffic calming measures through the Urban Safety Management (USM) Review. Under the USM Review, residential areas were divided into 'cells' bounded by main roads or other boundaries such as canals/fields/motorways/railways etc. Cell 13 which included Moorside Road and was bounded by Chesterfield Road/The Northern Road/Moor Lane and Brownmoor Lane was included in the USM Review that was carried out in 2009. At present the Council was only prioritising areas (cells) where there have been seven or more recorded injury accidents in the last three years. At the time of the last review there were less than seven accidents in cell 13, so the area was not included in any of the USM programmes. The latest three year study period revealed just two minor injury accidents within the cell and, therefore, it was unlikely that the area would be prioritised if the accident record stays as it is when future reviews are carried out. However, the formal USM Review would be carried out later this financial year and if by that time the accident record had deteriorated to such an extent that there were seven or more accidents in the cell, then the area would be included in future programmes. In the meantime, Mr. Dwyer would arrange for an automatic traffic count to assess speed and volume of vehicles using Moorside Road because of Ms. Peters's concerns of 'rat-running' and excessive speed. He had offered to write to her again once he had the findings of the traffic count, but this may take up to six weeks due to the time it took to process the data.

- (c) Mr. D. McLean indicated that the recent planning report stated that the new Sainsbury's, if accepted, would provide an anchor for the east of the centre and the sub-divided units providing complementary retail offer to the west and as such this should give rise to a vibrant centre. He stated that this was a sentiment echoed by others and asked what enquiries and checks had Members made to assure themselves that should this development go ahead as proposed, this would be the case given that Sainsbury's representatives had openly stated that they have no other interested parties to enter Crosby Village. He also indicated that he had visited the allegedly comparable store in Urmston and 9 of the

14 retail units were vacant, so he could not see how the Crosby store was going to be sustainable.

Mr. J. Alford, the Assistant Director of Planning and Economic Development, commented that the Planning Committee's role now was to consider the planning application submitted by Sainsbury's. Government advice in Planning Policy Statements was that issues of need were matters for the applicant. The Council was not in a position to require evidence of future occupation. The application sets out how the development proposals could be implemented in a phased manner. It would not be in Sainsbury's interest to retain vacant accommodation. The Planning and Economic Development Director had been advised that potential interested parties were unlikely to come forward until the planning position on the new store was clear. He could not comment on the Urmston store because he had not visited it.

- (d) Ms. B. Mason asked if anyone could explain how Sainsbury's plans were going to be for the good of Crosby residents, when half the village would be demolished. She also asked if anyone in the Council realised that Maghull Developments hardly actually developed anything at all. She stated that this company sold on the land/buildings etc. that they acquired after they had fallen into disrepair. This then became ideal for someone like Sainsbury's to walk in and buy up the land. She added that the survey conducted on the weekend of 4 September 2010, clearly showed that not only residents, but also visitors to Crosby Village were against the plans in the current form. Many visitors also said that they came into Crosby because they like the atmosphere and that if Sainsbury's built this huge store, then for their day out they would continue on into Formby. She asked if this was what was wanted.

Mr. Alford commented that the Planning Committee had an obligation to consider the planning application submitted by Sainsbury's. The viability and vitality of District centres was one of the key policies in the Council's Development Plan. Sainsbury's was a major retailer in the centre and a major landowner. Food shopping in supermarkets was a feature of most of our towns and cities. The Planning Committee had to consider a wide range of planning issues and representations in relation to the application and make its judgement.

- (e) Parish Councillor West referred to a series of complaints from a resident who resided adjacent to the Children's Playground situated near Thornbeck Avenue, Hightown regarding the height of some trees which prevented him from receiving adequate television transmission for his Sky channel. He asked if a site meeting could be arranged so that the possibility of pruning the trees referred to could be discussed.

Mrs. Maxwell indicated that a site meeting had already been held and it had been decided that the trees in question would be trimmed back within the next three months. She agreed to confirm this information in a written response to Parish Councillor West.

- (f) Ms. N. Farrell asked, regardless of current planning proposals by Sainsbury's, if the Council would consider restricting parking or access at the Little Crosby Road end of De Villiers Avenue to alleviate congestion and prevent its use as a "rat run".

Mr. Alford indicated that Sainsbury's proposed to implement a staff travel plan which would ensure that staff consider and take up alternative modes of transport to and from the store. The travel plan would be monitored and updated in accordance with a schedule to be agreed and set out in the plan. De Villiers Avenue had been specifically identified (and scheduled) within a planning condition covering the potential to implement a residents Privileged Parking Scheme subject to a pre- and post-evaluation/impact process. The Council would consider such a proposal at that time.

A number of Members referred to their understanding of Sainsbury's proposals in relation to parking. Mr. Alford agreed to request Mr. B. Mason of the Highways Development Control Section to inform Councillor McGinnity of Sainsbury's proposals for parking.

The Chair indicated that he would seek clarification from Sainsbury's about whether parking for residents of De Villiers Avenue was proposed for implementation immediately if the development was approved and he agreed to notify Ms. Farrell of the outcome of his enquiries.

- (g) Mr. T. Whittaker stated that since Sainsbury's proposed to employ more staff, more would therefore come to work by car and park in nearby streets. He felt that "residents only" parking would merely push the problem elsewhere. He asked if Sainsbury's would pay for staff parking in the proposed new car parks.

Mr. Alford indicated that Sainsbury's had prepared a full highways assessment on traffic flows and safety, but the question of paying for staff parking was a matter for them.

- (h) Mr. K. Downes indicated that paragraph 10.79 of the Planning report submitted by the Planning and Economic Development Director on the Sainsbury's application stated "In my view the Council will have fulfilled its obligation to existing traders as far as possible by requesting that the applicant provides complete evidence that they have asked existing traders exactly what they required, in a prescribed form, and for the combined answers to dictate the level of temporary occupation constructed". Mr. Downes asked if Councillors elected to represent the Wards that include

many traders who both live and work in the affected area, were satisfied that Sainsbury's have asked traders what they required and, if so, why.

Mr. Alford commented that paragraphs 10.76 - 10.86 of the report explained the background to a proposal to provide temporary accommodation on an adjoining site in the District Centre. The matter had been raised with Sainsbury's who were bringing forward a possible solution which had sufficient flexibility to meet a range of needs. Neither the Council nor Sainsbury's were in a position to know how many, if any, of the existing traders wished to take up this opportunity.

A number of members of the public and Councillors raised doubts about whether Sainsbury's had properly consulted with existing traders. Mr. Alford agreed to draw this to the attention of the agents acting for Sainsbury's and Mrs. Maxwell agreed to request her colleague, Ms. Nicky Owen, who was the Crosby and Waterloo Business Village Manager, to pursue this issue.

38. PROPOSED A565 ROUTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

Further to Minute No. 86 of 5 November 2008 and Minute No. 142 of the Cabinet Member - Technical Services meeting of 24 February 2010, the Committee considered the report of the Planning and Economic Development Director inviting the Committee to comment on and endorse the final proposals for the above Strategy and Action Plan.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Strategy and Action Plan set out in the report be noted; and
- (2) the Planning and Economic Development Director be requested to re-examine the proposals for the College Road junction set out as item B5 on the proposed Action Plan annexed to the report.

39. MISCHIEF/BONFIRE NIGHTS PERIOD 2010 - REQUEST FOR FUNDING

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director, Safer, Stronger Communities requesting funding for firework displays on Friday, 5 November 2010, including one at the Crosby Lakeside Adventure Centre. The report set out detailed statistical information which demonstrated the positive effect of such diversionary activities in reducing the incidence of criminal damage and anti-social behaviour in previous years. The report also indicated that the total cost of the proposed display at the Adventure Centre was £6,800 and a contribution of £3,800 was requested from the Area Committee's delegated budget to add to the combined Merseyside Police and Safer, Stronger Communities budget contribution of £3,000.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) subject to the appropriate officers investigating other potential sources of funding, including sponsorship and any fundraising surplus realised on the night, the sum of £666, representing the Crosby-wide element of the current delegated budget, be allocated to offset the shortfall in the cost of staging the Crosby firework display;
- (2) a further £783.50, representing a quarter of the remaining funding shortfall, be allocated from the Church Ward element of the delegated budget and the Blundellsands, Manor and Victoria Ward Members be requested to consider allocating a similar amount from their shares of the delegated budget; and
- (3) the dissent of Councillor Tonkiss from resolutions (1) and (2) above, be recorded.

40. BUDGET MONITORING

Further to Minute No. 28 of the meeting held on 7 July 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 £42,620.66 and setting out details of the progress of schemes for which funding had previously been approved.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Ward budgets for 2010/11 be noted;
- (2) the ongoing schemes for which funding was provided in 2009/10 be noted; and
- (3) the Leisure Director be requested to inform all Members of the Committee of which roads in Crosby were visited by the judges as part of the recent Britain in Bloom competition.

41. PREVIOUS QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE OPEN FORUM

Copies of responses to issues raised at previous meetings of the Committee were submitted for information.

RESOLVED:

That the correspondence be noted.

42. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the next meeting be held at **6.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 6 October 2010, at the Pavilion, Waterloo Rugby Club, St. Anthony's Road, Blundellsands.**