

MASA Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment

Site at 45 Mersey View, Brighton Le Sands, Liverpool, L22 6QA

15th November 2023



ACCESSIBILITY ASSESSMENT

The following assessment is based on Sefton Council's Sustainable Travel and Development SPD.

Table 3.1: Minimum Levels of Accessibility: Target Scores

| Development Type | Location (see key below) | Development Size | Target score for walking | Target score for cycling | Target score for public transport | Target score for vehicle access & parking |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| A1 Retail D2 Assembly & Leisure | Town or district centre | Large | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 4 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| | | Small /Medium | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| A3 Restaurants & Cafes A4 Drinking Establishments A5 Hot Food Takeaway | Town or district centre | All | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| | Other Urban | All | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| A2 Financial and Professional Services B1 Business | Town or district centre | Large | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 or 3 ⁽²⁾ |
| | | Small /Medium | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| B2 Industrial Uses | Town or district centre | Large | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 or 3 ⁽²⁾ |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| B8 Storage and distribution | Town or district centre | Large | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 or 3 ⁽²⁾ |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| C1 Hotels | Town or district centre | Large | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| | | Small /Medium | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| C3 Dwelling Houses | Town or district centre | Large | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| | | Small /Medium | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| | Other Urban | Large | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| | | Small /Medium | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| C2 and D1 Residential and non-residential institutions | Town or district centre | All | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |

| Development Type | Location (see key below) | Development Size | Target score for walking | Target score for cycling | Target score for public transport | Target score for vehicle access & parking |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| (e.g. medical centres, museums and galleries, public halls and meeting places) | Other Urban | All | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| Notes: | | | | | | |
| (1) Town and District Centres as shown on the Local Plan policies map. | | | | | | |
| Other Urban = The areas that are not in the Town or District Centres, including local centres and other urban areas. | | | | | | |
| (2) In locations outside of the main centres, if reduced parking standards cannot be applied with on-street parking controls (score 3), then the maximum parking level may be sought (score 1) | | | | | | |

B2: Accessibility checklist

When completing the Accessibility Assessment (MASA) you should:

- Identify the minimum 'scores' for walking, cycling, public transport and vehicles, which are applicable to your development from Table 3 in chapter 3 of this SPD.
- Write these minimum 'scores' in each section summary in the checklist
- Work through each section of the Accessibility Assessment (i.e. access by foot, cycle, public transport and motor vehicles), filling in the appropriate score as you go, identifying whether your development meets each factor
- Depending on whether the proposed development meets each factor, place the appropriate 'points' in the 'score' column
- For each mode total the 'scores' and compare this figure with the minimum 'score'
- If your total score is equal to or more than the minimum score, then your development will be considered accessible by that mode.

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Proposal: | Address: 45 MERSEY VIEW |
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | Completed by: WROOT DESIGN |
| Access diagram | |
| Has a diagram been submitted which shows: how people move to and through the place and how this links to surrounding roads, footpaths and sight lines? | <u>Yes</u> / NO |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Proposal: | | Address: 45 MERSEY VIEW | | |
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: WROOT DESIGN | | |
| Access on foot | | Points | Score | |
| Safety | Is there safe pedestrian access to and within the site, and for pedestrians passing the site? | | | <u>Yes</u> / NO |
| Location | <u>Housing development:</u> if within 800m of a district or local centre | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| | <u>Other development:</u> if the density of local housing (i.e. Within 800m) is more than 50 houses per hectare | No | 0 | |
| Internal | Does 'circulation' and access | Yes | 1 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|
| Proposal: | | Address: | | |
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: | | |
| Access on foot | | Points | Score | |
| layout | inside the site reflect direct, safe and easy to use pedestrian routes for all, with priority given to pedestrians when they have to cross roads or cycle routes? | No | 0 | |
| External layout | Are there barriers between the site and local facilities or housing, which restrict pedestrian access? E.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dropped kerbs at crossings or on desire lines; Pavement less than 1.35m wide A lack of a formal crossing where there is heavy traffic Security concerns, e.g. As a result of lack of lighting | There are barriers | -1 | 1 |
| | | There are no barriers | 1 | |
| Other | Links to identified recreational walking network | | | |
| TOTAL (B) | | | | |
| Summary | Box A: Target score (from table 3) | | 2 | |
| | Box B: Actual Score | | | |
| | Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Proposal: | | Address: | | |
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: | | |
| Access by Cycle | | Points | Score | |
| Safety | Are there safety issues for cyclists either turning into or out of the site or at road junctions within 400m of the site (e.g. dangerous right turns for cyclists due to the level of traffic)? | | Yes <u>No</u> | |

| Proposal: | | Address: | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: | |
| Cycle parking | Does the development meet cycle parking standards in a secure location with natural surveillance? (See Table 7) - or where appropriate contribute to communal cycle parking facilities? | | <u>Yes/</u> WWW |
| Location | <u>Housing Development</u> : if within 1 mile of a district or local centre <u>Other development</u> : if the density of local housing (e.g. within 1 mile) is more than 50 houses per hectare | <u>Yes:2</u> WWW | 2 |
| Internal layout | Does 'circulation' and access inside the site reflect direct and safe cycle routes, with priority given to cyclists where they meet motor vehicles? | WWW <u>No:0</u> | 0 |
| External Access | The development is within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle and/or proposes to create a link to a cycle route, or develop a route | 1 | 1 |
| | The development is not within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle route | 0 | |
| Other | Development includes shower facilities and lockers for cyclists | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL (B) | | | |
| Summary | Box A: Target score (from table 3) | 3 | |
| | Box B: Actual Score | 4 | |
| | Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall | | |

| Proposal: | | Address: | |
|---|--|-----------------|-------|
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: | |
| | ACCESS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT | POINTS | SCORE |
| Location and access to public transport | Is the site within a 200m walk of a bus stop, and/or within 400m of a rail station? | Yes: 2 No: 0 | 2 |
| | Are there barriers on direct and safe pedestrian routes to bus stops or rail stations i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lack of dropped kerbs Pavements less than 1.35m wide A lack of formal crossings where there is heavy traffic Bus access kerbs | Barriers: 0 | |
| | | No barriers: 1 | 1 |
| Frequency | High (four or more bus services or trains an hour) | 2 | 2 |
| | Medium (two or three bus services or trains an hour) | 1 | |
| | Low (less than two bus services or trains an hour) | 0 | |
| Other | The proposal contributes to bus priority measures serving the site | 1 | |
| | The proposal contributes to bus stops, bus interchange or bus or rail stations in the vicinity and/or provides bus stops or bus interchange in the site | 1 | |
| | The proposal contributes to an existing or new supported bus service (Merseytravel or Community Transport) | 1 | |
| TOTAL (B) | | | |
| Summary | Box A: Target score (from table 3) | 5 | |
| | Box B: Actual Score | 5 | |
| | Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall | | |

| Proposal: | | Address: | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|
| Application reference: DC/2023/01272 | | Completed by: | |
| | VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING | POINTS | SCORE |
| Vehicle access and circulation | Is there safe access to and from the road? | | <u>Yes / No</u> |
| | Can the site be adequately serviced? | | <u>Yes / No</u> |
| | Is the safety and convenience of other users (pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) affected by the proposal? | | <u>Yes / No</u> |
| | Has access for the emergency services been provided? | | <u>Yes / No</u> |
| | For development, which generates significant freight movements, is the site easily accessed from the road or rail freight route networks (i.e. minimising the impact of traffic on local roads and neighbourhoods)? | | Yes / No |
| Parking | The off-street parking provided is more than advised for that development type | | Yes / No |
| | The off-street parking provided is as advised for that development type | 1 | |
| | The off street parking provided is less than 75% of the amount advised for that development type (or Shares parking provision with another development) | 2 | 2 |
| | For development in controlled parking zones: | | |
| | Is a car free development | 1 | |
| | Supports the control or removal of on-street parking spaces (inc provision of disabled spaces) or contributes to other identified measures in the local parking strategy (including car clubs) | 1 | 1 |
| | TOTAL (B) | | |
| Summary | Box A: Target score (from table 3) | 3 | |
| | Box B: Actual Score | 3 | |
| | Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall | | |

The site meets the scoring requirements and the local facilities meet the needs of an urban district centre.