

**SEFTON METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**REPORT INTO OBJECTIONS TO THE  
PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (June 2005)  
TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT REPLACEMENT  
SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Inspector: Mr B Roberts BA MRTPI**

Public Local Inquiry: 25 January 2006

# CONTENTS

<b><u>Chapter</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>One - Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Two - Objections to Proposed Modifications</b>	<b>2</b>
(Chapter 5 – Economic Development and Tourism – page 2)	
(Chapter 6 – Housing and Neighbourhood Renewal – page 3)	
(Chapter 7 – Retail Development – page 12)	
(Chapter 9 - Energy, Minerals and Waste – page 16)	
(Chapter 10 – Green Belt and Countryside – page 16)	
(Chapter 13 - Urban Greenspace and Recreation – page 17)	
<b><u>Annex</u></b>	
<b>Appendix 1 - Schedule of Representations</b>	
<b>Appendix 2 - List of Core Documents</b>	
<b>Appendix 3 - Public Inquiry Programme</b>	

# Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 The review of the Sefton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in 1995 commenced in March 1998. The process of review led to the preparation of the First Deposit Draft in 2002 and the Revised Deposit Draft in 2003. A Public Local Inquiry into objections to the draft plans was held in 2004, and the report of the Inspector, Dr. Sheelagh Bussey, was published in January 2005.

1.2 Following consideration of the Inspector's report, the Council published their Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft (CD/14) in June 2005. These Proposed Modifications comprise an amalgamation of pre-inquiry and non-advertised changes, together with changes that result from recommendations made by the Inspector and changes that reflect new circumstances and updating. Proposed Modifications comprise changes both to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft and to the Proposals Maps.

1.3 The Proposed Modifications were formally placed on deposit for the making of objections and representations for a period of six weeks from 27 June 2005 to 5 August 2005. A total of 70 representations were received, comprising 50 objections and 20 supporting representations. Of the 50 objections, 2 have been totally withdrawn, and 8 withdrawn conditional upon my agreement to changes made by the Council in response to these objections in their written proofs (W/SMBC 1 & 2, and SMBC/1 & 2). Of the 48 objections considered in this report, 10 were heard at the Public Local Inquiry held at Bootle Town Hall on Wednesday 25 January 2006.

1.4 This report deals with all objections not withdrawn. Account is taken of Supporting Representations. The main issues considered relate to housing policies and to designations applied to the Seaforth and Litherland Shopping Centres. The objections are summarised and are followed by the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations.

1.5 The following abbreviations have been used in the report:

CD	Core Document
CW	Conditionally Withdrawn
MOD	Proposed Modification
PIA	Primarily Industrial Area
PM	Proposals Map
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PRA	Primarily Residential Area
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

## **Chapter 2 – OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

(Chapter 5 – Economic Development and Tourism)

### **MOD / PM / 18 – Proposals Map (Mayflower Industrial Estate, Formby)**

**OBJECTIONS: Mr & Mrs H Wells (0144/1001), Ascot Industrial Developments (0149/1028), Mr G Ryan & Mrs J Ryan (0153/1071), Mrs C A Williams (0154/1072), J Dudley & E Dudley (0155/1073), Mr J Price (0156/1074)**

#### **SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.1 The Mayflower Industrial Estate, Formby should be designated as lying within a Primarily Residential Area, and not be designated as a Primarily Industrial Area, on the Proposals Map (Formby).

#### **INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.2 The Council concur with the objections. I also concur with the Council.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

2.3 That the Mayflower Industrial Estate, Formby, be designated on the Proposals Map (Formby), as lying within a Primarily Residential Area, and not designated as a Primarily Industrial Area.

.....

### **MOD / 05 / 38 – Policy EDT 17A – Retention of Local Employment Opportunities**

**OBJECTION: Ascot Industrial Developments (0149/1029)**

#### **SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.4 A third exception clause should be added to Policy EDT17A to read: ‘Where continued employment use would be incompatible with surrounding land uses.’

#### **INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.5 The Council propose to add two further sentences to paragraph 5.109D(A) that also include a cross-reference to Policy H3. I consider that any exceptions or possible relaxations of policy should be set out clearly in the policy. I concur with the objection that a third exception be added to Policy EDT17A. This would be consistent, for example, with the Council’s decision to designate the Mayflower Industrial Estate, Formby within a Primary Residential Area. I set out below in my recommendation, a re-wording of that proposed in the objection which does not fit with the main text of the policy. The rewording should also be more specific in terms of what is meant by ‘incompatible’. Cross-reference to Policy H3 is unnecessary, as the plan should read as a whole.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.6 That Policy EDT17A be modified to include a third criterion (c) to read as follows: “would replace an employment use that is seriously detrimental to local amenity and the local environment.”**

**That the word ‘or’ be inserted at the end of criterion (b).**

.....

(Chapter 6 – Housing and Neighbourhood Renewal)

**MOD / 06 / 12 – Policy H2 – Requirement for Affordable and Key Worker Housing**

**OBJECTIONS: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1061), Mr Paul Cooke (0151/1064), Venus (0152/1068)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.7 The wording ‘Special Needs’ should be reinstated in the heading of Policy H2, and other text, equal with key worker housing.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.8 The Council agree to reinstate the wording ‘Special Needs’ in the heading of Policy H2, and the wording ‘and housing for people with special needs’ in the first clause of Policy H2. I concur with these changes.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.9 That the wording ‘Special Needs’ be included in the heading of Policy H2 following the word ‘Affordable’, and that the wording ‘and housing for people with special needs’ be included in the first clause of Policy H2 following the wording ‘Affordable Housing’.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 13 – Policy H2 – Requirement for Affordable and Key Worker Housing – Paragraph 6.13**

**OBJECTIONS: Government Office For The North West (0095/1038), Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1063), Mr Paul Cooke (0151/1065), Venus (0152/1069)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.10 The amount of affordable housing needed in Sefton should be quantified and set out in the text to Policy H2.

The Housing Needs Assessment 2003 needs to be reviewed and updated to accurately reflect the considerable changes to affordability that have arisen since then, notably in the Bootle area.

Equal provision should be made for Special Needs housing as to other needs.

The wording ‘Special Needs’ should be included in the text of paragraph 6.13.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.11 The Council has commissioned Consultants to update the 2003 Housing Needs Survey and to revise the need for affordable housing in the Borough. A draft report on the 2005 Housing Needs Assessment Update was published in November 2005 (CD/29). Although it is still only in draft form, there is no reason to believe that it cannot be finalised shortly, for the Council and others to be able to place reliance on its findings. I concur with Objection 0095/1038 that paragraph 6.13 of the Plan should specify the number of affordable dwelling units needed in the Borough, as stated in paragraph 9b of Circular 6/98. The data and conclusions in the text set out under the heading ‘Changes since 2003’ on page 54 of CD/29, should be incorporated into the Plan when the 2005 Study has been considered by the Council and finally published. A revision of paragraph 6.13 of the Plan should also include reference to ‘special needs housing’ alongside references to ‘affordable housing’ and ‘key worker housing’.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.12 That paragraph 6.13 be modified to refer to the 2005 Housing Needs Assessment Update, and that the paragraph also specifies the number of affordable dwelling units needed in Sefton Borough as reported in the 2005 Update (as finalised). That paragraph 6.13 also includes a reference to ‘special needs housing’ as additional to references made to ‘affordable housing’ and ‘key worker housing’ in that paragraph.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 14 – Policy H2 – Requirement for Affordable and Key Worker Housing – Paragraph 6.14**

**OBJECTIONS: Government Office For The North West (0095/1039), Mr Paul Cooke (0151/1066), Venus (0152/1070)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.13 Circular 6/98 (Planning and Affordable Housing) states at paragraph 9b that the plan should set indicative targets for the provision of affordable dwellings on specific suitable housing sites. The inclusion of such information within a Supplementary Planning Document should be stated to be an interim measure pending the preparation of an appropriate Development Plan Document.  
‘Affordable Housing’ is not clearly defined. A clearer definition will indicate to developers what is required from them on housing developments. Geographic areas in need of affordable housing are not defined.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.14 As stated above in this report, the 2005 Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) Update Draft Report (CD/29) should be capable of being finalised shortly, and published as a substantive document. It will enable the Council to robustly demonstrate a shortage of affordable housing to meet local needs. The 2005 Draft report indicates that there is a substantial increase in the need for affordable housing units compared to the year 2003. It is vitally important that the planning system secures a delivery of affordable dwellings on residential development sites in the Borough. This delivery is given greater prospect when the development plan sets indicative yield targets on specific sites (expressed either as numbers of houses or a percentage of the housing on the site) as stated in paragraph 9 of Circular 6/98. I note that the Council intend to produce a Supplementary Planning Document indicating how Policy H2 will be implemented in different

parts of the Borough, and I would expect this document to specify indicative affordable dwelling targets for specific residential development sites allocated in the Plan.

2.15 I appreciate that detailed analysis of the 2005 HNA Update and the consequent implications for policies may take some time yet, and that progress towards the adoption of the UDP should not be unduly delayed. Although not the subject of specific objections, the Council will need to look at the wording of Policy H2 and its supporting text to ensure that it reflects the key findings of the 2005 HNA Update, and that it will stand square with the detail of implementation to be considered for inclusion in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD could also add to the definition of ‘affordable housing’ by drawing upon local survey evidence and conclusions set out in the 2005 HNA Update. The SPD should be taken forward as a Development Plan Document in due course.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.16 That Paragraph 6.15 be modified to include reference to the Housing Needs Assessment Update 2005, and to add further detail on the content of the Supplementary Planning Document to be produced with particular references that indicate affordable dwelling targets on allocated residential development sites, that define geographic areas of need, and that further define the meaning of the term ‘affordable housing’. This paragraph should also state the Supplementary Planning Document will be taken forward as a Development Plan Document in due course.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 15 – Policy H2 – Requirement for Affordable and Key Worker Housing – Sustainability Appraisal**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1062)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.17 Delete the priority given to key workers.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.18 MOD/06/12 replaced the requirement for ‘special needs’ housing with ‘key worker’ housing in the heading of Policy H2. In response to objections however the Council have decided to reinstate ‘special needs’ into the policy heading. I have agreed with this latter change. Accordingly, there is no priority attached to any special category of housing need, and the wording set out under the heading ‘Sustainability Appraisal’ is not consistent with the revised Policy H2.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.19 That MOD/06/15 be deleted, and that the following wording be inserted under the heading Sustainability Appraisal: “Recognition is now given to key workers as having a specific housing need, additional to the need for affordable and special needs housing.”**

.....

**MOD / 6 / 17 – Policy H3**  
**MOD / 6 / 18 – Policy H3 (paragraph 6.16)**

**OBJECTIONS: Government Office for the North West (0095/1040 & 0095/1041)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.20 Include the figures for the number of dwellings provided between 2002-2004 to show how these are factored into the supply during the Plan period (with reference to Policy H3 and paragraph 6.16).

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.21 The Council propose to add a new paragraph (iii) to Section 1 of Policy H3 that gives the number of dwellings built between 2002-2004. They also propose to amend the first sentence of paragraph 6.16 of the plan. I concur with these changes, which are set out below.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.22 That a new paragraph (iii) be added to the first clause of Policy H3 to read “Number of dwellings built between 2002 (the start of the Plan) and 2004 totals 884.”**  
**That the first sentence of paragraph 6.16 be modified to read “In order to meet the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy H1, the Council has to demonstrate that it can identify land and buildings which can accommodate 1,750 additional dwellings on a rolling 5 year programme from 2002 (the start date of the Plan).”**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 17 – Policy H3 (H3.D – Land at Southport Infirmary, Scarisbrick New Road) - Proposals Map (Southport)**

**OBJECTION: Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust (0034/1012)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.23 The site of residential land allocation site at Southport Infirmary, Scarisbrick New Road, Southport, now deleted under MOD/06/17, should be included as a Housing Opportunity Site under Policy H5.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.24 The de-allocation of the Infirmary Site for residential development under MOD/06/17 results in the site lying within a Primarily Residential Area (PRA) under Policy H7. This policy gives a clear presumption in favour of residential development, should proposals for healthcare related development on the site not come forward. The PRA designation provides for greater flexibility than if the site were given a specific use allocation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.25 That no modification be made Policies H3 or H5, nor to the Primarily Residential Area designation applied to the site of Southport Infirmary, Scarisbrick New Road, Southport under MOD/PM/19.**

.....



**MOD / 06/ 17 – Policy H3 – Housing Land Supply – Paragraph 6.19C**

**OBJECTION: Secondsite Property Holdings Limited (0087/1023)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.26 Where there is an area of undeveloped land attached to an area of previously developed land, then the whole of the site can be categorised as previously developed land. Delete paragraph 6.19C, or amend to read “For the avoidance of doubt, the Council will accept the definition of previously-developed land as laid out in PPG3 - Annex C”.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.27 The Council agree with the objection that paragraph 6.19C should be corrected to refer to Annex C and not to Annex 3 of PPG3 - Housing. I also consider that paragraph 6.19C would be simplified if the Plan stated that the Council will apply the definition of previously-developed land set out in Annex C of PPG3. I also concur with the inclusion of the additional sentence to paragraph 6.19C as set out in the Council’s response to the objection, subject to the deletion of the words “In exceptional circumstances”, as the wording proposed defines the circumstances.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.28 That paragraph 6.19C be deleted, and replaced with the following wording: “In the consideration of residential development proposals on sites which comprise both previously-developed land (also known as Brownfield land) and open/greenspace land, the Council will rely on the guidance set out in Annex C of Planning Policy Guidance 3 – Housing, for the definition of these respective areas. Where only part of a site is defined as previously developed land, the Council will normally only grant planning permission for residential development on that part. However, the Council may consider granting planning permission for residential development on an equivalent area of open/greenspace land in substitution to that of the previously-developed land, where this would produce a more sustainable form of development on the site as a whole and relate better to the quality and use of the remaining area of the site.”**

.....

**MOD / 06/ 31 – Policy H3 – Housing Land Supply – Paragraph 6.19E**

**OBJECTION: Government Office For The North West (0095/1042)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.29 Clarify that the Sefton Council will only be encouraging developers to enter into Local Labour Agreements, or otherwise provide justification as to how this requirement, as a condition of granting planning permission to a development, would meet the tests of Circular 05/05 – Planning Obligations, paragraph B5.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.30 As a general comment, it is inappropriate to include an element of planning policy, apparently relating to development generally, within the explanatory text of a policy (in this

instance Policy H3 - Housing Land Supply). In their responses to this objection, the Council have amended the wording of paragraph 6.19E and draw upon a local labour policy that they have adopted to enable them to impose a condition relating to Local Labour Agreements on planning permission granted for development creating more than 10 jobs. I consider that such a condition, or if required as a Planning Obligation, would be inconsistent with the Secretary of State's policy requirements on planning obligations as set out in Annex B of Circular 05/05. I propose to recommend the deletion of part of the first sentence of paragraph 6.19E. The remainder of the paragraph should not be changed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.31 That the first sentence of paragraph 6.19E be modified to read:  
“The Council has adopted a local labour policy which will encourage developers to enter into a Local Labour Agreement with the Council on developments that create more than 10 jobs (including during the construction period).”**

.....

**MOD / 06 /36 – Policy H4 - Land at Town Lane, Southport – Paragraph 6.22**

**OBJECTION: Government Office For The North West (0095/1043)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.32 Amend paragraph 6.22 to be more in line with the report of the Inspector (CD/13) at paragraph 6.422(e)

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.33 The Council agree to add a reference to sites within the urban areas, as an addition to the last sentence. This change is agreed by the objector, and I also concur with it.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.34 That the last sentence of paragraph 6.22 be modified by the addition of the wording:  
“and that there are no other more suitable Brownfield sites or Greenfield sites located within the urban areas, available to satisfy that demand.”**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 37 – Policy H4A – Paragraph 6.25B**

**OBJECTION: Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust (0034/1013)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.35 The final sentence of paragraph 6.25B should be amended to read: “The provision of key worker housing for hospital employees is included within the definition of ancillary facilities.”

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.36 The Council concurs with the objection. I also concur with it.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.37 That the following wording be deleted from the last sentence of Paragraph 6.25B – “and is subject to the restriction that such housing could not be built before 2010.”**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 39 – Policy H5 – Housing Opportunity Sites – Paragraph 6.27**

**OBJECTION: Secondsite Property Holdings Limited (0087/1022)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.38 There is no basis for the insertion of the rider in the explanatory text to Policy H5 that the need for the retention of the Linacre Gas Works site in employment generating use has not yet been fully determined.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.39 The Council propose to replace the wording ‘has not yet been fully determined’ by the wording ‘which will be assessed at the time a planning application for housing is made.’ Site-specific policies in development plans should provide a positive lead for development and help create certainty, both for developers and the local community. MOD/06/39 and the proposed amendment only serve to create uncertainty and weaken the intention of Policy H5.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.40 That the wording “and the need for their retention in employment generating uses has not yet been fully determined” be deleted from the third sentence of paragraph 6.27.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 44 – Policy H6 – Housing Renewal and Regeneration – Paragraph 6.32A**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1060)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.41 Delete paragraph 6.32B. Criteria should be rigorous and objective in order to inform professional judgement.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.42 No specific evidence is submitted with the objection to establish that the additional wordings proposed in MOD/06/44 are factually incorrect. The Council draw their findings from the NewHeartlands Prospectus (CD/23) and the South Sefton Regeneration Strategy (CD/31), and indicate that detailed methodologies will be applied to Neighbourhood Renewal Assessments and other studies and approaches.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.43 That no modification be made to paragraph 6.32B as a result of this objection.**

.....  
..

**MOD / 06 / 45 – Policy H6 – Housing Renewal and Regeneration – Paragraph 6.32BA**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1059)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.44 Paragraph 6.32BA fails to address accepted methodologies/ analytical frameworks and assessment protocols and criteria to inform the Unitary Development Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plans. There is a need to specify in detail, criteria against which quality sustainable environments can be judged.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.45 Paragraph 6.32BA sets out the need to prepare more detailed documents relating to planning and development within specific local areas of Sefton Borough. The detailed methodology and criteria to be applied in securing the broad objectives referenced in this paragraph are best set out in a Local Development Scheme and Local Development Documents ((see PPS12 – Local Development Frameworks (CD/10) together with the Companion Guide to PPS12 – Creating Local Development Frameworks)). Consideration could be given by the Council to the inclusion of a reference in paragraph 6.32BA to the future preparation of area frameworks or plans as Local Development Documents.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.46 That no modification be made to paragraph 6.32BA as a result of this objection.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 47 – Policy H6 – Housing Renewal and Regeneration**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1057)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.47 The word ‘clearance’ should be included in the title of Policy H6.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.48 This objection is agreed by the Council. I also concur with it.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.49 That Policy H6 be titled “Housing Renewal, Clearance and Regeneration”.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 49 – Policy H6 – Housing Renewal and Regeneration – Paragraph 6.34**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1058)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.50 Delete the wording “but will increase significantly after this date” from the fourth sentence of paragraph 6.34.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.51 The Council anticipate that the scale of housing clearance will increase significantly after 2006. This anticipation relates to the level of dwelling demolition estimated as necessary in the period 2001-2011. This ‘anticipation’ is a supplementary wording in explanatory text following Policy H6, that gives an indicative level of dwelling demolition in the period 2001 – 2011, of which nearly five years have passed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.52 That no modification be made to paragraph 6.34 as a result of this objection.**

.....

**MOD / 06 / 53 – Policy H6A – Redevelopment within the Pathfinder Area**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1054)**

**MOD / 06 / 54 – Policy H6B – Hawthorne Road / Canal Corridor**

**OBJECTION: Mary-Jo Joyce (0150/1056)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.53 Delete Policies H6A and H6B.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.54 Policy H6A seeks to only allow development where it would not prejudice the comprehensive development of the local area within a Pathfinder neighbourhood. This is a sound approach. I am confident that the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans will enable full and transparent consultation with local communities. At the Inquiry, the Objector stated that she no longer wished to maintain her objection to Policy H6B. I consider that both policies H6A and H6B are important and necessary, and have been properly included within the Plan. In their absence, there is the prospect that further more detailed proposals may lack the strategic context and framework for their consideration and progression. It should be noted that Policies H6A and H6B apply to five Pathfinder Neighbourhoods as shown on Figure 6.2, and not to eight as stated in paragraph 6.34.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.55 That no modification be made to Policies H6A and H6B as a result of these objections.**

.....

(Chapter 7 – Retail Development)

## **MOD 07 / 02 – Introduction (Hierarchy of Centres in Sefton Figure) & Paragraph 7.30**

## **MOD / PM / 08 – Proposals Map (Bootle and Crosby) - Seaforth Local Centre**

**OBJECTIONS: Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (0070/1051), Government Office For The North West (0095/1044, 0095/1045), Asda Stores Limited (0117/1034, 0117/1035)**

### **SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.56 Objection is made to the format of the Litherland Local Centre, as it comprises areas in Sefton Street and Bridge Road that are separated physically by the A5036. They are only linked by a subway beneath that road, and do not form a local centre. If the Local Centre designation is agreed, the boundaries of both areas should be re-assessed to only include relevant areas.

The Plan should set out justification for the proposed change to the classification of Seaforth Local Centre to a Shopping Parade, and address the concerns of Inspector Bussey with regard to the future land uses in the Seaforth Centre and how the process of comprehensive restructuring will be managed, (see paras 7.84 and 7.85 of CD/13). Any changes to the boundaries of the Seaforth Local Centre should also take account of the findings of a detailed impact assessment on the Centre of the possible development of the Lanstar site for a major food store. Revision of the Proposals Map may result from a review of boundary changes.

The White Young Green Study (CD/44) fails to provide a detailed analysis of the impact of the Lanstar development on retail premises in Seaforth Local Centre, and also fails to consider how that centre can properly be restructured so that it can perform some role in the future.

### **INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS**

2.57 In the proposed modifications MOD/07/02 and MOD/PM/08, the Council propose to downgrade Seaforth Local Centre (effectively to a Shopping Parade) and to upgrade Sefton Street and Bridge Road) (currently two separate Shopping Parades) as a single Local Centre to be called Litherland Local Centre. In paragraph 7.30 of the plan, it is stated that Local Centres are important because of their valuable role in providing convenience shopping for local residents. I concur with the WYG Consultants' Study (CD/44) conclusion at paragraph 8.07, supported by my own assessments and observations, that there are two distinct catchments served by Seaforth Road and Sefton Street. The Study further anticipates that even with the development of the proposed Lidl foodstore on the Dibro site, significant linked trips will not occur between Bridge Road and Seaforth Road. I conclude that there are clearly separate issues arising in respect of the designation of the Litherland Local Centre and the de-designation of the Seaforth Local Centre.

2.58 I also conclude that the proposed designation of the Litherland Local Centre in the Proposed Modifications stems primarily from the allocation of the Lanstar site for a food superstore (Policy R9). This is reflected in the assumption made by Council's Consultants (page 55 of CD/44) that positive benefits will flow from the superstore that will revitalise facilities at Bridge Road and Sefton Street. I refer later in paragraphs 2.75 and 2.76 of this report to the need for the requirement on the developer of the Lanstar site to provide improved linkages to both Bridge Road and Sefton Street. I would endorse this requirement, to serve those walking and

cycling to the superstore, having particular regard to the nature of the site being hemmed in by the Leeds-Liverpool Canal and the A5036 Church Road dual carriageway, in particular.

2.59 The impact of the superstore on the retailing activities in Bridge Road and Sefton Street is a matter of some conjecture. In Bridge Road, in particular, more local shoppers in Linacre Road and adjoining residential areas may choose to visit the superstore for their convenience shopping; till facilities are provided at most superstores for small purchases. Equally, how many shoppers will visit the superstore and then walk to shops in Sefton Street is open to question. Few people currently make the journey on foot via the underpass between Bridge Road and Sefton Street, and there is no evidence that these weak linkages in shopping terms will be strengthened after the superstore is opened. I conclude that there is no clear justification for the designation of these two separate Shopping Parades as a Local Shopping Centre, and for them to be listed accordingly in the explanatory text to Policy R5.

2.60 In considering issues relating to the Seaforth Local Centre with its many problems of vacant shopping/business premises, poor quality fabric of buildings, poor quality environment, litter strewn areas and clear neglect, an ambience of a socially deprived locality is readily apparent. There is a need for urgent investment by both the public and private sectors to reverse this decline. The Seaforth Local Centre contrasts sharply with the Bridge Road and Sefton Street localities which exhibit apparently sound building structures and viable commercial premises. In their study of the Seaforth Local Centre, the Consultant's Study (CD/44) concludes that in policy terms, measures are necessary to manage the decline of the Seaforth Centre (para 6.16). The study however recognises the presence of the range of services available and used by local people in the Seaforth Local Centre, and that these key services should be retained. Concurrently, investment in the Centre must be encouraged within a flexible policy framework. These are discrete matters relating to the Seaforth Centre, and in my opinion, there is no relationship between policy decisions in respect of downgrading the Seaforth Centre and upgrading a joint Bridge Road and Sefton Street Centre, as would seem to be inferred in the fourth 'bullet point' paragraph on page 55 of CD/44. The designations to be applied to the two 'Centres' are for separate consideration and in their own rights.

2.61 PPS6 – Planning for Town Centres seeks the provision of a range of shopping, leisure and local services, which allow genuine choice to meet the needs of the entire community, and particularly socially excluded groups. Deficiencies in provision in areas with poor access to facilities should be remedied. In paragraphs 2.56 and 2.57 of PPS6, emphasis is placed on strengthening existing centres and ensuring that there is a range of facilities in local centres, consistent with the scale and function of the centre to meet people's day-to-day needs, particularly in deprived areas. Further relevant advice follows in paragraph 2.58. I am not satisfied that the Consultants' Study of March 2005 (CD/44) has delivered an adequate basis for informing the future extent, nature and role of the Seaforth Local Centre (elements as referenced by Inspector Bussey, paragraph 7.82 of CD/13). In particular, I concur with the statement in paragraph 2.21 of P/117/1 submitted by Mr Dixon for ASDA, that the starting point for the Seaforth Local Centre Study should be an assessment of local need. This would give more specific guidance on the level of retail floorspace required to serve the locality and help to redefine the extent of the Seaforth Local Centre on the Proposals Map.

2.62 For the purposes of the UDP and its progression to adoption, I conclude that the Seaforth Local Centre designation as defined on the Proposals Map for the Revised Deposit Draft should be retained, but should exclude the designated area on Bridge Road, which I consider should remain as an undesignated Shopping Parade. Facilities in Bridge Road are only likely to be used rarely by people living to the west of the railway line. I consider however that the Dibro site

should be included within the Seaforth Local Centre. This site is readily accessible on foot by shoppers and other users of Seaforth Road facilities and the designation will give a basis for confidence to the developers investing in the regeneration of this site for retail development, and help retain and give confidence to other core services e.g. Post Office, Health Centre, as to the future role of the Seaforth Local Centre. I note that the Council intend to prepare a Local Development Document to provide for change for the Stella Precinct and surrounding areas. The retention of the Seaforth Local Centre designation will not prejudice this work, but would give a more positive and open context than if a Shopping Parade designation were applied.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.63 That MOD/07/02 be deleted, resulting in the deletion of the designation of the Litherland Local Centre, and that the designation of the Seaforth Local Centre be retained in the Plan.**

**2.64 That MOD/PM/08 be deleted. The designation of the Seaforth Local Centre should be defined as shown on the Proposals Map being part of the Revised Deposit Draft Plan, to comprise the areas coloured blue on Seaforth Road and on the Dibro site (Wellington Road), but to exclude the area coloured blue on Bridge Road.**

.....  
**MOD / 07/ 04 – Policy R1 – Retail Development Strategy – Paragraph 7.5a**

**OBJECTIONS: Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd (0070/1052), Asda Stores Limited (0117/1030)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.65 Add further text to confirm that other retail sites that may come forward will be considered against relevant planning policies. Other sequentially preferable sites to the Lanstar site (Policy R9) may come forward during the Plan period which would be prejudiced by this allocation.

Modify the text to reflect the need to meet need, sequential and impact tests prior to any preference for the Lanstar site being a material planning consideration.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.66 The second and third sentences of MOD/07/04 could be combined and the text clarified. I note in paragraph 7.49A that the Lanstar Site is proposed to serve the Litherland area. References to ‘south of the Borough’ in paragraph 7.5, and to ‘South Sefton’ in paragraph 7.5A are less clear in relation to geographical definition. With reference to any future retail proposals in the Borough, these will be for consideration in light of operative planning policies.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.67 That the second and third sentences of paragraph 7.5A be deleted, and the following two sentences be written in their replacement:**

**“The Council have identified the Lanstar site (Policy R9) for an out-of-centre supermarket to serve the Litherland area. This allocation will address part of the balance of identified**



**need for retail development within the South of the Borough and has been made in accordance with the sequential approach to site selection.”**

.....

**MOD / 07 /06 – POLICY R6 – Local Shopping Parades – Paragraph 7.34A**

**OBJECTION: Asda Stores Limited (0117/1031)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.68 Rationalisation and replacement of shopping parades should be dealt with as part of an overall retail strategy, and not on an ad-hoc basis.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.69 I consider that Policy R6 gives a context for development of Local Shopping Parades. I see no value in the statement in paragraph 7.34A that a net reduction in retail floorspace is anticipated. This sets a negative tone on retailing. Local retailing services are vitally important to local people, especially to those who do not have the use of a car, and where feasible they should be retained.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.70 That the second sentence of paragraph 7.34A, starting ‘It is anticipated...’ be deleted.**

.....

**MOD / 07 /07 – POLICY R8 – Edge-of-Centre & Out-of-Centre Retail Development and Key Town Centre Uses**

**OBJECTION: Asda Stores Limited (0117/1032)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.71 Delete the wording “or will be made accessible.”

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.72 There is no sound reason to change the wording put forward by the Council in MOD/07/07. Clause 2(i) of Policy R8 will need to be satisfied prior to the granting of a planning permission.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.73 That no modification be made to Policy R8, Clause 2(i) as a result of this objection.**

.....

**MOD / 07 / 13 – Policy R9 – Lanstar Site, Church Road, Litherland – Paragraph 7.49BA**

**OBJECTIONS: Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd (0070/1053), Asda Stores Limited (0117/1033)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

2.74 The provision of improved linkages with Bridge Road and Sefton Street should not override the full assessment of all planning policy tests for a retail proposal on the site. The nature, quality, type and amount of “linkages” required, are not specified.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.75 The Council in MOD/07/13 have chosen to specify “linkages” to retail and commercial premises on Bridge Road and Sefton Street as a requirement of Policy R9. I concur with the objection that these linkages should be defined in more detail, and as they are specific to the Lanstar site should form part of the policy, and the explanation for their inclusion in the policy should be set out in the explanation. There is no basis for challenging the retail proposal on the Lanstar site (Policy R9) as this is an established policy not subject to modification.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**2.76 That MOD/07/13 – Paragraph 7.49BA be deleted, and that an additional clause be added to Policy R9 (Lanstar Site) that specifies the improved linkages that will be required to both Bridge Road and Sefton Street as part of the development proposals. That a new paragraph be added to the “Explanation” text to Policy R9 that sets out the basis for the requirement for the improved linkages specified.**

.....

(Chapter 9 – Energy, Minerals and Waste)

**MOD / 09 /02 – Indicator 9.1**

**OBJECTION: Government Office for the North West (0095/1046)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.77 Clarify the Indicator.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.78 The Council propose to amend Indicator 9.1 to read ‘Tonnages of green household waste recycled or composted in Sefton’. This is agreed by the Objector. I also concur with the amended wording.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.79 That Indicator 9.1 be modified to read: “Tonnages of green household waste recycled or composted in Sefton”.**

.....

(Chapter 10 – Green Belt and Countryside)

**MOD / 10 / 01 – Indicator 10.3**

**OBJECTION: Government Office for the North West (0095/1050)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.80 Planning decisions, both permissions and refusals, would more accurately reflect the wording of Indicator 10.3 relating to the best and most versatile agricultural land.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.81 The Council indicate that monitoring of all planning permissions will be inherent in the data collection methodology. I concur that no rewording of Indicator 10.3 is necessary.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.82 That no modification be made to the wording of Indicator 10.3.**

.....

**MOD / 10 / 10 – Paragraph 10.24A (Policy GBC3A)**

**OBJECTION: Government Office for the North West (0095/1047)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.83 The parameters of suitable uses will need to be set out in the Plan.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.84 The Council indicate that they have not yet identified suitable uses and assessed their likely impact. I concur that no change is feasible to paragraph 10.24A at this time.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.85 That no modification be made to the wording of Paragraph 10.24A.**

.....

(Chapter 13 – Urban Greenspace and Recreation)

**MOD / 13 / 04 - Paragraph 13.1B (Urban Greenspace and Recreation)**

**OBJECTION: Maghull Limited (0039/1020)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.86 Amend the first sentence of paragraph 13.1B to read: ‘The aim of the Plan is to protect those urban greenspace sites that provide benefits.’

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.87 I concur with the Council that all urban greenspace will have some beneficial value; whether or not they provide ‘benefits’ is not an issue. I consider that the first sentence should be reworded to remove the reference to ‘benefits’.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.88 That the first sentence of Paragraph 13.1B be reworded as follows: “The aim of the Plan is to safeguard and enhance urban greenspace.”**

.....

**MOD / 13 / 06 - Paragraph 13.1H (Urban Greenspace and Recreation)**

**OBJECTION: Mr G H Gribble (0106/1067)**

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

2.89 The Plan should state in precise terms that the ‘Open Space and Recreation Study’ must be completed before the end of 2006, and that the extent of the study must not be restricted from that previously defined for the Consultants.

**INSPECTOR’S CONCLUSIONS**

2.90 Following the cancellation in 2005 of the Consultant’s contract agreed in 2003 for an Open Space and Recreation Study in the Borough, the Council have set out a programme for the work to be undertaken by their own staff for completion by the end of this year. The scope of the study is set out in paragraph 13.1G of the Plan and is unchanged. The use of the word ‘must’ is inappropriate, but paragraph 13.1H should be reworded to strengthen the commitment to the study, and also to confirm the scope of the study.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**2.91 That paragraph 13.1H be modified to read as follows: “The Council intend to complete the Study by the end of 2006. The Study will seek to meet the requirements of PPG17 – ‘Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation’ and will follow the guidance set out in the Companion Guide to PPG 17 ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’. The Policy implications arising from this Study will be addressed through a future Local Development Document.”**

.....

# **ANNEX**

## APPENDIX 1

### SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS INQUIRY SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS

Reference	Party	Obj/ Sup	MOD Ref	Policy/Para	Objectors Proof Number	Council WR Number
5.6AA/0110/1006	North West Development Agency	Sup	MOD/05/03	5.6AA		
EDT9/0098/1015	English Nature (Cheshire to Lancashire Team)	Sup	MOD/05/16	EDT9		
5.52/0098/1016	English Nature (Cheshire to Lancashire Team)	Sup	MOD/05/17	5.52		
EDT13/0110/1007	North West Development Agency	Sup	MOD/05/24	EDT13 background docs		
EDT14/0110/1008	North West Development Agency	Sup	MOD/05/26	EDT14		
EDT15/0110/1009	North West Development Agency	Sup	MOD/05/28	EDT15		
EDT17A/0149/1029	Ascot Industrial Developments	Obj	MOD/05/38	EDT17A		W/SMBC/1
H2/0150/1061	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/12	H2		SMBC/2
H2/0151/1064	Mr Paul Cooke	Obj	MOD/06/12	H2		W/SMBC/1
H2/0152/1068	Venus	Obj	MOD/06/12	H2		W/SMBC/1
H2/0095/1038	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/06/13	H2		W/SMBC/1
6.13/0150/1063	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/13	6.13		SMBC/2
6.13/0151/1065	Mr Paul Cooke	Obj	MOD/06/13	6.13		W/SMBC/1
6.13/0152/1069	Venus	Obj	MOD/06/13	6.13		W/SMBC/1
H2/0095/1039	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/06/14	H2		W/SMBC/1
6.15/0151/1066	Mr Paul Cooke	Obj	MOD/06/14	6.15		W/SMBC/1
6.15/0152/1070	Venus	Obj	MOD/06/14	6.15		W/SMBC/1
SusApH2/0150/1062	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/15	SusAp to H2		SMBC/2
H7&PM/0034/1012	Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust	Obj	MOD/06/17	H7		W/SMBC/1
H3/0095/1040	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/06/17	H3		W/SMBC/1
6.16/0095/1041	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/06/18	6.16		W/SMBC/1
6.19C/0087/1023	SecondSite Property	Obj	MOD/06/29	6.19C		W/SMBC/1
6.19E/0095/1042	Government Office	Obj	MOD/06/31	6.19E		W/SMBC/1

**SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS INQUIRY  
SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS**

Reference	Party	Obj/ Sup	MOD Ref	Policy/Para	Objectors Proof Number	Council WR Number
	North West					
6.22/0095/1043	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/06/36	6.22		W/SMBC/1
6.25B/034/1013	Southport and Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust	Obj	MOD/06/37	6.25B		W/SMBC/1
6.27/0087/1022	SecondSite Property	Obj	MOD/06/39	6.27		W/SMBC/1
6.32B/0150/1060	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/44	6.32B		SMBC/2
6.32BA/0150/1059	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/45	6.32BA		SMBC/2
H6/0150/1057	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/47	H6		SMBC/2
6.34/0150/1058	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/49	6.34		SMBC/2
H6A/0150/1054	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/53	H6A		SMBC/2
H6B/0150/1056	Mary-Jo Joyce	Obj	MOD/06/54	H6B		SMBC/2
7.30 & fig/0095/1044	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/07/02	7.30 & fig		W/SMBC/2
7.30&fig/0100/1024	Tesco Stores Ltd	Sup	MOD/07/02	7.30 & fig		
7.30 & fig/0117/1034	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/07/02	7.30 & Fig	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
7.5A/0070/1052	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Obj	MOD/07/04	7.5A		W/SMBC/1
7.5A/0100/1025	Tesco Stores Ltd	Sup	MOD/07/04	7.5A		
7.5A/0117/1030	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/07/04	7.5A	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
7.34A/0117/1031	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/07/06	7.34A	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
R8/0117/1032	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/07/07	R8	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
7.49BA/0070/1053	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Obj	MOD/07/13	7.49BA		W/SMBC/1
7.49BA/0100/1026	Tesco Stores Ltd	Sup	MOD/07/13	7.49BA		
7.49BA/0117/1033	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/07/13	7.49BA	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
Indicators/0095/104 6	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/09/02	Indicator 9.1		W/SMBC/1
Indicators/0095/105 0	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/10/01	Indicator 10.3		W/SMBC/1
GBC2/0063/1002	Mersey Care NHS Trust	Sup	MOD/10/03	GBC2		
10.20/0063/1003	Mersey Care NHS Trust	Sup	MOD/10/08	10.20		
GBC3A/0063/1004	Mersey Care NHS Trust	Sup	MOD/10/10	GBC3A		
10.24A/0095/1047	Government Office	Obj	MOD/10/10	10.24A		W/SMBC/1

**SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS INQUIRY  
SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS**

Reference	Party	Obj/ Sup	MOD Ref	Policy/Para	Objectors Proof Number	Council WR Number
	North West					
GBC4/0063/1005	Mersey Care NHS Trust	Sup	MOD/10/11	GBC4		
13.1B/0039/1020	Maghull Limited, formerly Capricorn Group PLC	Obj	MOD/13/04	13.1B		W/SMBC/1
13.1H/0106/1067	Mr G Gribble	Obj	MOD/13/06	13.1H	P/106/1/M ODS & P/106/1/M ODS/RESP & P/106/2/M ODS/RESP	SMBC/1
DQ1A/146/1017	Merseyside Local Energy Support Programme	Sup	MOD/16/12	DQ1A		
DQ1A/0148/1019	Birkdale Civic Society	Sup	MOD/16/12	DQ1A		
MD8/0147/1018	Mobile Operators Association	Sup	MOD/18/06	MD8		
App3A/0087/1021	SecondSite Property	Sup	MOD/App/04	App3A		
PM/0098/1014	English Nature (Cheshire to Lancashire Team)	Sup	MOD/PM/01	PM		
PM/0110/1010	North West Development Agency	Sup	MOD/PM/01	PM		
7.30 & fig & PM/0070/1051	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Obj	MOD/PM/08	7.30 & Fig & PM		W/SMBC/1
PM/0095/1045	Government Office North West	Obj	MOD/PM/08	Proposals Map		W/SMBC/2
PM/0100/1027	Tesco Stores Ltd	Sup	MOD/PM/08	Proposals Map		
PM/0117/1035	Asda Stores Limited	Obj	MOD/PM/08	Proposals Map	P/117/1/M ODS	W/SMBC/2
EDT5 & PM/0144/1001	Mr & Mrs H Wells	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT 5 & Proposals Map		W/SMBC/1
EDT5 & PM/0149/1028	Ascot Industrial Developments	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT5 & Proposals Map		W/SMBC/1
EDT5 & PM/0153/1071	Mr & Mrs Ryan	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT5 & Proposals Map		W/SMBC/1
EDT5 &	Mrs Carol Williams	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT5 &		W/SMBC/1



**SEFTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS INQUIRY  
SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Obj/ Sup</b>	<b>MOD Ref</b>	<b>Policy/Para</b>	<b>Objectors Proof Number</b>	<b>Council WR Number</b>
PM/0154/1072				Proposals Map		
EDT5 & PM/0155/1073	June Dudley	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT5 & Proposals Map		W/SMBC/1
EDT5 & PM/0156/1074	Mr John Price	Obj	MOD/PM/18	EDT5 & Proposals Map		W/SMBC/1

## Appendix 2

## LIST OF CORE DOCUMENTS

1	PPG 3: Housing
2	PPG 4: Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms
3	PPG 6: Town Centres and Retailing
4	PPG 9: Nature Conservation
5	PPG 12: Development Plans
6	PPG 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
7	PPG 20: Coastal Planning
8	PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
9	PPS6: Planning for Town Centres
10	PPS12: Local Development Frameworks
11	Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (2003) - RPG13
12	Sefton Revised UDP with proposed modifications (2005)
13	Inspector's Report to the UDP Inquiry (2004)
14	'List of Proposed Modifications to Revised Deposit Draft and Response to Inspector's Recommendations', June 2005, Sefton MBC
15	'Sefton Council: Local Development Scheme', March 2005, Sefton MBC
16	UDP inquiry proofs of evidence - Asda/SMBC
17	'Section 1' and 'Summary' of the 'Council's Proof of Evidence SMBC/8 into Mr. Gribble's Objections SP/0106/0528, 13.1-13.1H & Fig13.1/0106/0642, G1/0106/0643, G1/0106/0644 and 13.36A/0106/0884', March 2004, Sefton MBC
18	'Section 3' of the 'Council's Proof of Evidence SMBC/124 into Policy G1 Protection of Urban Greenspace (policy wording only)', June 2004, Sefton MBC
19	
20	Housing Topic Paper for UDP inquiry
21	Retail Topic Paper for UDP Inquiry
22	Employment Topic Paper for UDP Inquiry
23	NewHeartlands Prospectus 2003
24	NewHeartlands Update 2005
25	Bedford Road/ Queens Road HMRI Supplementary Planning Guidance
26	Klondyke/ Canal Corridor HMRI Supplementary Planning Guidance
27	Bedford Road/ Queens Road HMRI Development Brief
28	Klondyke/ Canal Corridor HMRI Development Brief
29	Draft Housing Needs Study 2005
30	Housing Needs Study 2003
31	South Sefton Regeneration Strategy
32	EU directive (2001/42/EC) on SEA
33	Planning for Housing Provision' consultation paper, ODPM
34	Details of Council witnesses
35	Correspondence between Council and Parklife
36	Correspondence between Council and Ms Joyce
37	Statement of Case for the Compulsory Purchase Order, Klondyke and Canal Corridor
38	Committee Report, 21 September 05: UDP Response & Representations to Proposed Modifications

39	Retail Strategy Review 2005 - (not available until January 2006)
40	Committee Report, 21 September 05: Land at Bank Road, Strand Road, Bootle
41	Committee Report, 21 September: Former Lanstar Site, Hawthorne Road, Bootle
42	Letter from GONW, 7 November 05: Confirmation retail applications would not be called in
43	Mr. Gribble's Proof of Evidence for UDP Inquiry 2004
44	Seaforth Local Centre Study, March 2005
45	District Centres, Local Centre and Shopping Parades Study
46	Opening statement and statutory notices
47	Recreation and Open Space for Sefton Consultants brief, 2003

**APPENDIX 3**

**SEFTON UDP – MODIFICATIONS INQUIRY  
PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY  
PROGRAMME - DATED 25 JANUARY 2006**

**WEDNESDAY 25 JANUARY 2006**

**11.00 INSPECTOR'S OPENING STATEMENT FOLLOWED BY THE  
COUNCIL'S OPENING STATEMENT**

**Hearing of Objections**

<b>PRN</b>	<b>Objection Ref</b>	<b>POLICY / Full reference/ Proposed Modification</b>	<b>Objector</b>	<b>Representing Sefton Council</b>
106	1067	<b>13.1H/0106/1067 MOD/13/06</b>	<b>Mr G Gribble</b>  <b>INFORMAL HEARING</b>	Mr S Matthews, BA, MA, MRTPI, MBA – Local Planning Manager Ms L Eccles, BA Grad, Dip LD, MLI – Landscape Officer

**WEDNESDAY 25 JANUARY 2006 at approx 12.00**

150	1054	<b>H6A/0150/1054 MOD/06/53</b>	<b>Miss Mary-Jo Joyce</b>  <b>INFORMAL HEARING</b>	Mr A Young, BA, MCD, MRTPI – Strategic Planning Manager Mr J Ohren, DPA (Univ. of Liverpool) – Principal Housing Officer Mrs I Berry, BA MRTPI - Principal Planner
150	1056	<b>H6B/0150/1056 MOD/06/54</b>		
150	1058	<b>6.34/0150/1058 MOD/06/49</b>		
150	1059	<b>6.32BA/0150/1059 MOD/06/45</b>		
150	1057	<b>H6/0150/1057 MOD/06/47</b>		
150	1060	<b>6.32B/0150/1060 MOD/06/44</b>		
150	1061	<b>H2/0150/1061 MOD/06/12</b>		
150	1062	<b>SusApH2/0150/1062 MOD/06/15</b>		
150	1063	<b>6.13/0150/1063 MOD/06/13</b>		