B1: Accessibility Checklist for applicants: Guidance Notes and Frequently Asked Questions

This part of the appendix is most relevant for applicants and Council officers.

Proposal: Address: Rookery Sports Club, Rookery Sports Ground, Roe Lane, Southport, PR9 7HR
Application reference: DC/2022/02228
Completed by: Ian Millership, Transport Planner

Fill in the checklist before submission of the planning application

For some of the questions in the checklist applicants will need information gathered from the site. Applicants should fill in the checklist as best they can before submission of the planning application so they know what information is needed.

Sources of Information
Fill in the checklist using the following information:

· Information provided with the application;

· Map based information to be prepared by the applicant

· Information from a site visit

There is no overall score for all types of access

The scores for walking, cycling, public transport and driving are not added together to produce an 'overall' score. The development must provide a realistic choice of access and so must meet the target score for each type of access.

Outline

Applications

It may not be possible to identify the detailed criteria to meet the target scores in the assessment of an outline application. However, the checklist enables those criteria, which have not been met, to be identified as reserved matters to be considered in the full application.

Internal layout and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Priority

Sefton's Developers Pack sets a road user hierarchy with pedestrians and cyclists at the top. 'Priority' needs to be considered where there is conflict between two modes. Within a site boundary, it is suggested that the following priority issues should be considered:

· Can the pedestrian and/or cyclist be given priority by the location of the building's entrance in relation to the site entrance being minimised? This will normally mean putting the main doors close to the site entrance and the car park to the side (or back) of the development rather than the front. Consider giving pedestrians and cyclists separate site entrances from drivers.

or

· Will the pedestrian or cycle route to the building entrance fail to encourage access by walking or cycling because the cyclist or the pedestrian has to take a convoluted route

Direct, short and safe pedestrian and cycle routes (following ‘desire lines’) should be provided from convenient site entrances to the main doors of a development.
or

· If the pedestrian or cyclist has to cross a line of traffic within the site, is the pedestrian / cyclist given priority? If pedestrian or cycle routes cross car routes, measures (such as marked crossing points; give way markings; or traffic calming) should make sure pedestrians or cyclists have priority.

Access on foot

‘Barriers around site’
– ‘Barriers’ such as raised kerbs, narrow pavements and signposts in the middle of a walking route provide obstacles for people with difficulties getting around, while a busy road would be a major barrier to all pedestrians. A development will only be considered accessible by foot if it is accessible for all.

The distance from the development that barriers should be identified will be in proportion to the size of the development, but will normally be the shortest route to:

· Local facilities (e.g. shops, and local schools for housing developments)

· Public transport (i.e. the closest bus stops in both directions)

‘Heavy traffic’: To determine when heavy traffic presents a barrier to pedestrians, a measure of pedestrian / vehicle conflict may be used. This measure may also be used to determine what type of pedestrian crossing facilities may be required.

Access by cycle

‘Safety Issues’: for the site to be considered accessible by cyclists there must be safe cycle access to the site. ‘Safety issues’ for cyclists may arise:

· When they are turning into or out of the site across a line of traffic;

· At junctions approaching the site when turning across traffic; or

· Where the road width narrows and cyclists are not given priority by motor vehicles

These safety issues can be addressed by doing the following:

· At the site entrance, providing turning lanes on the road, or crossing facilities close to the site entrance; and cycle lanes for cyclists leaving the site;

· Within 400m of the site: providing advance stop lines at junctions with traffic signals.

The following measures can link a development to the developing cycle network.

· Cycle lanes

· Signs

· Off-road cycle paths

· Crossing facilities, including Toucan crossings (crossings with signals and facilities for cyclists)

Access by public transport

A number of actions can help support access by public transport, including the following:

· Contributing to the bus infrastructure facilities serving the site (bus stops, displays showing the ‘real’ time the bus is due, bus priority measures such as bus lanes or junctions which give priority to buses)

· Contributing to bus stations, rail stations, park and ride schemes

· Providing bus stops and waiting facilities on site

· Supporting a new service, including the support of Community Transport (paying a subsidy over an agreed period to establish a bus service where one currently does not exist)

· Providing a travel plan which includes subsidies for employees using public transport

Are walking distances to the entrance or centre of the site?

The important criterion to consider is whether the total distance someone will have to walk will mean that walking or public transport is not a reasonable choice of mode. In most cases the distance to the entrance of the site should be sufficient. However in the case of large sites – if public transport into the site is not provided – then the distance to the centre of the site should be considered

Vehicle access and parking
If the Council does not think the development has safe vehicle access and circulation, the application will be refused.

Within City/ district centres there is a limit on the total parking to be provided. So developments may have to:

· Remove on-street parking and provide public off-street spaces; or

· Reduce the development's off-street parking provision if public spaces are available within 400m

· Consider car free or car-capped development (if housing) as appropriate.

Mixed Use Developments
The use requiring the higher/highest target score should take precedence

Extensions In terms of safety and local amenity:

· it should be considered whether the addition of the extension will mean that the site, as a whole, will surpass unacceptable levels of safety or amenity. In terms of accessibility:

· the extension needs to be considered on its own merits

Target Score

Weightings
Weightings have been kept to a minimum, giving additional weight only to what is considered the most fundamental criteria in determining accessibility and/or promoting sustainable travel (provided the above issue is addressed), i.e. proximity to:

· Good public transport

· Population to enable access by walking or cycling

· Low or no car parking provision

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.

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? **Yes / No**

Access on foot Points Score

Safety
Is there safe pedestrian access to and within the site, and for pedestrians passing the site?
Yes / no

Location
Housing development: if within 800m of a district or local centre

Other development: if the density of local housing (i.e. Within 800m) is more than 50 houses per hectare **Yes 2** No 0

Internal Does 'circulation' and access 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? **Yes 1** No 0

Access on foot Points Score : 3

External layout
Are there barriers between the site and local facilities or housing, which restrict pedestrian access? E.g.

· 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
There are no barriers **1**

Other Links to identified recreational walking network
TOTAL (B) **4**

Summary Box A:

Target score (from table 3) **4**

Box B: **4**

Actual Score

Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall:
There is no shortfall in this measure.

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 / **No**

It is accepted that Roe Lane is a principal route but its layout means that cyclists have good visibility if they choose to enter or leave along Roe Lane. Levels of traffic are such that crossing should not be an issue. Further, nearby advisory cycle routes provide safe access to the Rookery Road entrances and provision of cycle storage near the first of the pedestrian entrances to the north of the site will enable safe storage of cycles on entry to the site. There will also be cycle storage provided near the new club house, immediately on entry to the site from Roe Lane.

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? **Yes** / No

Location
Housing Development: if within 1 mile of a district or local centre
Other development: if the density of local housing (e.g. within 1 mile) is more than 50 houses per hectare **Yes:2** No:0

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? **Yes:1** No: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**
The development is not within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle route 0
Other Development includes shower facilities and lockers for cyclists **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
The provision of two sets of cycle shelters with the proposal will enhance current provision and encourage cycling to the site.

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
Are there barriers on direct and safe pedestrian routes to bus stops or rail stations i.e.:

· 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**

Frequency
High (four or more bus services or trains an hour) **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) **4 to 6**
Box B:

Actual Score 5

Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall
There are no shortfalls identified.

VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING POINTS SCORE
Vehicle access and circulation

Is there safe access to and from the road? **Yes** / No
Can the site be adequately serviced? **Yes** / No
Is the safety and convenience of other users (pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) affected by the proposal? Yes / **No**
Has access for the emergency services been provided? **Yes** / No
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
NOT APPLICABLE

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
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

TOTAL (B)

Summary Box A:

Target score (from table 3) **2**

Box B:

Actual Score 1

Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall
See Transport Statement. It is not possible nor practicable to provide any further parking on the current playing field or development site. The site has presently operated successfully with a long history and there are no expectations that the new clubhouse facility will intensify usage which is restricted by the current provision of pitches within the playing field. Deliveries to the site are modest and undertaken by small vans. Many site attendees walk, come by bus, or cycle, and others car-share, with more than adequate on-road parking available for the small level of need on the few days this is required. See further detail in Transport Statement.