

SEFTON COUNCIL

Sefton Council (Maritime Corridor)

Compulsory Purchase Order 2025

Proof of Evidence of:

Peter Eustance

20 January 2026

## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
	Personal details .....	1
	Structure of this evidence .....	1
2.	Objectors .....	2
	Statutory Objections from Landowners directly affected by the CPO .....	2
	Statutory Objection OBJ1 – Network Rail Infrastructure Limited .....	2
	Statutory Objections OBJ2 - Aubrey and Rachel Weis (Represented by Mr Holland).....	3
	Statutory Objection OBJ3 – Your Housing (Represented by Mr Lashmar) .....	4
	Statutory Objection OBJ4 – Portfield Investments Ltd. (Represented by Mr Sowerby) .....	5
	Statutory Objection OBJ5 – Vesty Business Park .....	6
	Statutory Objection OBJ6 – SP Energy Networks (SPEN).....	7
3.	Conclusion.....	8
	Appendix A – Reason for Acquisition of Each Plot of Land .....	9
	Appendix B – Summary of Objections received.....	12

# 1. Introduction

## Personal details

- 1.1. My name is Peter Eustance. I am employed by SLC Property as Associate Director, Acquisition & Development, based at home in Liverpool, Merseyside.
- 1.2. SLC Property (SLCP) is a specialist infrastructure property consultancy which has offices in Birmingham and Newcastle.
- 1.3. I am a member of The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) having qualified in 1990. I attended the BSc Land Management course at Reading University.
- 1.4. Prior to my current role I held the position of Associate Director in the Claimant and Compensation team at Ardent and prior to that the role of Director in the North West Valuation Team at CBRE.
- 1.5. Since 2018 I have been involved in land acquisitions on behalf of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council (SC), Wirral Borough Council, Kirklees Borough Council and Northumberland County Council.
- 1.6. Other projects that I have been involved in include the reopening of the Northumberland Line.
- 1.7. I have been instructed on the Maritime Corridor project (Scheme) for SC since Spring 2023 having led on the land and property elements of the scheme from an early stage.
- 1.8. Where I have not undertaken discussions personally with landowners, I have been kept fully informed by colleagues at SLCP, SC's consultants WSP and legal advisors Brabners LLP and DAC Beachcroft LLP. Where SLCP have engaged in direct discussions and I have not been involved colleagues have reported details of the meetings to me. Where appropriate SC's consultants have provided me with notes of meetings and correspondence where relevant.
- 1.9. The evidence which I have prepared and provided in this Proof of Evidence has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the evidence is true, and the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

## Structure of this evidence

- 1.10. This evidence provides a summary of the objections received to the Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council (Maritime Corridor) Compulsory Purchase Order 2025 (Order), which was made on 12 June 2025.
- 1.11. My evidence addresses the following:
  - a) Section 2: Describes the Scheme objectors and details of their objections. It describes the status of each of the objections (withdrawn or outstanding) plus responses to the objections from Sefton Council to date.
  - b) Section 3: Describes the conclusions of my evidence.
- 1.12. Further evidence, providing Sefton Council's overview of and case for the Scheme, including the need and objectives, is being provided by other witnesses from the project team as follows.

Andrew Dunsmore of Sefton Council has set out in a separate Statement of Case the Sefton Council overview of the case for the Scheme, including the need and the objectives of the CPO.

Andrew Ivey of WSP has written a Statement of Case which provides an overview of the design of the Scheme and the land required to implement the design

## 2. Objectors

- 2.1. This section details the objections to the Order and sets out the status of each of the objections (withdrawn or outstanding) plus responses to date.
- 2.2. The Order, together with other enclosed documents, were published on 12 July 2025 and the statutory objection period concluded on 8 August 2025.
- 2.3. By the end of the objection period six statutory objections had been received.
- 2.4. One statutory objection has been withdrawn to date.
- 2.5. At the time of writing this Proof of Evidence, there are now 5 statutory objections, although three have underlying agreements upon which there are likely withdrawal of objections pending, as follows.

Statutory objectors:

- OBJ1 – Network Rail
  - OBJ2 – Aubrey and Rachel Weis (Represented by Mr Holland)
  - OBJ3 – Your Housing (Represented by Mr Lashmar)
  - OBJ4 – Portfield Investments Limited
  - OBJ5 – Vesty Business Park Tenants (Represented by County Planners)
  - ONJ6 – Scottish Power Energy Network – Now withdrawn
- 2.6. SC responded to each of the objectors as their objections were received and met with the statutory objectors on several occasions to help them understand the scheme, to remove their objection.
  - 2.7. A summary of the objections received, and SC's response was included in the Statement of Case and included in Appendix A to this proof.

### Statutory Objections from Landowners directly affected by the CPO

#### *Statutory Objection OBJ1 – Network Rail Infrastructure Limited*

- 2.8. Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (NRIL) have an interest in plots 1,2,4,8,9,10,11,12,13 and 14 in respect of conveyances, deeds of grant and agreements. NRIL served an objection requiring more details as to the interests being acquired.
- 2.9. NRIL have required more details as to the interests being acquired and extinguished to ascertain any impact upon their retained land.

#### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.10. NRIL made their objection on 8 July 2025 and SLCP contacted their surveyor Roger Brighthouse and arranged a meeting on 14 July 2025. Following the meeting both sides made various investigations and reconvened on 9 October 2025 with WSP to discuss the scheme and any impacts upon NRIL land holdings.
- 2.11. Following the meeting on 9 October 2025, SC have signed a Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA) with NRIL.

- 2.12. NRIL have confirmed that an internal consultation process has determined the Scheme will have no direct effect on NRIL's live operational rail lines. As such NRIL do not envisage any further internal authorisations being required in order to allow them to withdraw their objection.
- 2.13. To enable NRIL's objection to be withdrawn, NRIL require the completion of the Deed of Undertaking by SC. Separately, (and internally) NRIL need to sign off of a Licence Condition 17 (LC17) which safeguards against the inappropriate disposal of NRIL land assets. Both of these are in progress at the time of preparing this Proof of Evidence.
- 2.14. In view of the current progress, I anticipate that NRIL's objection will be withdrawn in advance of the Inquiry hearing.

### *Statutory Objections OBJ2 - Aubrey and Rachel Weis (Represented by Mr Holland)*

- 2.15. Aubrey and Rachel Weis are the landowners for Plot 20 to the south of Bridle Road.
- 2.16. A number of attempts were made to contact Aubrey and Rachel Weis, including writing to them by post to their Registered Address on 12 October 2023 and 4 December 2023. The first response we had from them was on 10 April 2025, when SLCP received an email from Benjamin Hassan, of Combined Property Control, following receipt of the Notice of Requisition on 2 April 2025.
- 2.17. Subsequently Mr and Mrs Weis, via James Ogborn and Chris Holland of Axis Property Consultancy LLP, raised a number of objections to the Order as follows:
- a) Mr and Mrs Weis are well-established property developers and investors and they are extremely concerned that the Scheme will adversely impact their retained land as the area proposed to be acquired forms part of the main road frontage to their property.
  - b) The Scheme may also impact vehicular access into the industrial estate (being their retained land) both during the construction period and post completion of the Scheme and therefore directly affect their business tenants.
  - c) In accordance with the 'Guidance on the Compulsory Purchase Process' published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, the Council has not adequately justified the requirement to take this land nor has it provided sufficient information to the owners for them to assess the potential impact the acquisition of this land will have on their retained land.
  - d) Compulsory purchase should be as a last resort and further engagement between the Council and the owner is required to enable an agreement to be entered into to cover elements such as mitigation measures to adequately protect the owner and its business tenants.

### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.18. SLCP made initial contact with Chris Holland of Axis on 6 May 2025 to progress discussions relating to Plot 20 and met on site on 7 May 2025.
- 2.19. Following the site meeting on 7 May and further discussions, SLCP set out heads of terms for an agreement with the owners on 3 July 2025. The objection was made subsequently on 11 July with the grounds detailed in 2.17 above.
- 2.20. SLCP have sought to progress with Axis subsequently but negotiations have been slow due to a lack of engagement by the owners.
- 2.21. During discussions with Axis, I was informed that the owners have obtained their own Transport Consultant's advice and are alleging that an alternative approach is possible which would not require the acquisition of Plot 20. However, details of this alternative approach or the Transport Consultant's advice have not been provided

in order to allow further negotiations.

- 2.22. In terms of the specific points I would comment as follows.
- 2.23. In relation to a) - concern that the Scheme will adversely impact their Retained Land. It's acknowledged that the owner has expertise in this sector, however, there are no pending applications or current planning permissions for the development of the owner's land and without the commentary from the owner as to the development potential of their site, we are unable to make comment as to the negative impact upon their residual landholding. SC's Highways Consultants WSP have an Active Travel team who have advised that they have not seen such claims regarding injurious affection from an Active Travel scheme made in similar schemes in the North. Furthermore, if there were any adverse impact on the Retained Land then this is a matter that can be addressed at the compensation stage (which is not an issue for confirmation). The Scheme has also been designed in line with National standards, which necessitates the need for the land to develop the width of highway and Cycle path required. This land is currently along the verge of the road and is situated between the estate wall, enclosing their industrial estate, and the highway. Fundamentally any adverse effect is a matter for compensation rather than a reason not to confirm the Order.
- 2.24. In relation to b) - impact on vehicular access into the industrial estate both during the construction period and post completion of the Scheme affecting their business tenants. The proposals will not affect the future access to the site and any disruption during construction can feasibly be mitigated by way of a management plan.
- 2.25. In relation to c) – sufficient justification. The Council consider the scheme to be suitably justified as detailed in Mr Ivey and Mr Dunsmore's evidence.
- 2.26. In relation to d) - SLCP were informed that Axis Property Consultancy LLP were appointed on 6 May 2025 and sent across details of the scheme and land required that day together with arranging a meeting on site the day later.
- 2.27. At the site meeting on 7 May 2025 and subsequent emails with Axis, SLCP have set out the requirements for the land based upon the standards set for such schemes and before the CPO was made on 12 June 2025.
- 2.28. The owners have not sought to proactively engage with SLCP or SC in regard to the Scheme or any potential impacts that this may have on their retained land. Without further clarification from the owners, it has not been possible to address these concerns with the owner
- 2.29. SC and I totally agree that "*Compulsory purchase should be as a last resort and further engagement between the Council and the owner is required*". SC and SLCP have sought to engage with the owners to progress such discussions and would welcome open dialogue with the owners. These discussions began as soon as Axis were appointed as noted in paragraph 2.18 above and we have made offers to purchase the land
- 2.30. We did not receive any response until Walker Morris, solicitors for Mr and Mrs Weis, issued a report on 29 December 2025 during the Christmas Break, which had been written by Mike Hibbert of TTHC Limited in September 2025. We responded with full response to the claimants in the week commencing 12 January 2026. Mr Hibbert requested details of the scheme which could have been provided at any point in the preceding 24 months since initial contact was sought with the landowners. Given the lack of contact prior to this report and the fact it required three months to be released delayed discussions and illustrates the ongoing lack of engagement by the owners. This is why the CPO is a last resort.
- 2.31. The substantive response to the Report – which alleges an alternative scheme – is dealt with in Mr Ivey's proof who sets out why it is not a viable alternative.

### ***Statutory Objection OBJ3 – Your Housing (Represented by Mr Lashmar)***

- 2.32. Your Housing Group (YHG) are the freehold owners of plots 1,2,4,8,9,10 and 11. An objection was received by Department for Transport (DfT) via email on 9 July 2025 by Deloitte Legal, on behalf of YHG, stating that while YHG does not object in principle to the delivery of the Scheme, they do object as follows:

- YHG does have significant concerns and objections to the current design of the Scheme which involves the taking of "unnecessary land".2.28.2 In addition, they also cite a lack of engagement from the Council with those affected and a failure on the part of the Council to consider genuine and viable alternatives to the current proposals.
- 2.33. YHG's plots form part of their proposed development of their land, for which they obtained planning permission (on appeal). This permission was obtained after SC initially discussed their Scheme with in 2023.
- 2.34. For the avoidance of doubt, YHG also own plots 12 and 13 fronting Park Road and I have been in discussions with Mr Lashmar, Director of Deloitte's with regard to these plots as YHG are in principle in agreement with the acquisition of these plots.

### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.35. I have held some initial discussions with Mr Lashmar in connection with the plots 12 and 13. The main discussions have been between SC and YHG in connection with plots 1,2,4,8,9,10 and 11. There is a draft Settlement Agreement between SC and YHG which is being finalised currently which will allow for withdrawal of the Objection.

### *Statutory Objection OBJ4 – Portfield Investments Ltd. (Represented by Mr Sowerby)*

- 2.36. Aidan Grimshaw (AG) as a Director of Portfield Investments Ltd (PIL) submitted an objection to the Order relating to Plot 16 and is not supportive of the Scheme having cited concerns relating to the potential impact of the Scheme on the Vesty Business Park post construction. There has also been an objection raised by County Planners on behalf of Vesty Business Park Occupiers and will also be covered by Mr Grimshaw.
- 2.37. PIL's main objections are as follows:
- a) Consultation should be more than a formality; it should involve genuine dialogue, allowing parties to express their views and concerns and potentially influence the acquiring authority's decisions
  - b) Authorities must carefully consider the responses received during consultation and demonstrate how they have taken these into account when deciding whether to proceed with the CPO
  - c) It is crucial for acquiring authorities to document all engagement with affected parties, including the steps taken, the information provided, and how responses were considered.

### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.38. SC has sought to consult with Mr Grimshaw over a number of years to discuss the Scheme and its potential impacts on Vesty Business Park (being the business park affected by the proposed acquisition of plots 16,18 and 19 and we are currently progressing with plots 18 and 19. SLCP met with Mr Grimshaw on various Teams Calls on 4 December 2023, 12 February 2024, 02 April 2025 (with SC) in addition to a number of email and phone calls over the years. I also attended a meeting (in person) with the SC and a number of tenants of the estate on 02 October 2025.
- 2.39. PIL's grounds of objection centre around the process of engagement and the speed of response to queries raised in meetings. Some of those questions, required input from third parties, such as the Police, in order to discuss the feasibility of CCTV operation in the area. Despite these discussions taking place in order to address PIL's concerns, Mr Grimshaw has raised objection to the speed at which these discussions have taken place.
- 2.40. Despite various discussions with Mr Grimshaw, he has maintained his objection, in principle, to the Scheme and in particular in relation to the acquisition and use of plot 16. His concerns relate to a concern that the Scheme will result in an increase of anti-social behaviour and crime in and around Vesty Business Park.
- 2.41. It should be noted that Mr Grimshaw has indicated he would be willing to accept the acquisition of plots 18 and

19, which front Bridle Road. However, these discussions have been hindered by Mr Grimshaw's objection to the acquisition of the remaining plots and a fear that accepting the acquisition of these plots will prejudice his objection to the acquisition of plot 16.

- 2.42. The grounds on which SC are seeking to take the land for the link between Deltic Way and Vesty Business Park are as follows:
- a) One of the key drivers of the cycle paths will be to assist lower income communities in the vicinity where car ownership is lower than the national average in one of the most deprived areas of the UK,
  - b) The cycleway will help to join dissected communities in the area,
  - c) The tenants highlighted that currently on dark evenings that there is anti-social behaviour at the rear of their properties which would be alleviated with the proposed improved CCTV lighting,
  - d) The cycleway will rejuvenate Deltic Way which has become a focus for fly tipping and will enable better public access from Aintree Station on foot,
  - e) The improvement in Active Travel will assist improvement in Public Health, and
  - f) In delivery of such plans, Highways Departments are required to meet National standards which set out the width and specification of roads and pavements required which also has an impact upon design.
- 2.43. In response to the concerns over consultation we note the objectors' concerns, however some of the delays were as a result of investigations being made to alleviate issues of design for the tenants. The planning application for the design of the Scheme along this area, has been amended in order to include additional mitigation measures in order to address AG's concerns. Details of the planning will be covered in Andy Ivey's proof.
- 2.44. I do not believe the objections made are relevant to the issue of whether the CPOs should be confirmed.

### *Statutory Objection OBJ5 – Vesty Business Park*

- 2.45. The objection related to the CPO as a whole rather than specific plot numbers.
- 2.46. An objection was received by DfT on 11 July 2025 from County Planners, on behalf of a number of occupiers of Vesty Business Park as part of the Objection noted in 2.33 above.
- 2.47. Their objections relate to:
- a) The proposal fails to adopt appropriate means and recommendations, for example, Secured By Design principles, in order to deter and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour.
  - b) The proposals would result in a dark, dingy alley way that would in-time become a hot-spot for criminality. The proposal fails to adopt appropriate means and recommendations, for example, Secured By Design principles, in order to deter and prevent crime and anti-social behaviour. The proposals would result in a dark, dingy alley way that would in-time become a hot-spot for criminality
  - c) In addition, the objection highlights that the area is already subject to high levels of crime with the fears that the proposals would increase these ongoing issues.

### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.48. The objection is not clear exactly which tenants/occupiers of Vesty Business Park object to the Scheme. I wrote to County Planners to clarify who has objected and I received a response from Aidan Grimshaw of PIL stating that County Planners are no longer instructed on this matter and that all negotiations are to be conducted via him.



- 2.49. As mentioned at para 2.34 above, a meeting was held with various tenants of Vesty Business Park to discuss their concerns regarding the Scheme on 2 October 2025. Their concerns appear to mirror those of PIL, in that they are concerned that the Scheme will increase anti-social behaviours and crime at the business park. Although in discussions with myself and SC the tenants have welcomed the proposed mitigation measures (e.g. CCTV, boundary treatment etc), they have maintained that they will not withdraw their objection to the Order as a matter of principle
- 2.50. However, the issues they raise as merits disagreements with the Scheme. While the Council reject them, they are also not relevant to the question of whether the CPO should be confirmed. The question is whether there is a compelling case in the public interest and the Council have demonstrated that there is.

### *Statutory Objection OBJ6 – SP Energy Networks (SPEN)*

- 2.51. SPEN is the statutory electricity undertaker for the region and has apparatus within the highways being the subject of the Order.
- 2.52. SC and the design team have been working with SPEN on this project since initial commencement of engagement in 2023.
- 2.53. SPEN made an objection on 8 August 2025 in order to safeguard their assets (managed by SP Energy Networks) being adversely impacted by the Scheme and for the applicant to engage as much as possible to avoid such impacts. This Objection has now been withdrawn as of 8 December 2025.

### *Sefton Council's Response*

- 2.54. SC and SPEN have agreed a Protective Provisions agreement and this objection has been withdrawn.

### 3. Conclusion

- 3.1. In conclusion, this proof of evidence sets out objections and discussions with objectors to the scheme (section 2) confirming the compelling case set out by SC and WSP to justify the use of CPO powers to acquire the land for the Scheme.
- 3.2. We have engaged with all the landowners impacted by the scheme, and in 1 case we have reached agreement with the landowners for the acquisition of their land and to enable their objection to be removed. However, some landowners have refused to agree to the acquisition of their land or failed to engage with the Council, and the CPO is needed as a last resort to purchase this land should future negotiations fail.
- 3.3. It provides an overview of the objections to the Orders, and my response to confirm that SC has engaged with objectors during and following the objection period; and where applicable have reached agreements to remove objections.
- 3.4. I confirm that I have made clear which facts and matters referred to in this report are within my own knowledge and which are not. Those that are within my own knowledge I confirm to be true. The opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinions on the matters to which they refer. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth

## Appendix A – Reason for Acquisition of Each Plot of Land

The CPO identifies the land required for the scheme, the plans included in the CPO break this down into land ownership which are identified by various plot numbers, the table below should be viewed in conjunction with the CPO and confirms the reason and need for the acquisition of each plot.

<b>Number on CPO Plan</b>	<b>Extent, description, and situation of the land</b>	<b>Proposed Use of the land Justification for inclusion in the CPO</b>
1	All interests in 471.6 square metres of grassland and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of The Boxworks excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
2	All interests in 126.2 square metres of grassland and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of The Boxworks excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
3	All interests in 23.9 square metres of shrubbed area (Unit 1-2, 49 Ormskirk Road, Liverpool, L9 5AF excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
4	All interests in 24 square metres of grassland, trees, and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
5	All interests in 5.9 square metres of trees and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Road and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
6	All interests in 2.7 square metres of trees and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
7	All interests in 4.3 square metres of trees and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
8	All interests in 55.4 square metres of trees and shrubbery; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)

9	All interests in 303.6 square metres of grassland; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
10	All interests in 126.1 square metres of grassland, trees, shrubbery, and cycleway; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
11	All interests in 5.8 square metres of grassland and cycleway; south of Heysham Road and east of Longbridge Drive excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
12	All interests in 371.4 square metres of grassland and shrubbery; north of Park Lane and west of Sentinel Way excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
13	All interests in 233.2 square metres of grassland and shrubbery; north of Park Lane and east of Sentinel Way excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Heysham Road and Sentinel Way to create a safer cycle route between Heysham Road and Park Lane and an alternative to Ormskirk Road (A59)
14	All interests in 667.9 square metres of private accessway; south of Deltic Way and west of Sefton Business Park except those owned by the acquiring authority and excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Deltic Way, Vesty Road and Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route between Park Lane and Bridle Road. The route is less constrained and invasive than an alternative along Bridle Road
15	All interests in 737.1 square metres of sports ground (Bootle Football Club, 4 Vesty Road, Bootle, L30 1NY) except those owned by the acquiring authority and excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Deltic Way, Vesty Road and Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route between Park Lane and Bridle Road. The route is less constrained and invasive than an alternative along Bridle Road
16	All interests in 797.2 square metres of grassland; east of Vesty Road and west of Deltic Way excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Deltic Way, Vesty Road and Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route between Park Lane and Bridle Road. The route is less constrained and invasive than an alternative along Bridle Road
17	All interests in 18.7 square metres of public highway verge (Vesty Road) except those owned by the acquiring authority and excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway between Deltic Way, Vesty Road and Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route between Park Lane and Bridle Road. The route is less constrained and invasive than an alternative along Bridle Road
18	All interests in 283.1 square metres of grassed area, trees, and shrubbery; north of Vesty Road and east of Bridle Road excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway along Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route on and Bridle Road.

19	All interests in 178.9 square metres of grassed area, trees, and shrubbery; south of Vesty Road and east of Bridle Road excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway along Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route on and Bridle Road
20	All interests in 693.4 square metres of grassland; south of Bridle Way and east of Bridle Road excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway along Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route on and Bridle Road
21	All interests in 456.5 square metres of commercial premises (Senate Business Park, Senate Way, Bootle, L30 4TY) except those owned by the acquiring authority and excluding mines and minerals	To be used as part of cycleway along Bridle Road to create a safer cycle route on and Bridle Road

## Appendix B – Summary of Objections received

Ref	Status	Date received	Objector	Concern raised	Sefton Council engagement with objector
OBJ1	Statutory Objector	08.07.25	Network Rail	NRIL objecting on grounds of Rights and Historic Rights being impacted upon by proposals	<p>09.07.25 - Received Objection - Holding covering intersections with scheme. PE called and arranged meeting on 14.07.25</p> <p>14.07.25 - PE met RB on Teams Call. RB to check of any past agreements impact upon land transfers. Key issue is Plot 14 where Northern Trust granting surrender of land and whether NR need to be part of agreement. Issue re roadworks over Rail Bridges but need to confirm with SC</p> <p>13.08.25 - PE sent RB chasing email</p> <p>14.08.25 - PE emailed NRIL asking what information required to w/d Objection</p> <p>14.08.25 - RB responded with details required. PE forwarded to wsp and Brabners</p> <p>28.08.25 - RB responded that want to move vehicles on RoW(although overgrown) - requested Questionnaire re APA and SC</p> <p>01.09.25 - PE sent RB completed Questionnaire and request for NRIL to withdraw Objection.</p> <p>18.09.25 - PE emailed RB to query impact upon bridges at Netherton way and park Lane and impact upon Eversheds fees. RB on leave until 22.09.25</p> <p>02.10.25 - PE called RB - to arrange meeting with wsp/SC</p> <p>09.10.25 - RB met with SC/wsp - shared programme and responded re programme. To pass to Eversheds re APA</p> <p>22.10.25 - Follow up meeting to 09.10.25 - PE sent email to chase</p>

					<p>up fee authorisation</p> <p>17.11.25 - PE chased up RB re LC17 and BAPA progress by email</p>
OBJ2	Statutory Objector	11.07.25	Aubrey & Rachel Weis	<p>1. Scheme will adversely impact Retained Land as land required part of main frontage</p> <p>2. Scheme will impact Vehicular Access</p> <p>3. Council not justified requirement to take land</p> <p>4. Require mitigation measures to address impact on businesses and estate</p>	<p>11.10.23 - AI requested PE contact landowners regarding pre-planning queries</p> <p>12.10.23 PE written to Aubrey and Rachel Weis making initial contact</p> <p>05.12.23 - Update Letter sent to Mr &amp; Mrs Weis</p> <p>February - Letter sent from Sefton</p> <p>20.02.25 - PE emailed Bowcliffe LLP in Leeds who Highgate Properties suggested acted for Mr&amp;Mrs Weis. Awaiting response</p> <p>02.04.25 - Notice of Requisition sent to Mr and Mrs Weis</p> <p>10.04.25 - Benjamin Hassan of Control Property Group sent completed Requisition Notice. PE contacted - CPG to appoint surveyors later in month.</p> <p>06.05.25 - Axis been appointed to act for Weis. PE responded to email and called Chris Holland to arrange site meeting.</p> <p>06.05.25 - PE emailed across details re land required</p> <p>07.05.25 - PE/Chris Holland met on site and discussed case and tenancies</p> <p>08.05.25 - PE put Gavin Hynes for Abbey Commercial in touch with Axis for Weis</p> <p>23.06.25 - PE emailed details of CPO to Axis - Query from Axis re</p>

				<p>Details</p> <p>26.06.25 - Correspondence with Axis re land required - valuation of plots for negotiations</p> <p>30.06.25 - Call with Axis re land requirements and approach to Valuation. Require details of Abbey Solicitors</p> <p>03.07.25 - PE sent Offer and Revised HoT to Axis.</p> <p>11.07.25 - Axis sent in Objection to DoT</p> <p>14.07.25 - James Ogborn emailed PE re Objection and subsequently discussed on 15.07.25. Discussed issue of impact upon landholding - will further post A/L on 04.08.25</p> <p>05.08.25 - PE emailed Chris to pursue negotiations</p> <p>08.08.25 - PE/CH spoke. Axis to seek further instructions from Weis but on A/L</p> <p>14.08.25 - PE called AXIS - 50 minute Call - Issue for Weis is any residual impact and having Transport Study undertaken to clarify if affected. Also want to know what is being agreed with Tenant as facing loss of rent for area taken - PE noted that if Tenant didn't request rent reduction then Weis would gain if compensated. Axis to contact once can respond with counter offer.</p> <p>26.08.25. PE called CH to discuss case. Axis awaiting details from Advisors to Weis re Transport impacts. Client on A/L currently</p> <p>27.08.25 - PE sent response to Objection to CH to encourage settlement and removal of objection</p> <p>08.09.25 - PE sent chasing email post call to James Ogborn to follow up last contact with CH</p> <p>16.09.25 - PE sent chasing email post call to James Ogborn to follow up last contact with CH</p> <p>25.09.25 - PE called CH post A/L to progress. Left VM</p> <p>29.09.25 - PE called CH post A/L to progress. Left VM. Sent chasing email and cc to JO</p> <p>01.10.25 - Update call with CH subsequent to SoC being issued.</p>
--	--	--	--	--



					<p>Will pick up negotiations on 14.10.25. In meantime CH to send Highways Report to AI</p> <p>14.10.25 - PE met CH to discuss. Covered points from SoC - to pick up on 27.10 once Highways Report been circulated and considered</p> <p>21.10.25 - PE chased up Details re Traffic report. CH responded details are still with clients</p> <p>27.10.25 - Meeting with Axis regarding land requirement. PE to raise query raised by Weis Transport consultant re land requirement</p> <p>28.10.25 - PE called CH - Follow up on call of 27.10.25 and requested CH forward Transport Report when available</p> <p>03.11.25 - PE emailed CH chasing up report to support request re land reduction</p> <p>06.11.25 - PE emailed further details to request of 03.11.25</p> <p>10.11.25 - PE sent email requesting report to circulate</p> <p>12.11.25 - PE emailed CH chasing up action</p> <p>17.11.25 - PE called CH to chase up. Left VM</p> <p>18.11.25 - CH called re case and explained situation awaiting client instructions</p> <p>09.12.25 - PE left VM chasing up situation</p> <p>10.12.25 - PE left VM chasing up</p> <p>17.12.25 - PE called CH to progress case. CH to forward report to AI.TR if allowed whilst PE on leave</p> <p>06.01.26 - PE contacted Axis post report sent to DfT including Transport Report. CH acknowledged email. PE to send Atkins report</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

OBJ3	Statutory Objector	09.07.25	Your Housing Group	<p>The Council has not made sufficient effort to acquire the land via negotiation and therefore the CPO is premature and unjustified. There has not been a balanced view between the intention of the Council and the concerns of YHG whose interest in land is being acquired compulsorily</p>	<p>16.10.23 - Alec Drake of wsp acting for YH contacted PE regarding arranging meeting to discuss initial proposals.</p> <p>30.11.23 - Bill Fulster contacted to say he is retiring and Kieron Moore taking his place</p> <p>25.02.25 - PE arranged round table meeting wwith YH and wsp and SC for 6.3.25</p> <p>03.03.25 - PE sent details of plots and meeting attendees to Alec Drake after request</p> <p>06.03.25 - PE met with Alec Drake, Doug Haan and Keiron at YH.</p> <p>07.03.25 - Email from Brendan Keville. PE responded on 10.03.25 informing him that had meeting with Keiron Moore on 06.03</p> <p>02.04.25 - PE forwarded Notice of Requisition. Keiron raised queries post meeting and PE responded that SC can respond once Planning appeal been resolved</p> <p>11.04.25 - PE received details from Brendan re RFI. called to confirm details arrived</p> <p>14.04.25 - PE called BK to confirm arrival of details</p> <p>17.04.25 - PE emailed AD re contact post Planning Appeal once situation clear and no conflict which exists whilst Planning Appeal progressing</p> <p>07.05.25 - PE emailed request for YH to update as Planning Appeal progresses</p> <p>23.06.25 - PE sent across details re CPO. KM responded that YH now have Planning and seek to set up meeting. PE chased up SC re dates</p> <p>24.06.25 - Round group arrangements to meet with SC on 02.07.25 to progress. All accepted + SC (AI + AD)</p> <p>02.07.25 - Met to progress post Planning Appeal. AD and AD to progress between wsp and SC re design and works</p> <p>11.07.25 - Deloitte Submitted Objection for YH to DoT</p>
------	--------------------	----------	--------------------	---	---

					<p>15.07.25 - PE called Kieron Moore and emailed post discussion. Clarified that plots 12 &amp; 13 can be discussed. Chased up Steve Lashmar at Delotttes</p> <p>16.07.25. Initial Meeting with Steve Lashmar at deloittes. Discussions re PLOTS 12 &amp; 13 very contingent on discussions re plots 1-11. SL to send Fee Undertaking request to Brabners</p> <p>21.07.25 - Alec Drake sent across proposals for route and clashes. To Progress with SC</p> <p>12.08.25 - PE chased up SL re progress</p> <p>08.09.25 - Email from S Lashmar re actions and fees. PE reverted and sought confirmation from SC.</p> <p>16.09.25 - PE arr meeting with SL on 22.09.25</p> <p>25.09.25 - PE/SL met on Teams. Unable to progress until YH has progressed significantly and Memorandum of Understanding agreed</p> <p>17.10.25 - Email from Deloittes re progress with SC</p> <p>20.10.25 - PE emailed Deloittes to progress re plots on Park Rd. Chased up wsp re plans</p> <p>27.10.25 - PE contacted YH re meeting dates</p> <p>04.11.25 - AD been in touch re meeting on 10.11.25 to confirm dates</p> <p>13.11.25 - Met SL from Deloittes. PE to send draft HoT</p> <p>19.11.25 - PE issued draft HoT re plots 12 and 13</p> <p>02.12.25 - SL sent across email chasing Agreement - AI sent on 03.12.25</p> <p>10.12.25 - PE left VM chasing up HoT</p> <p>15.12.25 - SL called and explained differences re agreement between DABC and Deloittes. To reconvene in 01.26</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

OBJ4	Statutory Objector	11.07.25	Portfield Investments Limited	<p>1. Consultation should be more than a formality; it should involve genuine dialogue, allowing parties to express their views and concerns and potentially influence the acquiring authority's decisions</p> <p>2. Authorities must carefully consider the responses received during consultation and demonstrate how they have taken these into account when deciding whether to proceed with the CPO</p> <p>3. It's crucial for acquiring authorities to document all engagement with affected parties, including the steps taken, the information provided, and how responses were considered.</p>	<p>22.11.23 - PE emailed and called re land at corner of Bridle/Vesty Road</p> <p>23.11.23 - PE follow up call and text</p> <p>04.12.23 - PE met with AG on TEAMS Call. AG said the scheme is extremely well run and presented and the proposals, especially the path to Bootle FC creates an "ratrun". He is also unenthusiastic as to the road widening at Bridle Road junction which he sees as unnecessary. Any change to the estate requires input and consent from the 18 long leaseholders on the estate.</p> <p>12.02.24 - AG responded very negatively to proposal and not willing to work with us.</p> <p>17.02.25 - AG in contact with Elaine Field claiming not heard from Sefton Council. PE called AG and reminded of correspondence of 02.24. AG had hoped problem would go away. PE to arrange meeting with SC/Designers and AG and tenants. PE to send plan of route.</p> <p>17.02.25 AG emailed PE with summary of objections and required confirmation that previous objections been raised with SC</p> <p>25.02.25 - PE contacted AG requesting dates to meet with SC to discuss</p> <p>11.03.25 - PE called and emailed AG to arrange dates to meet with TR - in week of 8-10 April. To confirm when heard from TR</p> <p>13.03.25 - PE emailed AG chasing up meeting dates</p> <p>14.03.25 - AG responded - PE emailed re points raised and called 18.03.25 to chase up agreed dates.</p> <p>24.03.25 - PE called to chase up meetings</p> <p>25.03.25 - PE called - no answer</p> <p>31.03.25 - Arranged meeting with AG/Zak property on 02.04.25</p> <p>02.04.25 - Met with Richard Birchwood/PE/AD/TR - Still unhappy at route and impact upon estate. AD to send letter to occupiers via</p>
------	--------------------	----------	-------------------------------	---	--

				<p>AG</p> <p>02.04.25 - PE sent Notice of Requisition</p> <p>04.04.25 - PE called AG. Unproductive meeting as differences of opinions regarding letter. PE to confirm with SC/Brabners and respond.</p> <p>07.04.25 - PE sent AG holding email whilst awaiting response from SC</p> <p>10.04.25 - PE emailed Portfield with details post meeting last week.</p> <p>30.04.25 - Email from AG regarding consultation. PE responded and AD sent email with letter to affected parties on Vesty to tie in with Planning</p> <p>07.05.25 - PE called AG. wanted to progress negotiations re plots on Bridle Road. AG wanted answers re consultation with Tenants</p> <p>15.05.25 - AG emailed requesting response re Council Consultation</p> <p>19.05.25 - PE response re Council update. PE awaiting response and will send once received</p> <p>21.05.25 - PE sent joint email to Aidan Grimshaw and Richard Birchwood re response concerning Sefton Council Consultation</p> <p>03.06.25 - PE sent email to Aidan Grimshaw re letter to tenants of Vesty Business Park</p> <p>04.06.25 - AG responded with alterations to letter and queries re Consultation. PE pointed AG to SC re letter, Reminded of email re Consultation and informed of Zak being removed from CPO</p> <p>09.06.25 - PE sent AG updated letter from SC which is to be circulated. Sent subsequent email updating that letter was originally sent by SC Mailing company on 13 May.</p> <p>23.06.25 - PE emailed AG details of CPO. AG responded that returns from leave on 30.06.25 and will be objecting to CPO.</p> <p>30.06.25 - PE contacted regarding setting up meeting re making offer. AG responded that wanted to appoint agents. PE sent</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>across CPA Contacts and RICS advice. AG also forwarded responses from tenants regarding objections to Planning</p> <p>05.07.25 - AG sent across letter objecting to proposals</p> <p>08.07.25 - PE emailed AG requesting details of letter and who sent to. Also correcting some errors in letter regarding the proposals. Later Response from AG with all issued emails and response. PE responded to AG email</p> <p>09.07.25 - PE emailed AG re details of email at DoT</p> <p>11.07.25 - AG submitted Complaint to SC re Consultation and objection to CPO. AD picking up for SC.</p> <p>14.07.25 - PE called AG to discuss Objection. Is open to discuss Bridle Road plots and will be appointing Sanderson Weatherall to deal with cases. To send confirmation once agreed.</p> <p>17.07.25. PE texted to AG to update that on leave and hoped to speak prior to departure. Sent email</p> <p>05.08.25 - PE called AG to follow up on previous correspondence. AG stated that would do all possible to stop route. Wasn't happy with consultation or fact told that money had to be spent in specific timescale. PE followed up with email and sent link to Planning Application</p> <p>09.08.25 - AG emailed. Unhappy at poor response from Sefton Council and also poor consultatoin re Planning. SC to respond re initial point. PE called on 11.08 re Planning</p> <p>12.08.25 AG objected formally re Planning and SC picked up - PE responded to SC</p> <p>13.08.25 - Sanderson Weatherall (SW) been appointed by Portfield and sent across Fee Proposals - PE seeking SC instructions. Spoke to Richard at SW and sent across details</p> <p>20.08.25 - Portfield responded to SC email of 19.08.25 - disagreed with stance SC taken</p> <p>01.09.25 - PE called Liz at SW to discuss way forward and approach</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>taken and how to make progress. Liz to discuss with AG and RS and either she or RS to revert.</p> <p>16.09.25 - PE spoke to Liz - AG awaiting designs - PE chased up SC to get designs</p> <p>22.09.25 - AI emailed AG re planning</p> <p>25.09.25 - AG response to AI email</p> <p>01.10.25 - AI email to AG summarising position</p> <p>01.10.25 - AG response to AI email</p> <p>01.10.25 - SLC email updating AG re Meetings with occupiers</p> <p>20.10.25 - AG requested update to meetings on 02.10.25 - AI to respond on 20.10</p> <p>28.10.25 - AG requested details of meeting - AI responded</p> <p>29.10.25 - PE met SW re Vesty Road and Bridle Road land plots</p> <p>10.11.25 - PE call with SW re Background issues to case.</p> <p>11.11.25 - PE sent offer to RS at SW</p> <p>12.11.25 - PE call with RS re offer made and follow up email re Values</p> <p>18.11.25 - PE called RS re points raised in last meeting and ran through. RS meeting AG on 20.11.25</p> <p>19.11.25 - PE called to check if RS required further detail for AG meeting tomorrow. Called with reminder re survey access on site to design boundary wall</p> <p>20.11.25 Meeting with RS/AI. RS to discuss with AG. Email from AG to AI</p> <p>27.11.25 - AG chased response from AI</p> <p>28.11.25 - AI response by email</p> <p>01.12.25 - AG responded to AI and subsequent emails with PE</p> <p>04.12.25 - SC/SLCP met with AG/SW/Richard Birchwood re Scheme - discussions re physical factors and CCTV.</p> <p>09.12.25 - Discussions with RS re agreement</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>10.12.25 - Further Negotiations - PE sent HoT for consideration and followed up on 11.12.25 with plan. RS to forward to AG</p> <p>16.12.25 - Meeting with RS re case - followed up with emails re HoT for all 3 plots</p> <p>18.12.25 - Meeting with RS - reverted with comments regarding works timescales and CCTV</p> <p>06.01.26 - RS reverted with updated HoT's for meeting on 07.01.26</p> <p>07.01.26 - PE call with SW to follow up Heads of terms. Referred points to wsp.</p>
OBJ5	Statutory Objector		Vesty Business Park	Allied to Portfield Objection above	Allied to Portfield Objection above
OBJ6	Statutory Objector	08.08.25	SP Energy Networks	SPEN objecting to the scheme's impact on SPM assets which are within the proposed Order limits	Objection Withdrawn



