

## 2017 Supplementary Planning Document consultation

### Consultation statement - Crosby Centre SPD

The Council consulted statutory and other consultees on the draft Crosby Centre SPD in line with the approved 2011 Statement of Community Involvement (<https://www.sefton.gov.uk/sci>). The consultation period ran from mid-March to 2nd May 2017.

A total 7 responses were received, from the following:

- Crosby Investment Strategy Group
- Environment Agency ('no comment')
- Historic England ('no comment')
- Marine Management Organisation ('no comment')
- Natural England
- Network Rail ('no comment')
- St Modwen

The table below summaries the main issues raised by consultees ('summary of comment'), and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD ('Response').

| Consultee                               | Summary of comment  | Response   |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Crosby Investment Strategy Group</b> | Para 1.4 - The Crosby Investment Strategy was prepared for the Council by Nexus not Broadway Malyan.  | The SPD will be amended to correct this reference.   |
|   | Para 2.2 refers to the lack of bus links to Blundellsands and Crosby railway station. Will the SPD review such an opportunity as part of an overall Transportation Review?  | Whilst a review of bus links to and from the railway can be encouraged, this would need to be promoted by Merseytravel.  |
|   | After para 2.6 the SPD should include more data on current performance of the Town Centre such as gap analysis, assets and areas for improvement, enhanced management, improved profile and accessibility (see Prescot SPD by Knowsley Council) e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current Performance of the Town Centre</li> <li>• Retail, Leisure and Service sector Performance</li> <li>• Local Retail Property Market Review</li> <li>• Environmental Review</li> </ul> | More detail is provided in the Crosby Investment Strategy and in the Crosby Health Check. It is not necessary to replicate this information in the SPD, in part because such information would quickly become out of date. |

| Consultee | Summary of comment   | Response  |
|-----------|--|---|
|           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport Infrastructure Review and parking</li> <li>• Assets and Areas for Improvement</li> </ul> <p>The SPD should comment on the range of uses along Coronation Road/Liverpool Road, and Cooks Road/Little Crosby Road. The presence of Hearts Leisure Club and quasi industrial uses (Auto-Electrical and Tyre depot), and should be mentioned to demonstrate diversity. Does the Council believe such industrial uses contribute towards the vitality of the village and would such uses be acceptable in future applications?</p>   | <p>In relation uses along Coronation Road and on Cooks Road/ Little Crosby Road, this area falls outside the scope of the SPD. Non-town centres uses in town centre will be assessed against Local Plan policy ED2.</p>   |
|           | <p>Para 2.8 – Why is NatWest Bank site included within the red line area but not the Farm Foods to Co-op travel block along Liverpool Road. Ditto the vacant Thomas Cook, Stamps, Oxfam, Moorcroft block.</p> <p>Para 2.8 clearly illustrates that Sefton Council is the primary landowner in the Village but the SPD offers no clue as to the Council’s intentions regarding its land-holdings or public car parks. The plan should include the McCarthy and Stone site, with a commentary on the recent development of this area for residential units.</p>  | <p>The town centre boundaries were set at the Local Plan examination; therefore the SPD has reflected these boundaries.</p> <p>The SPD’s purpose is to form guidance that applies to all development proposals within Crosby district centre. The McCarthy and Stone site is not covered by the Town Council as there is no prospect of this area being redeveloped for town centre uses.</p>                         |
|           | <p>Para ED9 of the Local Plan refers to St Michael’s Cross but this important historic feature is not referred to in the Context paragraphs.</p>   | <p>Reference to St Michael’s Cross will be added to the SPD.</p>  |
|           | <p><b>Crosby Centre Development Principles:</b><br/> CC1, para 1 and 2 The SPD should amplify and clarify what is meant by high design quality<br/> CC1 para 2 The SPD should acknowledge the need for “sense of place,” identity and gateways. The centre currently has a poor sense of arrival with indistinct gateways. This exacerbates the layout of the existing highway network which largely bypasses and conceals the village centre and what it has to offer.<br/> CC1 para 3 refers to pedestrian connections but this will require a commitment by the highway authority, which is not evident in the SPD.<br/> CC1 para 8 mentions public realm but the SPD should demonstrate some commitment by the Council towards the public realm and acknowledge that improvements to the centre’s environment also have a role to play in supporting new investment. This will be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Setting a standard for high quality new development, including public realm.</li> </ol> | <p>Agree to amend CC1 para 2 to refer to importance of gateways.</p> <p>With regard to the suggestion that the Council should financially commit to investing in the centre, the Council is not able to commit to the precise actions it will take at present. To do so would be too inflexible and could prevent the Council from taking advantage of future opportunities that cannot be identified at present.</p> |

| Consultee | Summary of comment   | Response  |
|-----------|--|---|
|           | <p>2. Using public investment to improve the setting of key development sites and encourage high quality private development.</p> <p>3. Facilitating the delivery of new investment through the targeted use of public sector resources.</p> <p>Para 3.2 refers to the appearance of the rear of shops or car parks fronting the perimeter road network. The recent approved planning application for Glenn Buildings (south) Moor Lane showed no evidence of the Council's commitment to improving the appearance of its public land alongside the Bypass.</p> <p>What opportunities does the Council envisage for improvement of properties outside the boundary of the 3 proposed development sites, for environmental, shopfront and security enhancements if these are not to detract from regeneration opportunities in the 3 key sites?</p> <p>After para 3.5 the Council should refer to page 46 of the Crosby Investment Strategy, referring to the Council's role and commitment as landowner, landlord, highway and planning authority to ensure comprehensive site redevelopment proposals come forward. This includes preparing a development brief and procuring a development partner.</p>        | <p>With regard to the preparation of a Development Brief, this will be considered at the appropriate time. This could include the treatment of the areas identified by the Crosby Investment Strategy Group.</p>  |
|           | <p><b>Site 1 Moor Lane North Side</b></p> <p>Para 4.4 Some guidance should be offered to the type of uses which would be accepted on Site 1 Moor Lane North Side, for example retail, health &amp; community, co-located public services. There should also be reference to the introduction of residential, rationalisation of public transport and improvements to public realm.</p> <p>Has the Council tested the viability of a 2-level car park? 3 What is meant by "The redevelopment should include the redevelopment of Allengate surface car park in order to provide additional levels of parking (in partnership with Sefton Council)? " What form of partnership is proposed?</p> <p>CC2 and 4.5 refers to a comprehensive retail-led development but already the application for refurbishment of Glenn Buildings (North) would tend towards a more piecemeal approach. Would the Council be willing to support uses other than retail (see 4.4. above)</p> <p>Does the Council intend to encourage new residential development within the centre to regenerate key sites and create additional demand for shops and services or is residential to be confined to upper floors of retail units?</p> | <p>The SPD will be revised to suggest appropriate uses in paragraph 4.4. This could include residential development if this supports the town centre uses.</p> <p>The SPD is not the appropriate place to identify how the Council will be involved in the regeneration of the centre. As indicated above, this would be too inflexible and could prevent the Council from taking advantage of future opportunities that may arise in the future.</p> |

| Consultee                             | Summary of comment  | Response   |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
|                                       | <p><b>Site 2 - Islington</b><br/> Site 2 – should refer to a requirement to improve linkages with Coronation Road, including a review of the highway infrastructure and the confusing array of roundabouts within the highway.<br/> 4.10 What justification is there for suggesting that Islington is the second major site for redevelopment? You have also indicated that Moor Lane South is the second major site (para 4.14)</p> <p><b>Site 3 – Moor Lane South</b><br/> Site 3 - should acknowledge McCarthy &amp; Stone’s presence and opportunities thus created. The aspirations in the SPD for a comprehensive development have been overtaken by the recent approval of St Modwen’s application for the refurbishment of Glenn Buildings, retention of the Home Bargain store and the proposed new-build to the western end of their land-holding. The SPD should now address what is to happen to the Council-owned car park, public conveniences, and other public realm fronting the Bypass.<br/> 4.14 says this is the second major site, but the CIS says it is the lowest priority site. How do the SPD proposals reconcile with St Modwen’s proposals for remodelling the existing retail units with offices above?<br/> How will the car parking and views to the By-Pass be reconciled if not through the Council’s direct participation as landowner?</p> <p>Sefton Local Plan Policy ED9 para 3 states “Proposals that would prejudice the comprehensive development of key sites within the Centre will not be permitted.”<br/> Already this Policy has been breached by allowing consent for piecemeal development of the Glenn Buildings without having regard to the broader site implications of land held by the Council alongside the Bypass.</p> | <p>The reference in para 4.14 to Moor Lane South as the second major site will be amended.</p> <p>No proposed changes</p> <p>No proposed changes</p> |
| <b>Environment Agency</b>             | No comments   | No proposed changes  |
| <b>Historic England</b>               | No comments   | No proposed changes  |
| <b>Marine Management Organisation</b> | No specific comments.   | No proposed changes  |
| <b>Natural</b>                        | This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This   | Agree to amend CC1 Development   |

| Consultee           | Summary of comment  | Response   |
|---------------------|---|--|
| <b>England</b>      | <p>should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area. There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• green roof systems and roof gardens;</li> <li>• green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling;</li> <li>• new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity).</li> </ul> <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</p> <p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment.</p> <p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity</p> | <p>Principles to incorporate these issues.</p> <p>Agree to amend CC1 Development Principles to incorporate these issues.</p> <p>No proposed changes</p> <p>No proposed changes</p> |
| <b>Network Rail</b> | No comments.  | No proposed changes  |
| <b>St Modwen</b>    | <p><b>CC1 Development Principles</b><br/>Criteria 2 states that developments should be ‘at least 2 storeys in height’. This statement is considered too prescriptive for future design considerations and it is suggested the wording is revised to allow greater flexibility. It is considered that the emphasis should be on creating a strong street frontage and a high quality of design, without prescriptive details.</p> <p><b>CC2 Moor Lane North</b><br/>As for CC1, it is considered that greater flexibility should be introduced into this Policy to ensure there is flexibility for a range of development options to come forwards. Flexibility should also be given greater consideration when bringing forward redevelopment given that the town centre falls under a number of different ownerships. The following amendments to the wording are suggested</p>  | <p>No proposed changes</p> <p>Amend criteria 4 of CC2 as suggested.</p>  |

| Consultee | Summary of comment   | Response            |
|-----------|--|---------------------|
|           | <p>for the Council's consideration.</p> <p>It is suggested that Criteria 4 be amended to 'Pedestrian links between Moor Lane and Richmond Road should be maintained and enhanced.' This will allow for a greater degree of flexibility in future redevelopment options to accommodate different schemes and layouts, to achieve the best possible design.</p>  |                     |
|           | <p><b>CC4 Moor Lane South</b></p> <p>As for Policy CC2, it is suggested that the requirement for development to be at least 2 storeys in height is amended to require strong road frontages and high design quality. This is to allow flexibility in design options to achieve the best possible solution for the site.</p>  | No proposed changes |
|           | <p><b>General Comment</b></p> <p>The policies set out in the document make reference to the redevelopment of the town centre. St. Modwen considers that options for refurbishment of existing assets to enhance the character of the area should also be considered, such as the Glenn Buildings. This will also allow for a more holistic approach to improving the town centre and ensuring the best results are achieved.</p> | No proposed changes |