

Part I: Proposal TR1 - New Railway Stations

TR1/4 Beechwood; Noctorum

Proposal TR2 - New Park and Ride Facilities

TR2/2 Hoylake; TR2/3 Bidston

Proposal TR3 - New or Extended Railway Car Parks; and supporting text

TR3/7 Woodchurch Road, Prenton

PROPOSAL TR1 - NEW RAILWAY STATIONS; TR1/4 Beechwood; Noctorum

PROPOSAL TR2 - NEW PARK AND RIDE FACILITIES;

TR2/2 - Hoylake; TR2/3 - Bidston

PROPOSAL TR3 - NEW OR EXTENDED RAILWAY CAR PARKS;

TR3/7 - Woodchurch Road, Prenton; Written Statement Paragraph 15.10

OBJECTIONS: 070/11, 070/12 GO-M 004/1 to 004/3 Mr A T Garrett

COUNTER-OBJECTIONS: 090/E, 090-F, 090/G Mr D I Maurice Jones

Summary of Objections

- 15.1 Proposals TR1, TR2 and TR3 should be clarified by reference to the reservation of land for new stations. The park and ride facilities at Hoylake and Bidston would be in the Green Belt. Paragraph 15.10 of the Written Statement anticipates the content of the revised PPG2 *Green Belts*¹ and assumes that reference to park and ride facilities as 'appropriate development' will remain in the PPG or that a case for exceptional circumstances can be made (070/11, 070/12).
- 15.2 There should be more commitment by the Council/Merseytravel to the Wrexham-Bidston railway line. Proposals should be more detailed, with a clearer statement about funding. A new station site for the Beechwood Estate should be found. Park and Ride facilities should be developed at Upton Station. A new station/park and ride should serve the Noctorum/Woodchurch Estates. A site should be designated at Woodchurch Road, Prenton for a new station, with park and ride. The UDP should provide for improvements to Heswall Station² (004/1-3).
- 15.3 The proposals subject to published changes to Proposals TR1, TR2 and TR3³ should be identified on the Proposals Map by the delineation of the site boundaries as well as by a symbol (090/E, 090/F, 090/G)⁴.

¹ The revised version of PPG2 was subsequently published in January 1995.

² The Council submitted at the inquiry that the references to a new station at Noctorum and the possible improvement at Heswall Station should be disregarded, as they were not referred to in the Objector's original representations. Whatever the merits of this I consider it helpful in the context of the Objector's other representations to take these representations into account.

³ ALT/TRANSPORT/002 (CD056, page 196), ALT/TRANSPORT/003 (CD056, page 197) and ALT/TRANSPORT/004 (CD056, page 198).

⁴ Although the Council have implicitly cast doubt upon whether these Counter-objections were 'duly made', I consider that they can be taken to be a response to the proposal in each case to refer to the *reservation*, rather than the development, of land. I therefore consider the Counter-objections on their merits.

Assessment and Conclusions

15.4 The published changes to Proposals TR1, TR2 and TR3 do in my view rectify the cause of the criticism that the Proposals go beyond land use planning considerations. The proposed amendments to the supporting text in response to misgivings about the status of some park and ride sites in Green Belt policy terms⁵ make it clear that in all probability the proposals at Bidston (TR2/3) and Hoylake (TR2/2) would amount to 'inappropriate development' and could therefore only be justified if 'exceptional circumstances' were found⁶. This may not place the UDP directly at odds with current policy in PPG2, but it does in my view mean that development is contemplated in the Plan which might go against the normal application of Green Belt policy.

15.5 The implication of the proposed amendment to Paragraph 15.10 is that any planning applications for park and ride facilities at Bidston and Hoylake may have to be treated as departures from the development plan, with possible reference to the Secretary of State. In the absence of any Counter-objection to the amended Proposal TR2 or Paragraph 15.10 I do not suggest any further change to the Plan. However, it means in practice that whilst land is being reserved for park and ride facilities, there is no absolute assurance that any necessary planning permission will be granted because of the Green Belt implications.

15.6 Because the UDP is a land use Plan there is no justification in my view for the detail to be provided in the Plan which would be expected to be provided in planning applications for new stations or enhanced facilities at existing stations. Development plan proposals must be realistic and mindful of the available resources, and it would be inadvisable in my view to insert into the UDP any statement about funding which was not committed or at least reasonably assured⁷. The UDP makes provision for a new station to serve the Beechwood Estate, namely Proposal TR1(b)/4. The evidence presented to the inquiry does not clearly point to the need to provide extensive park and ride facilities in the proposed location at Fender Way, which may attract non-local traffic into the residential area. It is unlikely therefore that there will be any hidden land use implications in this proposal as it stands.

15.7 There may be a case for further consideration to be given to the need for a further new station to serve the Noctorum and Woodchurch Estates. The fact that this would result in three stations at Woodchurch Road (Prenton), Noctorum and Beechwood relatively close together is not in my view fatal on its own. The Council point out that this issue was examined

⁵ A published change to Paragraph 15.10 of the Written Statement, ALT/TRANSPORT/005 (CD056, page 199).

⁶ I recommend on page 137 of this report that the land adjoining Bidston Station be part of the proposed Green Belt in the M53 corridor. The land at Hoylake is in the approved Green Belt.

⁷ See the guidance in PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*, paragraph 5.20.

Part I: Proposal TR1 - New Railway Stations

TR1/4 Beechwood; Noctorum

Proposal TR2 - New Park and Ride Facilities

TR2/2 Hoylake; TR2/3 Bidston

Proposal TR3 - New or Extended Railway Car Parks; and supporting text

TR3/7 Woodchurch Road, Prenton

in the 1992 Merseytravel Study; the conclusion was reached that a station at Noctorum would not be justified, as passenger needs could be adequately served at Upton and Woodchurch Road (TR1(b)/5). The case for a station at Noctorum may be improved if land at the former Old Birkenians Rugby Club, Noctorum Way were to be developed for housing, an issue I report on elsewhere⁸. I note that the case for Noctorum is to be re-examined by consultants. Even if that process resulted in due course in a firm proposal that a station be developed at Noctorum there is no case in my view for representing the proposal in the UDP at the present time.

15.8 It is for the Council with Merseytravel and others to formulate park and ride and car parking strategies in a process mindful of, but separate from, the UDP. The reasons for taking up the schemes mentioned in Proposals TR2 and TR3 are briefly explained in Paragraphs 15.9 to 15.11 of the Written Statement. Whilst there may be a case for providing some parking facilities at Upton station, the Council's evidence is that this is likely to prove unfeasible for reasons of cost, road safety and land contamination, and no evidence of substance was submitted to counter this view. Substantial car parking facilities are intended to be provided at the proposed station at Woodchurch Road (TR3/7), but in my view none of the evidence strongly supports a case for making this a major park and ride proposal, at least before the station is built and in use.

15.9 The Council appear to accept that improvements may be made to Heswall station at a later date, outside the present UDP plan period. There are no firm proposals in this regard and therefore in my view no case for representing them in the UDP. If there were a case for giving Heswall Station earlier attention this is a matter which should in the first instance be concluded upon and action taken outside the UDP process; it would be inappropriate for the UDP to spearhead initiatives in the absence of firm commitment from the transportation authorities and identified resources.

15.10 Whilst it might be appropriate for the extent of land *reserved* under Proposals TR1, TR2 and TR3 to be shown on the Proposals Map, such an approach would in my view only be appropriate if the extent and boundaries of such land had been clearly established. I have no evidence that this is the case; in some instances the 'land take' may be relatively small in terms of extension beyond present operational boundaries.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.11 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Proposals TR1, TR2 and TR3 in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/002 to 004, and of the Written Statement in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/005, but that no modification be made in response to Objections 004/1 to 004/3 and Counter-objections 090/E, 090/F and 090/G.

⁸ See pages 128-131 of this report.

Part II: *Proposal TR5 and supporting text - Major Highway Schemes*
TR5/1 Heron Road, Saughall Massey Road Improvement and Diversion
(Phases 1 & 2)
TR5/3 Heswall Town Centre Relief Scheme
Green Street to Canning Street Railway Line, Birkenhead

PROPOSAL TR5 - MAJOR HIGHWAY SCHEMES

Written Statement Paragraph 15.18.

TR5/1 Heron Road/Saughall Massie Road Improvement and Diversion (Phases 1 and 2)

TR5/3 Heswall Town Centre Relief Scheme

Green Street to Canning Street Railway Line, Birkenhead

OBJECTIONS: 032/3, 032/7 The Heswall Society 070/13 GO-M
088/2 Wallasey Civic Society 090/1 Mr D I Maurice Jones
129/6 British Telecommunications plc

Summary of Objections

15.12 The reference to 'subject to Policy TR8' in Proposal TR5 should be made firmer (draft suggested)(070/13). Schemes listed under Proposal TR5 should be adequately justified; it is not sufficient to include them merely because they are in the Transport Policy and Programmes (TPP)¹. In particular, the need for the Heswall Town Centre Relief Scheme (TR5/3) is not explained, nor any indication given about its content or extent (032/3). Paragraph 15.18 is irrelevant and should be deleted (032/7). Scheme TR5/3² appears to abut the Heswall Telephone Exchange, and there should be consultation with the Objector at the earliest possible stage (129/6).

15.13 The Heron Road/Saughall Massey Road Improvement and Diversion scheme should not be implemented, as it would cause increased traffic and harm the rural character of the present road. The retention of the existing road would act as a traffic calming measure (088/2). Proposal TR5 should contain measures for relieving traffic congestion in central Birkenhead by the construction of a new road along the bed of the Green Street to Canning Street Railway Line. This road in a cutting could be built over in parts, thus optimising land utilisation (090/1).

Assessment and Conclusions

15.14 A published change to Proposal TR5³ adopts the wording suggested in Objection 070/13 as better reflecting the need to ensure that environmental considerations are fully taken

¹ The Objector refers to PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*, paragraphs 5.28 to 5.32 and 5.35 and PPG13 *Transport*, paragraphs 5.1 to 5.7.

² The Scheme is referred to in the Objection as 'T5/3', and because of this and the nature of the representations, the Council consider the Objection not to have been 'duly made'. It is possible that the wrong reference could be due to a simple drafting error in the Objection, and I am reluctant therefore not to consider it for that reason. Although the representations do not amount to a clear 'objection' I propose to deal with them in this section of the report.

³ ALT/TRANSPORT/007 (CD056, page 201).

*Part II: Proposal TR5 and supporting text - Major Highway Schemes
 TR5/1 Heron Road, Saughall Massey Road Improvement and Diversion
 (Phases 1 & 2)
 TR5/3 Heswall Town Centre Relief Scheme
 Green Street to Canning Street Railway Line, Birkenhead*

into account in road schemes falling under the Proposal. The proposed amendments to the Proposal also have the effect of dividing it into two parts - the schemes identified for implementation within the Plan period, and those locations (including Heswall Town Centre) where problems of traffic congestion and vehicular/pedestrian conflict have been observed and may need to have action taken on them. To that extent, the Heswall Town Centre *Relief Scheme* has been deleted; its replacement reference TR5/8⁴ specifies no solutions, and it is assumed that appropriate consultation would take place with local interests if the need to take action emerged in due course. Any proposals would require to satisfy the criteria in Policy TR8⁵.

15.15 In these circumstances I consider Objection 032/3 to have been satisfactorily responded to. Objection 032/7 does not explain why Paragraph 15.18 of the Reasoned Justification is irrelevant; proposed amendments to that paragraph⁶ clarify the relationship between the UDP listings and the TPP. Although mainly an 'information' paragraph, 15.18 does in my view account for the inclusion of the schemes listed in accordance with relevant guidance in PPG12⁷. No reason is given for each scheme listed, but in circumstances in which some of the schemes may not require express planning permission and others will be the subject of planning permission and cannot be the subject of Objections to the UDP⁸, this does not seem to be a crucial omission. Objection 129/6 requests consultation about Proposal TR5/3 but does not suggest that the UDP needs to be modified. It therefore requires no further consideration here.

15.16 The Heron Road/Saughall Massey Road proposals (TR5/1) have been promoted in the TPP since 1987/88 and were retained in the 1996/7 bid. The scheme is now in 5 phases and this is reflected in the published amendments to Proposal TR5. The phases of the road to which Objection 088/2 refers are the subject of a planning permission granted in 1994. I agree with the Council that the representation of this part of the road scheme in Policy TR5 is now by way of 'corridor protection' than as a 'proposal'. Whatever the merits of the Objector's reasons for opposing the proposals in principle (which the Council state were not submitted for consideration at the planning application stage), these representations are not now matters which I can take into account in my recommendation on Proposal TR5⁹.

⁴ The deletion of the scheme is proposed under ALT/TRANSPORT/019 and its replacement under ALT/TRANSPORT/007 (see Footnote 3 above).

⁵ Policy TR8 - Criteria for the design of highway schemes.

⁶ ALT/TRANSPORT/009 (CD056, page 203).

⁷ See PPG12, paragraph 5.29.

⁸ See PPG12, paragraph 5.32.

⁹ PPG12, paragraph 5.32.

15.17 The operational Green Street to Canning Street Railway Line at Birkenhead was owned by Railtrack at the time of the UDP Inquiry. The Council's evidence confirmed that there was no intention to abandon the line and that the reintroduction of freight traffic had not been ruled out. It seems to me therefore that there is considerable doubt as to whether the line would be available for reuse for the purpose envisaged in Objection 090/1, or for any other purpose, in the lifetime of the UDP. I note the status of the suggested proposals for the line upon abandonment contained in the Hamilton Quarter Initiative; the fact that the Council may have considered such a scenario does not affect the availability of the line as already discussed.

15.18 Even if the line were to be abandoned and made available for other uses in the period up to 2001, I find the evidence of the Objector that a clear case exists for creating the suggested road link far from convincing. There is significant discrepancy between the conclusions reached by the Objector about traffic growth in the Queensway Tunnel and the figures produced by the Department of Transport and Merseytravel, the latter with the benefit of actual movements up to the beginning of 1996. I do not consider that the Objector's estimates can be relied upon as the basis for advocating a new road within the Central Birkenhead system; they run counter to the conclusions reached by consultants about the capability of the system as existing and presently planned (following the demolition of the Conway Street Flyover) to accommodate traffic flows up to 2010¹⁰. The Objector also appears to have attached little weight to other proposals for the development of the road system and traffic management measures¹¹, and to have overestimated the rate at which new development may influence traffic levels.

15.19 The railway line is a feature of this part of Central Birkenhead and if it were taken out of operational use careful consideration should be given to its potential in land use, design and technical terms. But that event has not taken place, and there is doubt about whether it will take place in the foreseeable future, certainly in sufficient time to enable any alternative use to be implemented within the lifetime of the Plan. I therefore conclude that there is no justification for the UDP to be modified on the lines suggested in Objection 090/1.

Inspector's recommendation

15.20 I recommend that in response to Objection 070/13 and 032/3 the UDP be modified by the amendment of Proposal TR5 and Paragraph 15.18 in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/007, 009 and 019, but that no other amendment be made in response to those Objections or Objections 088/2, 090/1 and 129.6¹².

¹⁰ See Appendix 2 to Objector's proof 90/P/1.

¹¹ The Council in particular refer to the published changes to Policy TR5 which involve the amalgamation of TR5/7 and TR5/9 and to incorporate a new road (the 'Mollington Link'), under ALT/TRANSPORT/020 (CD056, page 215 and map following).

¹² This recommendation is without prejudice to other amendments to Proposal TR5 and its supporting text proposed under ALT/TRANSPORT/017, 018 and 020 and ALT2/TRANSPORT/003.

Part II: Proposal TR6 and supporting text - Minor Highway Improvements
TR6/2 Pensby Road, Heswall
TR6/27 Appin Way Extension, Tranmere
TR6/28 Rationalisation of Queensway Tunnel Approaches, Birkenhead
TR6/29 Cleveland Street and Adjoining Roads, Birkenhead
Pearson Road/Church Road/Whetstone Lane/Holt Hill

PROPOSAL TR6 - MINOR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS;

Written Statement Paragraph 15.18

TR6/2 Pensby Road, Heswall

TR6/27 Appin Way Extension, Tranmere

TR6/28 Rationalisation of Queensway Tunnel Approaches

TR6/29 Cleveland Street and Adjoining Roads, Birkenhead

Pearson Road, Church Road, Whetstone Lane and Holt Hill, Birkenhead

OBJECTIONS: 032/4 The Heswall Society 070/14 GO-M 049/2 Ms N Christall
084/11, 084/22 to 084/24 Merseyside Development Corporation

Summary of Objections

- 15.21 The reference to 'subject to Policy TR8' in Proposal TR6 should be made firmer (draft suggested)(070/14). Schemes under Proposal TR6 should be adequately justified; it is not sufficient to include them merely because they are in the Transport Policy and Programmes (TPP)¹. In particular, the need for improvements at Pensby Road, Heswall (TR6/2) is not explained, nor any indication given about the content or extent of that scheme. Paragraph 5.18 of the Reasoned Justification is irrelevant, and should be deleted (032/4)².
- 15.22 A proposal for a roundabout at the junction of Whetstone Lane/Pearson Road/Holt Hill/Church Lane, Birkenhead has been withdrawn from Proposal TR6, and should be reinstated³ (049/2).
- 15.23 The Appin Way Extension, Tranmere (TR6/27) and the scheme for the rationalisation of Queensway Tunnel Approaches (TR6/28) are no longer proposed, and should be deleted and in the case of TR6/27, replaced by the 'Mollington Link' (084/11, 084/23). TR6/29 should be renamed 'Cleveland Street and Price Street Corridor Improvements'. The site is wrongly located on the Proposals Map (084/23, 084/24).

¹ The Objector refers to PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*, paragraphs 5.28 to 5.32 and 5.35 and PPG13 *Transport*, paragraphs 5.1 to 5.7.

² Like the Council, I take the reference in the Objector's further written representations to Proposal TR6/3 to be an error, and consider instead TR6/2.

³ The Council wrote to the Objector expressing the view that, as the proposal referred to by her had not been included in the UDP Draft for Public Consultation, the reference to it being 'withdrawn' from the Deposit Draft of the UDP was incorrect, and the Objection was therefore not 'duly made'. Whilst I accept the facts as the Council present them, this does not in my view invalidate the Objection now made, and I shall consider Objection 049/2 as a request that the road improvement measure referred to should be listed under Proposal TR6.

Part II: *Proposal TR6 and supporting text - Minor Highway Improvements*
TR6/2 Pensby Road, Heswall
TR6/27 Appin Way Extension, Tranmere
TR6/28 Rationalisation of Queensway Tunnel Approaches, Birkenhead
TR6/29 Cleveland Street and Adjoining Roads, Birkenhead
Pearson Road/Church Road/Whetstone Lane/Holt Hill

Assessment and Conclusions

15.24 A published change to Proposal TR6⁴ adopts the wording suggested in Objection 070/14 as better reflecting the need to ensure that environmental considerations are fully taken into account. I consider Paragraph 15.18 elsewhere⁵, and my conclusions on the reference to that paragraph in Objection 032/4 are therefore similar. It is proposed to delete Proposal TR6/2 (Pensby Road, Heswall)⁶ following a review of the scheme by the Council in 1996.

15.25 Published changes to the UDP would result in the deletion from Proposal TR6 of TR6/27 (Appin Way Extension, Tranmere), the insertion into proposal TR5 of the proposed substitute scheme the 'Mollington Link' and the deletion from proposal TR6 of TR6/28 (Rationalisation of the Queensway Tunnel Approaches)⁷. The Council have not commented on the Objector's assertion that Proposal TR6/29 is wrongly shown on the Proposal Map, and they should therefore give this matter their consideration.

15.26 It is argued in Objection 049/2 that the Whetstone Lane/Pearson Road/Holt Hill/Church Lane junction is a potential hazard, as the turns from Pearson Road into Holt Hill and from Whetstone Lane into Church Road are dangerous and conditions will be made worsen as an anticipated future increase in traffic has its effect. The Council state that regular monitoring of this junction has resulted in the conclusion that traffic conditions do not justify the provision of a roundabout or any other form of junction improvement. Although I have no detailed evidence from the Council to support that view other than a reference to two traffic accidents, neither is there any evidence from the Objector to outweigh the Council's view beyond the assertion that the conditions merit highway improvement measures. In these circumstances I conclude that no modification to the UDP is justified, although this would not preclude further review by the Council in the future.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.27 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Proposals TR5 and TR6 in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/008 and 020 and ALT2/TRANSPORT/004 subject to consideration of the submission in Objections 084/23 and 084/24 that Proposal TR6/29 is wrongly located on the Proposals Map, but that no modification be made in response to Objection 049/2.

⁴ ALT/TRANSPORT/008 (CD056, page 202).

⁵ See pages 297-299 of this report.

⁶ ALT2/TRANSPORT/004 (CD057, errata).

⁷ ALT/TRANSPORT/008 (CD056, page 202) and ALT/TRANSPORT/020 (CD056, page 215).

PROPOSAL TR7 - TRANSPORT CORRIDOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS
Written Statement Paragraph 15.22

OBJECTION: 070/15 GO-M

COUNTER-OBJECTION: 090/I Mr D I Maurice Jones

Summary of Objections

- 15.28 Policy and proposal are not clearly distinguished in Proposal TR7 and its supporting paragraph, contrary to guidance in PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*¹. It would also help implementation if the final sentence in Paragraph 15.22 (minus 'appropriate') were incorporated into the 'Policy' (070/15).
- 15.29 The proposed amendment to Proposal TR7² should be further amended by the mention of tourism and recreation as special considerations (090/I).

Assessment and Conclusions

15.30 The published changes to Proposal TR7 and to the Reasoned Justification³ make the specific amendments requested in Objection 070/15 which in my view give sufficient clarity to distinguish the 'proposal' element of TR7 from the 'policy' element. I support the Council's view that it is not necessary to make special reference to tourism and recreation in the Proposal. Whilst transport corridors may be suitable for tourism and recreational activities it would be inappropriate to single out these two activities as being of special significance. After all, the main purpose of the Proposal is to seek the *environmental* enhancement of transportation corridors, consistent with their nature conservation interest.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.31 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Proposal TR7 and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/010 and 011, but that no modification be made in response to Counter-objection 090/I.

¹ PPG12, paragraph 7.12.

² ALT/TRANSPORT/010 (CD056, page 204).

³ ALT/TRANSPORT/011 (CD056, page 205).

POLICY TR9 - REQUIREMENTS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING

Written Statement Paragraphs 15.27 to 15.36

OBJECTIONS: 031/2 Sefton MBC 038/1 Nationwide Building Society
070/16 GO-M 084/10 Merseyside Development Corporation
129/7 British Telecommunications plc¹

COUNTER-OBJECTIONS: 070/C, 070/D GO-M

Summary of Objections

- 15.32 The Reasoned Justification for Policy TR9 should be amended to refer to car parking restraint in specified areas, particularly in town centres and other areas well served by public transport (031/2). The words in the Policy 'where the local planning authority consider it practical and appropriate' are unsatisfactory. The Policy should be amended to make it clear that the requirement for off-street parking provision should be dependent on the characteristics of the development itself (038/1).
- 15.33 'Policy' and 'proposal' are not clearly distinguished in Policy TR9, and the generally expressed text does not conform to the general and specific requirements of PPG13 *Transport*². The Reasoned Justification is also contrary to PPG13 and appears to place too much reliance on Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 41 which is not part of the UDP (070/16).
- 15.34 The Policy makes no reference to servicing requirements and should be amended so to do, as this affects the operational realities of industrial, commercial and retail developments (084/10).
- 15.35 Policy TR9 as proposed to be amended³ fails to conform with the guidance in PPG13 that parking standards should be set as a range of maximum and operational minimum amounts of parking for broad classes of development and location⁴. Criterion (iv) of the amended Policy should be changed accordingly (draft suggested) (070/C, 070/D).

¹ The Council point out that this Objection refers to a Policy TRT9 - Parking and Servicing Arrangement, which was part of the UDP Draft for Public Consultation. The words which the Objector specifically requests be omitted ('in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority') are not to be found in Policy TR9 with which this section of this report is concerned. The Objector has not responded to the Council's request that the Objection be withdrawn, but in the circumstances I support the Council's view that the Objection was not duly made, and do not propose to consider it.

² The Objector refers to paragraphs 4.4 to 4.10 of PPG13, and in particular to the requirement in paragraph 4.4 that car parking policies should support the overall locational policies in a development plan.

³ ALT/TRANSPORT/012 (CD056, page 206) and ALT/TRANSPORT/013 (CD056, pages 207-8).

⁴ PPG13, paragraph 4.5.

Assessment and Conclusions

15.36 The proposed changes referred to in Footnote 3 give Policy TR9 a much more satisfactory criterion-based structure and appear to remedy most of the shortcomings in the deposit version of the Policy identified by the Objectors.

15.37 The Council propose to change the Policy further⁵ to meet the points raised in Counter-objections 070/C and 070/D by amending Criterion (iv) in the manner suggested by the Objector to refer to operational minimum and maximum car parking requirements. In this final form I consider the Policy to be an acceptable reflection of current guidance in PPG13.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.38 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of the preamble to Policy TR9 and the insertion of Criteria (i) to (iii), (v) and (vi) of the Policy in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/012, the insertion of Criterion (iv) of the Policy in accordance with ALT2/TRANSPORT/001 and the amendment of the Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/013.

⁵ ALT2/TRANSPORT/001 (CD057, page 28).

PROPOSAL TR10 - CYCLE ROUTES

TR10/5 Eastham Country Park to Port Sunlight Village

POLICY TR12 - REQUIREMENTS FOR CYCLE PARKING

OBJECTION: 016/1 Merseyside Cycling Campaign 068/7 UML
070/105 GO-M 215/18 Wirral Green Belt Council

Summary of Objections

- 15.39 The UDP should have a policy provision relating to cycle routes which Proposal TR10 does not provide. It should be possible to provide general guidance as to the priorities for provision for cyclists, such as the creation of routes to shopping centres, schools, railway stations and sports centres, or for provision related to tourism or for health benefits. This does not rule out the identification of specific routes, but those listed do not provide a comprehensive coverage over the whole of the Borough (015/1).
- 15.40 Policy TR10 does not deal with the problems of off-road cycling and the multi-user use of off-road routes (215/18).
- 15.41 The proposed cycle route between Eastham Country Park and Port Sunlight Village (TR10/5) could not be implemented in full. The land subject to Proposal EM4/3 is occupied by a chemical company and public access would be unacceptable for security reasons. The coastal route from Commercial Road to Port Rainbow is likely to be impracticable for operational and estate reasons, and should be rerouted (route suggested). Land for the section from Spital Dam along Bromborough Road cannot yet be released from operational use. A connection between Bromborough Road and Port Sunlight Station would be impracticable (068/7).
- 15.42 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy TR12 (070/105).

Assessment and Conclusions

15.43 The Council submit that the main influence on the number of cycle track routes identified in Proposal TR10 is the availability of finance. National guidance is clear that UDPs should have regard to the resources available to carry out projects¹. The Council explain the limitations which exist under present budget constraints, and in the absence of any countervailing evidence it would be difficult for me to conclude that the resources available permit them to promote within the lifetime of the UDP a larger number of schemes than are represented. In the absence of further evidence as to how the further schemes suggested might be carried forward I conclude that there is no case for increasing the number of schemes already listed.

¹ PPG12 *Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance*, paragraph 5.20.

15.44 Proposal TR10 as it stands is clearly in the main a proposal; the Council maintain that a policy background is provided in the supporting text, Paragraphs 15.37 to 15.39. Whilst this is so the text does not provide the sort of policy direction that the Objector seeks. PPG13 *Transport* advises that Local Plans (or UDPs Part II) should include policies that encourage the implementation of specific measures to assist people to use bicycles.

15.45 Proposal TR10 does contain a policy element, namely the last sentence which deals with the manner in which new developments can be planned so as to maintain the integrity of a continuous cycle route. In my view it is likely that the realisation of opportunities for developing mainstream cycle provision will arise as a result of *proposals* funded from a variety of sources. However, other policies in the UDP do provide some provision for cyclists², although I appreciate that this does not go as far as the Objector would like.

15.46 It seems to me that despite the references to cycling provision in these policies (mainly in terms of parking), the UDP might benefit from a policy which listed the circumstances in which provision for easier and more convenient cycle *movement* might be sought in the context of new development. It would be difficult to prescribe what sort of provision might be appropriate, as this could vary from case to case. Any enhanced provision would therefore as I see it come primarily from negotiation with developers.

15.47 I therefore conclude that the inclusion of such a policy, or the adaptation of other relevant policies, should be given further consideration. Any provision other than in the context of development proposals would fall under the ambit of Proposal TR10, the constraints on which are discussed above. The Cycling Strategy referred to by the Council is of its nature outside the UDP, but is no doubt an influence on the resources which the Council as highway authority commit to this area of provision.

15.48 Like the Council I agree that there is some merit wherever possible in designing for the separation of cyclists from pedestrians. However it is difficult to see how such a matter of detail could be represented in the UDP as it is essentially part of the design process. In these circumstance I recommend no change to the UDP.

15.49 The Council have reached agreement with those directly affected on an alternative alignment for TR10/5 the Eastham Country Park to Port Sunlight Village cycle route. This has

² Policy EM6 (General Criteria for New Employment Development, Criterion (iv)); Policy EM7 (Environmental Criteria for New Employment Development), Criterion (iv); Policy TR8 (Criteria for the Design of Highways Schemes), Criterion (iii); Policy TR11 (Provision for Cyclists in Highways Schemes), Criteria (ii) and (iii); Policy TR12 (Requirements for Cycle Parking); Policy SH1 (Criteria for Development in Key Town Centres), Criterion (iii); Policy SH2 (Criteria for Development in Traditional Suburban Centres), Criterion (iii) and Policy SH10 (Design and Location of Out-of-Centre Retail Development), Criterion (iv).

been published as a change to the UDP³ and appears to be acceptable to Objector 068. A further published change omits 'normally' from Policy TR12⁴.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.50 I recommend that the UDP be modified

(a) by the insertion of a new policy, or the adaptation of existing policies, specifying the circumstances in which provision for the easier movement of cyclists will be sought by negotiation with developers in the context of new development,

(b) by the realignment on the Proposals Map of TR10/5 (the Eastham Country Park to Port Sunlight Village cycle route) in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/021 and

(c) by the amendment of Policy TR12 in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/014;

but that no modification be made in response to Objection 215/18.

³ ALT/TRANSPORT/021 (CD056, page 2156 and map following).

⁴ ALT/TRANSPORT/014 (CD056, page 209).

POLICY TR13 - REQUIREMENTS FOR DISABLED ACCESS

OBJECTION: 070/17 GO-M

Summary of Objection

15.51 Policy TR13 and its Reasoned Justification should be reworded to make it clear under the guidance of PPG1 *Policy and Principles*¹ that the Policy is designed to ensure that consideration is to be given in the design of developments to the access needs of people with disabilities, but that the determination of the detailed provision is dealt with under other legislation than the Planning Acts (wording suggested).

Assessment and Conclusions

15.52 The Council have published changes to Policy TR13 and its supporting text² which appear to meet the points raised in the Objection.

Inspector's Recommendation

15.53 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy TR13 and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/TRANSPORT/015 and 016.

¹ The Objector is referring to PPG1 (1992), paragraph 36. This PPG has been replaced by PPG1 (1997) *Policy and Principles*, the nearest comparable reference being paragraphs 33 and 34.

² ALT/TRANSPORT/015 (CD056, page 210) and ALT/TRANSPORT/016 (CD056, page 211).