DEAR CLERK,

49. **Declarations of Interest**

An opportunity was provided for Members and Officers to declare a personal or prejudicial interest in any matter on the Agenda:-

(a) i) Councillor Peter Millea declared a personal interest In Minute No.56. Question Time as a City Council representative on the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority and

ii) Councillor Peter Millea declared a personal interest as a local resident In Minute No.52. Waste Development Plan Document Sub-Regional Waste Facility (R&T 26);

(b) Councillor Liam Robinson declared a personal interest as a City Council representative on the Merseyside Integrated Transport Authority. In Minute No. 56. Question Time;
(c) Councillor Gary Millar declared a personal interest as a Residents off street Parking Permit Holder, Brouhaha and Matthew Street Festival Events and as a Member of the Economic Growth Partnership of Liverpool First in Minute No.54 Use of Scheme of Delegation;

(d) Councillor Paula Keaveney declared a personal interest as a resident of Liverpool 19 In Minute No.52. Waste Development Plan Document Sub-Regional Waste Facility (R&T 26);

(e) Councillor Tony Concepcion declared a personal interest as a City Council representative on the Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority; In Minute No.52. Waste Development Plan Document – Sub-Regional Waste Facility (R&T 26); and

(f) Councillor Beatrice Fraenkel (Chair) declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a local resident In Minute No.52. Waste Development Plan - Document - Sub-Regional Waste Facility (R&T 26), she took no part in the consideration thereof and left the room;

50. **Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The Committee considered the minutes of the last meeting of this Select Committee held on 6 January 2011.

**Matters Arising:**

**Minute No. 41. Minutes of the Last Meeting.**

**Minute No. 35. Muirhead Avenue Flats.**

The Chair (Councillor Beatrice Fraenkel) read out the following statement in respect of the matter:-

“Having reviewed email correspondence from residents of Muirhead Avenue and having concluded discussions with Regenda Housing, it is clear that both parties are now set on courses of action that could result in legal action. Given the range of legal issues involved, I have received clear legal advice that the Council should have no further discussion or debate on the matters of contention between the residents of Muirhead Avenue and Regenda Housing; and

The Council is of the view that the concerns raised regarding the Council’s involvement in the redevelopment of Muirhead Avenue have been resolved and intends to take no further action relating to the issues that have been raised to date. If residents have any new issues they wish to raise regarding the Council’s involvement in the
redevelopment of Muirhead Avenue then these should be forwarded to
the nominated officer,
Darren Hardy– Regeneration"

Minute No. 37. Question Time – Victoria Street Car Park by
Councillor Gary Millar

Question;
The issue of wardens issuing tickets for cars parking across two
marked lines at Victoria Street Car Park, effectively taking up 2 spaces
was raised; and

At the car park there is an issue in respect of tree roots coming through
the ground which hinders parking between marked lines.

Response;
It is correct that a Penalty Charge Notice may be issued if a vehicle
parks across 2 marked out parking bays in one of our off street car
parks. This is much the same as all car parks across country. Obviously
a car parking across 2 spaces prevents the council receiving income
from both spaces. If any individual does receive a penalty then they
have a statutory right of appeal in which they may accept the
contravention took place but there were mitigating circumstances for
their actions. As a council we are bound to consider mitigation as a part
of any appeal.

Regarding the issue of the trees in Victoria Street car park and in
particular to the difficulties we have with the tree roots removal. The
trees are all of an unsuitable type and the maintenance of their root
system is an ongoing issue. The damage to the car park surface is an
expensive cost to the council and root surgery is an equally expensive
exercise. Officers are currently exploring options for removal of the
trees and replacement with a more suitable alternative. Obviously this
will be done with full engagement and consultation as appropriate.

Minute No. 38. Access to Cash – Notice of Motion by Councillors
Paula Keaveney, Peter Millea and Ron Gould.

Minute No. 47. Question Time. Major Roads Not Gritted During
Recent Heavy Snowfalls, by Councillor Norman Mills.

Question

During the recent heavy snowfalls, three major roads through the centre
of West Derby Village and the Ward were not gritted causing
considerable problems. When I contacted senior managers in the
planning and transportation departments, I was informed that none of
the roads were included in the gritting programme, and therefore would
not be treated.
I have written to the Chief Executive and the Executive Councillors for Regeneration and the Environment, but would like assurances that this situation will be looked at urgently before the situation occurs again in this bad Winter. The three roads (Town Row, Almonds Green and Leyfield Road) are major routes from east to west Liverpool for thousands of motorists, and intersect at West Derby Village, which is the heart of West Derby Ward. There are at least 4 large primary schools on these roads, and also the secondary schools of Cardinal Heenan and Broughton Hall at the Leyfield Road / Honeysgreen Lane junction. Town Row and Leyfield Road are major routes to Yew Tree and Knotty Ash wards, whilst Almonds Green is an access route to Fazakerley Hospital, Clubmoor and Croxteth wards.

The majority of motorists in West Derby use these three roads to either drive to work, take children to school, to access shops, or to visit family and friends. Residents of West Derby, and I are amazed that major bus routes such as these three roads are not included in the gritting programme. If the local schools had not been on holiday during the snowfalls, there would have been massive congestion on these three roads, as well as many more minor accidents unfortunately.

Can I ask for assurances from the Executive Councillor and this Committee that the situation will be reviewed urgently? (to date - 4th January, I have had no reply from the Chief Executive, whom I wrote to on the 22nd December).

Response

There are eight prescribed routes that are gritted as and when conditions dictate. These cover principal routes across the City with the aim of keeping the City moving and cover arterial routes and access to essential services i.e. hospitals, public transport interchanges and key bus routes. The eight prescribed gritting routes across the City cover a total of 401km. We have an overall highway network length of 1550km, which means we grit 26% of our highway network when required. Regrettably, it is simply not possible nor is it feasible in many cases to grit all highways across the City. The Winter Service Plan is reviewed every summer to make sure that we take account of latest policy / techniques such as the Independent Review that was conducted into the Resilience of England’s Transport Systems in Winter.

Salt supply is a major issue for the country as a whole and although the Council had more salt in store than it ever has previously with some 2000t on site at the beginning of November 2010, due to the prolonged period of inclement weather over 2400t have already been deposited
onto the City’s highway network. The Council also had a 2000t “call off” order with Salt Union at the start of the winter season which started to be called upon towards the end of November. However, deliveries have been very sporadic and unreliable, however, Salt Union are one of only two suppliers in the country. Highways colleagues are currently reviewing other alternative suppliers (including those outside of the country) and will be discussing with Merseyside colleagues on possible joint procurement and storage facilities.

There have been many requests for additional roads / routes to be included within the principal gritting routes. A winter de-brief is being held on Thursday 6th January 2011 and the additional requests will be discussed at this session to review the potential for additional routes to be included.

**Minute No. 47. Question Time – Local Businesses Snow Removal, by Councillor Sarah Jennings.**

**Question**

How will the Council respond to any enquiries from local businesses and residents for help in organising snow removal and gritting of pavements in local areas?

**Response**

Community resilience is a key factor in maintaining access to businesses during periods of prolonged inclement weather. There are over 7000 roads in the City and the Council does not have the resources at its disposal to clear snow and ice from all roads on the highway network. As part of the de-brief that took place to review the Council’s response to the prolonged period of inclement weather between 17th and 27th December 2010, one of the issues for further investigation was the potential storing of salt / grit within communities and allowing teams of dedicated volunteers access to the resources to allow gritting of footpaths. This idea does need to be talked through with Elected Members, district committees and neighbourhood colleagues. The proposal also relies on access to salt supplies which have been unreliable from Salt Union over the last two years.

However, an example of how the Council worked with businesses during the last period of inclement weather was on the approach to Everton Football Club’s (EFC) home game against Birmingham on Boxing Day. The roads around the club were covered in snow and ice and EFC approached the Council for assistance in clearing snow and ice from the pavements. The Council arranged for the Environmental Enforcement Team, some local volunteers and the Community Payback Team to assist with snow and ice clearance around EFC. The Council also arranged for additional gritting to be provided to support the work that was being carried out on footways. This is an approach that can be built on for future winters seasons, however this does show how the
Council has recently worked with a local business and provided help with snow clearance to support their activities.

51. **Question Time**

An opportunity was provided for the submission of questions from both Members of the Select Committee and the public to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Transport.

Questions from both Members of the Select Committee and the public were submitted to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.

The following question had been received prior to the meeting from a member of the public and was forwarded to the appropriate officer for response;-

**Question - Merseytravel**

“The city districts and city suburbs of the City of Liverpool are under-provided for by Merseyrail compared to other Merseyside areas. For example, Birkenhead is as close or closer to Liverpool city centre as/than Toxteth, Wavertree, Old Swan, West Derby, Knotty Ash, Tuebrook, Stoneycroft, Norris Green, Anfield and Everton etc. Birkenhead has many Merseyrail stations whereas the aforementioned Liverpool city districts have none.

Will Liverpool City Council undertake to work towards re-balancing this discrepancy by endeavours to facilitate the following:

1. In the short to medium term
   a) re-activation of the existing Liverpool Loop Line from Hunts Cross on the Northern Line to Rice Lane on the Kirkby Line;
   b) consideration of the opening of stations on the Liverpool Loop Line at Alder Hey Hospital, Liverpool Football Club and Everton Football Club as priorities, as economic enablers of the project; and
   c) creation of a junction on the Liverpool Loop Line at Broadgreen to allow additional access, using existing active railways, to Liverpool city centre through Wavertree Technology Park and central inner Liverpool suburbs. This would also create two city loops, increasing flexibility of services; and

2. Production of a long term strategy to provide many more Liverpool city districts and citizens with the enormous benefits of quality commuter/Metro rail services which are part of and integrated into the existing extensive Merseyrail network.”

**Response**

It is Merseytravel rather than the City Council who controls the provision of rail services across Merseyside. Merseytravel have provided the following response to the Question:
Merseytravel fully supports the development of the local transport network and works, in conjunction with partners and stakeholders, to deliver the appropriate transport solution to the problems encountered. This has led to the development of a high quality transport network which includes both bus and rail transport.

The legacy of the rail network provides many challenges and it is difficult to make changes to the network Merseytravel has inherited. However Merseytravel refutes the idea that Wirral has a better rail network and while we accept that there are parts of Liverpool without direct rail access this is also the case with large parts of the Wirral, St Helens and Knowsley.

Merseytravel is committed to developing the public transport network across the whole of Merseyside, providing the appropriate transport intervention where required. The Local Transport Plan Bus and Rail Strategies set out Merseytravel aspirations to develop the public transport network.

The Rail Strategy sets out a number of improvements for the Liverpool area including opening the Bootle branch for passenger rail services and a series of new railway stations. While Merseytravel would like to take forward these proposals the current funding position makes this extremely difficult. The potential to develop the outer loop line has been lost as part of the line has been built on and thus is not identified within the Rail Strategy.

On a positive note the lines between Liverpool and Manchester and Liverpool and Wigan have been identified for electrification in the near future by the Government.

**Question Leyfield Road**

Councillor Tony Concepcion raised the issue of the volume of traffic in the vicinity of a school located in Kendal Park, Leyfield Road. The area is gridlocked twice a day due to the school run.

Response officers are requested to look at the matter and submit a report on the matter to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Transport.

Agreed that all responses are noted.
Having previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the next item Councillor Beatrice Fraenkel vacated the Chair and left the meeting room during consideration of this item and with the agreement of the Select Committee. The Chair was taken by Councillor James Noakes.

The Committee considered the following decision of the Cabinet of 10 February 2011 which has been called in for scrutiny by

(a) Councillors Richard Oglethorpe, Peter Millea, Paula Keaveney, Karen Afford and Gary Millar for the reasons that

- Factual inaccuracies in the report approved by the Cabinet on 4 February 2011;

- Conflict with previous consultation;

- Inadequate consultation and lack of clear rationale for the decision; and

- Failure to consider other alternative sites; and

(b) Councillors Mary Rasmussen, Stephenie Till, Joe Hanson, Alan Dean and Christine Banks for the reason that “the proposal needs further in depth scrutiny by the Select Committee prior to the final decision being taken” -

“The Cabinet considered a recommendation that -

(i) the Stalybridge Dock Site (Jack Allen Holdings) be approved as the City Council’s preferred site for the purposes of the Waste DPD;

(ii) the results of consultation on the Waste Development Plan Document Preferred Options Report be noted;

(iii) the Preferred Options 2: New Sites Consultation Report be approved with a six-week public consultation commencing in early 2011; and

(iv) funding arrangements be noted as agreed by the City Region Cabinet and for the City Council to make appropriate financial provision in its revenue estimates 2011/12 and 2012/13 to complete the Waste DPD.
The Cabinet Member – Regeneration & Transport advised the Committee that he had reached his decision after a lot of discussion and advice from officers. Planning permission for a resource recovery park handling 150,000 tonnes of waste was granted last year by the Planning Inspector, an independent Central Government Body, against the advice of Liverpool City Council at an appeal against our original decision. If an alternative site was identified other than that that has planning permission it would, in affect, be allowing 2 waste sites within the Liverpool city boundary; the site with planning permission and the site identified for those purposes within the Waste DPD. This is a situation that we want to avoid.

During the discussion members raised the following issues:–

- How were other sites considered and ruled out other suggested sites were in non residential areas;
- Report seems to be predetermining who will be dealing with waste on site;
- Does WDP grant contract to Jack Allen Holdings;
- Did other sites scores increase or decrease during the scoring process;
- LCC Public Enquiry, waste site in Garston detrimental to Garston regeneration;
- When planning permission is granted will site be developed;
- If site isn’t developed by Jack Allen could site be used for housing; and
- Could developers install an incinerator at site.

Officers responded to the issues raised:–

- Jack Allen Holdings will have to go through bidding process for contact for site;
- A 2 Stage Scoring Process was carried out at over 1500 sites covering the Mersey Sub-Region area;
- 43 criteria were used to arrive a score for each site. The process included technical appraisals, land searches, site visits, environmental assessments, statutory agencies, and land contamination tests;
There were some changes in site scores during the process; Information on the site scores is available on Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (Merseyside EAS website); If Jack Allen Holdings do not develop site due to Planning Inspectorate decision the site can be used for waste disposal; and Due to the proximity of the airport an incinerator would not be installed at the site.

The following questions were submitted by a member of the public; and With the permission of the Select Committee a number of local residents addressed the meeting on this matter.

1. In the report to cabinet members (4.0 sub regional selection) why was the information provided so unbalanced in supporting the nomination of Stalbridge Dock?

   The Liverpool Unitary Development Plan EP5 states that Waste Related Uses must “not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring areas (especially residential) by virtue of noise, dust, fumes, smell or other nuisance. Will not discourage new investment in adjacent sites or in the area generally”. The cabinet member for regeneration totally failed to include even a mention of a huge number of local concerns about all of these issues and the initial refusal by LCC due to concerns about the effect on regeneration. The supporting map failed to include the adjoining Cressington Heath housing development and the newly opened secondary school ESLA. Does the member for regeneration not feel that he has therefore neglected his core brief of regeneration?

2. Even more seriously why has he included the statement “4.2 The Stalbridge Dock Site has always been a high scoring site”? Where is the evidence for this?

   The Merseyside Joint Waste Development Plan: All sites survey (excel file attached) in fact gives the exact opposite picture. The transparent scoring system on row 57 scores site Stalbridge Dock L2337 as minus 15. The highest scoring sites score over 50 with two large sites in Liverpool scoring 48 and 20. Does the cabinet member not wish to acknowledge that this statement was extremely misleading to his colleagues?

3. Public statements have suggested that as planning permission has been granted that nothing is lost by nominating this site?
Does the cabinet not appreciate that planning permission has only been given for a plant operating autoclave technology? The ongoing investigation by the HSE into the fatal accident at the only other plant operating this technology makes it uncertain that this plant would be allowed to operate. By nominating this site it would open the way for an alternative planning application for a different or indeed more invasive plant on this site. Does the cabinet not feel that this puts at risk a community that contains residential, schools, hospital, site of special scientific interest, RAMSAR etc all well with 1 km of the site? (Supporting annotated map to be supplied)

4. Is the cabinet aware that at the Public Inquiry, I presented data obtained from FOI request that highlighted the decreasing parental preferences for the predecessor schools (New Heys and St Benedict’s) and the first new intake to the new secondary school ESLA situated directly opposite the proposed site. Have they investigated the actual intake to this school and the parental choices for its second year of operation. Do they not fear that the unwelcome presence of such a large facility will put the viability of this school at some risk?

5. The Liverpool Unitary Development plan lists Garston (St Mary’s Road) as a District Centre in section S5. “The vitality and viability of these centres will be maintained and enhanced in order to secure the best access for all the city’s residents to shopping and other related facilities” The reality for Garston is completely at odds with this aspiration. The road surface, paving, street furniture and shop fronts all showing serious neglect painting a picture of deprivation comparable with any other neighbourhood in the city. Since the Public Inquiry a major renovation of a property for an upscale eatery has gone out of business. Does the cabinet not feel that their duty to encourage regeneration in a ward described as one of the poorest in the country would be ill served by placing a further cloud over this area? How does this sit with the recently publicly trumpeted upgrade to the more affluent Allerton Road?

Motion by Councillor James Noakes, (Chair) -

That the decision of the Cabinet of 10 February 2011, be supported and entered into the Register of Decisions.
Amendment by Councillor Paula Keaveney, seconded by Councillor Peter Millea –

That the Cabinet Decision is not supported and alternative sites are considered for the City Council’s preferred site for the purposes of the Waste DPD.

A vote was taken, when there appeared

For the Amendment 3
Against it 4

The Amendment was lost.

Second Amendment by Councillor Tony Concepcion, seconded by Councillor Liam Robinson –

That the Motion be supported but that in addition - Recognising that;- At the Executive Board on the 26 February 2010, an addendum was moved by Councillor F Clucas, the Ward Councillor for Allerton and agreed by the Liberal Democrat Executive Board. That the Spitfire Road site is not considered suitable for waste use and should not be considered further as part of the Waste DPD process. The City Council’s options to identify a suitable location were therefore deliberately reduced by this decision;

The site at Stalbridge Dock was granted planning permission in October 2010 by the Planning Inspectorate of the new Conservative Government and their Liberal Democrat partners, despite the City Council previously rejecting the original application; and

This Select Committee has no other option other than to support the recommendation proposed by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration & Transport.

A vote was taken, when there appeared –

For the Second Amendment 4
Against it 3

The Second Amendment was carried and became the Substantive Motion the Substantive Motion was carried (4 Members voting in favour and 3 against) and it was resolved accordingly.

The Committee received a presentation from Nick Kavanagh – Director Regeneration on the Liverpool Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report. Nick outlined the key points of the presentation:

- The Local Development Framework;
- The Core Strategy – Theme New Housing Development;
- The Core Strategy – Theme Employment and Economic Growth;
- The Core Strategy – Theme Environment and Sustainable Development;
- What Next?

During the discussion Members raised the following issues:

- Members Drop in Sessions invitation be extended to all Elected Members;
- Important issue for future of the City – Presentation to Political Groups;
- How to develop involving partners;
- Core Strategy Presentation to Cabinet; and
- Next Steps what it means for City update to next meeting.

Agreed that:

The information is noted;

The best thanks of the Select Committee be extended to Nick for his interesting and informative presentation and

An update report on the Liverpool Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report. is submitted to the next meeting of this Select Committee.

(please note presentation is attached to minutes)

Severe and Adverse Weather November December 2010 - Debrief Of Council Services

Nick Wilassey – Emergency Planning introduced a report that has been produced following a debrief of Council services held on Thursday 6th January 2011. Council services and Joint Venture Partners participating in the debrief were: LDL Call centre; Emergency Planning Unit;
During the discussion Members raised the following issues:-

- Consultation with utility providers,
- Raise public awareness of what is being done and what information is available.
- Information on LCC website in respect of gritting routes and severe weather warnings has improved immensely.

Agreed that :-

The information is noted; and

The Cabinet Member – Regeneration & Transportation requested that all staff are thanked for all their hard work during the severe weather period.

55. **Use of Scheme of Delegation**

The Committee received a report to inform Members of the decisions made by officers within the Regeneration Portfolio under delegated powers.

During the discussion Members raised the following issues:-

Reports to be submitted quarterly; and

The format of the summary to be reviewed, to include Electoral Wards.

Agreed that the information is noted.

56. **Motion - Liverpool Cricket Club Aigburth Road by Councillors Paula Keaveney and Ron Gould.**

The Committee considered the response to the following motion, by Councillors Paula Keaveney and Ron Gould.

**Motion**

“Committee notes that Liverpool Cricket Club on Aigburth Road provides a useful and popular venue for all sorts of events from boot sales to county cricket matches.

Committee however also notes that during major events, the overspill parking from such events has caused major problems for residents in nearby roads. These problems have included

* inability to get into and out of properties
* difficulty in seeing round corners when pulling into other roads
Residents have reported that they have experienced some potentially dangerous situations because of this.

Committee believes its important to balance the needs of the venue and its visitors with those of the local residents.

Committee therefore calls for the City Council to

* review what plans exist for parking control during major events at the club
* organise a joint police/council site visit during the first major event in 2011 to ascertain the scale of the problem and to recommend any measures that need to be taken for future events.
* liaise with the Cricket Club and hirers of the cricket club about the best way to manage parking demand caused by large scale events”

**Response**

There are very limited waiting restrictions around Liverpool Cricket Club particularly in the residential side roads i.e. Beechwood Road and Riversdale Road and therefore visitors to the cricket ground are able to park very close to the ground itself, which does have an impact on residents’ ability to park in close proximity to their properties.

To progress a scheme of waiting restrictions could be an option to improve the situation however, it would not be possible to provide an exemption for residents and therefore this would have a detrimental impact on resident’s ability to park close to their properties at all times, not just on match days.

To resolve the issue of difficulties getting into and out of driveways residents could apply for “H” bracket markings, which serve to highlight to other road users that there is an access point that needs to be kept clear. The use of these markings has been very successful in other areas of the City.

The majority of the traffic issues that are generated at Liverpool Cricket Club are as a result of matches played by Lancashire Cricket Club. Lancashire will be playing the following matches at Liverpool Cricket Club this season:

- Friday 8th – Monday 11th April, Lancashire vs SUSSEX
- Wednesday 20th – Saturday 23rd April, Lancashire vs SOMERSET
- Wednesday 18th – Saturday 21st May, Lancashire vs YORKSHIRE
- Monday 27th – Thursday 30th June, Lancashire vs DURHAM
- Monday 1st – Thursday 4th August, Lancashire vs WARWICKSHIRE

The match against Yorkshire is likely to draw the biggest crowd and therefore the joint police / council site visit will take place on one day during the match. Liverpool Cricket Club will be invited to attend the
joint site visit and following this a report will be prepared for presentation to a future meeting of this Committee, which will set out any recommendations to improve matters for residents whilst also taking into account the needs of Liverpool Cricket Club.

Agreed that the information is noted.

57. **Exclusion of Press and Public**

The Select Committee considered whether –

(i) members of the press and public should be excluded from the meeting of the Cabinet during consideration of the following items of business in accordance with sub-section 4 of section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 because it is likely in view of the nature of the business that exempt information would be disclosed being information defined in section 100(1) and paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information)) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972; and

(ii) the disclosure of information is in the Public Interest, if any relevant exemptions are applicable and whether, when applying the Public Interest test and exemptions, the Public Interest to disclose outweighs that of withholding information.

Agreed that members of the press and public be excluded during consideration of the following items which involved consideration of exempt information in respect of which involves information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

58. **Director Regeneration Briefing.**

The Select Committee received a verbal briefing from Nick Kavanagh – Director Regeneration. On issues relating to regeneration portfolio across the City.

Agreed that the information is noted.
The Liverpool Local Development Framework
The Local Development Framework

Core Strategy:

- the **long term** (2027 +) strategy at the heart of the LDF
- Sets out the broad quantities of development for housing and economic development in particular
- Identifies the broad locations for that development, and
- Sets out strategic development management policies

Land Allocations and Citywide Policies Plan:

- Builds on and implements the Core Strategy
- Allocates sites for development – housing, employment uses etc
- and detailed development management policies
The Core Strategy – Theme New Housing Development

• 37,000 (net) new homes over next 16 years – (cf. 17,000 in past 16 years, 1994 – 2010)

• Falling household size and aspirations for population growth indicate we need the proposed level of growth

• 70 % in the City Centre and Inner Areas overall – a reduction on previous years’ figure of 85%

• Within this a focus on North Liverpool and on Liverpool Waters

• 30 % in the Rest of the City – a significant increase on previous years’ figure of 15%

• This strategy supported by consultation responses in 2010
The Core Strategy – Theme Employment and Economic Growth

• Safeguard existing and identify new economic development assets
  – City Centre
  – Strategic Investment Areas
  – 274 hectares of existing supply sites across these areas

• Encourage and support the development of key sectors
  – Knowledge
  – Low Carbon Economy
  – SuperPort
  – Creative & Digital

• Vital and viable shopping centres
  – Defines hierarchy of local and district centres
  – Promotes Great Homer Street, Park Road
  – Supports regeneration of Edge Lane and Stonebridge Cross
  – Underlines city-region importance of Liverpool City Centre
The Core Strategy – Theme Environment and Sustainable Development

A suite of Strategic Development management Policies covering:

• Urban Design

• The Historic Environment

• Green Infrastructure

• Building for Life, Code for Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes and related matters including:
  – Efficient use of energy, water and other resources,
  – Renewable energy, reducing the need to travel, carbon neutral development, sustainable waste management etc

• Sustainable Access - ensuring that development occurs in the existing most accessible locations, or is closely linked to public transport network
What Next?

• Member Drop-In Session 28th February 2011

• Approved for Publication and Submission and Submission to Secretary of State by Full Council 9th March 2011

• Plan Published for Consultation (6 Weeks) April 2011

• Plan and results of Consultation sent to Secretary of State August 2011

• Public Hearings Period November 2011

• Inspectors report received March 2012

• Adoption by Resolution of Full Council June 2012
The Annual Monitoring Report

- Legal requirement (PCPA 2004, Regulations and SEA) but change coming
- Reviews progress of local development framework preparation against the timetable and milestones in the local development scheme;
- Assesses the extent to which policies are being implemented and if not why and how this should if necessary be dealt with
- Identifies the significant effects of implementing policies in the local development framework and whether they are as intended; and
- Sets out whether policies are to be amended or replaced.
- Available online or on request
Key AMR Messages

Analysis of Context

• Familiar indicators and a well understood picture – deprivation, regeneration challenges and opportunities

• **Key Message** – the Core Strategy “Focussed Regeneration” approach is the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances

Local Development Framework Preparation

• Council approve the Core Strategy for publication as soon as possible

• Progress the Land Allocations and Citywide Policies plan to support the Core Strategy

Policy Performance

• The majority of UDP policies remain valid in whole or part

• Need to develop new policy areas – such as climate change, renewable energy, building for life/lifetime homes