APPENDIX 3.4

MINIMUM ACCESSIBILITY STANDARD ASSESSMENT

FORMER GEORGE HOTEL/PUBLIC HOUSE

DUKE STREET

SOUTHPORT

PR8 5DH

ADL REF. ADL/AM/5391/21A

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Sefton Council use the Accessibility Checklist or Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment (MASA) to assess the extent to which a proposed development is accessible by all modes of transport and meets the requirements of policy EQ3 'Accessibility'.

1.2 As such, ADL Traffic & Highways Engineering Ltd (ADL) have been appointed by Central England Cooperative Ltd to prepare this MASA in support of a planning application for the demolition of a former public house and construction of a new building to form a ground floor convenience store and café with 4 residential units on the first floor, at The George Hotel, Duke Street, Southport, PR8 5DH.

1.3 This report has been prepared in line with Sefton Council's Sustainable Travel and Development SPD (June 2018), notably the Accessibility Checklist in Appendix B.

1.4 The SPD (Table 3.1) sets out the scores expected for developments of differing scale, when assessed against the Accessibility Checklist. Given the proposals, the target scores are summarised in Table A below.

Table A Minimum Levels of Accessibility: Target Scores

Element of Development	Location	Development Size	Walking	Cycling	Public Transport	Vehicle Access and Parking
A1 Retail	Other Urban	Small/Medium	4	3	4	1
A3 Restaurants & Cafes	Other Urban	All	4	5	4	1
C3 Dwelling House	Other Urban	Small/Medium	4	3	5	1

1.5 As the convenience store element of the development is the predominant use class, the target scores in this MASA are to reflect this use.

2.0 Access Diagram

2.1 The access diagram showing how people move to and through the development and how the site links with the surrounding roads, footpaths and sightlines is included in Figure A.

Figure A Access Diagram

2.2 Figure A shows that the site is accessed by foot (and public transport) and by cycle/vehicle in all directions.

3.0 Access on Foot

3.1 The site's accessibility on foot is summarised in Table B below.

Table B Access on Foot

Access on Foot			Points	Score
Safety	Is there safe pedestrian access to and within the site, and for pedestrians passing the site?			Yes
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	No	0	
Internal Layout	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 crossroads or cycle routes?	Yes	1	
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 no barriers	1	
Other	Links to identified recreational walking network	-	-	
Summary	Target score			4
	Actual Score			2
	Comments:			

3.2 Table B demonstrates that the site has an actual score of 2.

3.3 The density of the local housing population is less than 50 houses per hectare (calculated to be approximately 25 houses per hectare, based on number of dwellings in Sefton 007 MSOA as 3,662 and area of 145.67ha according to 2011 Census data).

3.4 However, the site remains to be in a suburban and predominantly residential location. As such, the site would serve the local population, as did the previous use of the site.

3.5 Notwithstanding the housing density, Table B shows that the pedestrian infrastructure within and external to the site is suitable to accommodate pedestrian trips to and from the site.

4.0 Access by Cycle

4.1 The site's accessibility by cycle is summarised in Table C below.

Table C Access by Cycle

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)?			No
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
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	No	0	
Internal Layout	Does 'circulation' and access inside the site reflect direct, safe, and easy to use cycle routes for all, with priority given to cyclists when they have to crossroads or cycle routes?	Yes	1	
External Layout	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	Yes	1	
Other	Development includes shower facilities and lockers for cyclists	No	0	
Summary	Target score			3
	Actual Score			2
	Comments:			

4.2 Table C demonstrates that the site has an actual score of 2.

4.3 Notwithstanding the housing density, Table C shows that the cycle infrastructure within and external to the site is suitable to accommodate cycling trips to and from the site.

5.0 Access by Public Transport

5.1 The site's accessibility by public transport is summarised in Table D below.

Table D Access by Public Transport

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	
	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	No barriers	1	
Frequency	High (four or more bus services or trains an hour)	-	-	
	Medium (two or three bus services or trains an hour)	Yes	1	
	Low (less than two bus services or trains an hour)	-	-	
Other	The proposal contributes to bus priority measures serving the site	No	0	
	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	No	0	
	The proposal contributes to an existing or new supported bus service (Merseytravel or Community Transport)	No	0	
Summary	Target score			4
	Actual Score			4
	Comments:			

5.2 Table D demonstrates that the site meets the target score for access by public transport, i.e., 4. The development is therefore considered to be accessible by public transport.

6.0 Vehicle Access and Parking

6.1 The site's vehicle access and parking is summarised in Table E below.

Table E Vehicle Access and Parking

Vehicle Access and Parking		Points	Score
Vehicle access and circulation	Is there safe access to and from the road?		Yes
	Can the site be adequately serviced?		Yes
	Is the safety and convenience of other users (pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) affected by the proposal?		No
	Has access for the emergency services been provided?		Yes
	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)?		N/A
Parking	The off-street parking provided is more than advised for that development type		No
	The off-street parking provided is as advised for that development type	1	Yes
	The off-street parking provided is less than 75% of the amount advised for that development type (or Shares parking provision with another development)		No
	<u>For development in controlled parking zones:</u> Is a car free development 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)	N/A	
Summary	Target score		1
	Actual Score		1
	Comments:		

6.2 Table E demonstrates that the site meets the target score for vehicle access and parking, i.e., 1. The development is therefore considered to be accessible by vehicles.

7.0 Summary and Conclusions

7.1 The actual scores for the site are summarised as:

Access on foot:	score = 2 / 4
Access by cycle:	score = 2 / 3
Access by public transport:	score = 4 / 4
Vehicle access and parking:	score = 1 / 1
Total:	score = 9 / 12

7.2 The shortfall in score relates only to the housing density in the vicinity of the site, which is less than 50 houses per hectare. However, the site remains to be in a suburban and predominantly residential location. As such, the site would serve the local population, as did the previous use of the site. The accessibility of the site by all modes and the existing infrastructure scores the remaining points.

7.3 It is concluded that the site and development is accessible by all modes of transport, including on foot, by cycle, by public transport, and in terms of vehicle access and parking.