

Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment

Proposal: Redevelopment of Edge Lane Retail Park and Adjacent Areas		Address: Edge Lane/Rathbone Road/Milton Road, Liverpool	
Application Reference:		Completed by: Sanderson Associates (CE) Ltd	
		Ref:- MASA – 5358-003	
Access Diagram			
Has a diagram been submitted which shows how people move to and through the development and how this links to the surrounding roads, footpaths and sight lines? (This can be included within the Design and Access Statement, see Section 2.25.) If a diagram has not been submitted your application may not be processed/			Yes
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: is the development within 500m of a district or local centre (see Accessibility Map 1 in Appendix F) Other development: is the density of existing local housing (i.e. within 800m) is more than 50 houses per hectare (see Accessibility Map 4 in Appendix F)		0
Internal layout	Does 'circulation' and access inside the sites 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?		1
External layout	Are there barriers between site and local facilities or housing, which restrict pedestrian access? (see Merseyside Code of Practice on Access and Mobility) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dropped kerbs at crossings or on desire lines; Steep gradients; A lack of a formal crossing where there is heavy traffic; Security concerns, e.g. lack of lighting 		1
Other	The development links to identified recreational walking network (see Accessibility Map 1). If no, please provide reasons why not.		Yes
Total (B)			2
Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (from Table 3.1)	4	Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall Variable housing mix has reduced score achieved. To the north the housing density is 50+. However, to the east this reduces to 30-49 and <30 as these areas are more recently develop areas comprising mainly of semi-detached properties as opposed to the traditional terraced areas..
	Box B: Actual Score	2	

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)? If yes, you must address safety issues in your application.			No
Cycle parking	Does the development meet cycle parking standards, in a secure location with natural surveillance, or where appropriate contribute to communal cycle parking facilities? If no, you must address safety issues in your application.			Yes
Location	<u>Housing Development</u> : is the development within 1mile of a district or local centre (see Accessibility Map 1)			
	<u>Other development</u> : is the density of local housing (e.g. within 1 mile) is more than 50 houses per hectare (see Accessibility Map 4)	No	0	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	1
External Access	The development is within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle route (see Accessibility Map 1) 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 (see Accessibility Map 1).			
Other	Development includes shower facilities and lockers for cyclists			
		No	0	
			Total (B)	2
Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (from Table 3.1)	5	Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall See previous comments regarding housing densities. Also as no details are available of internal fit-out of units it cannot be guaranteed that shower facilities will be available although these will be encouraged by the developer.	
	Box B: Actual Score	2		

Access by Public Transport			Points	Score
Location and access to public transport	Is the site within a 200m walk of a safe and convenient walking distance of a bus stop, and/or within 400m of a rail station? (See Accessibility Map 2)	Yes	2	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 2m wide; A lack of formal crossings where there is heavy traffic; Bus access kerbs. 	There are barriers		
		There are no barriers	1	1
Frequency	High (four or more bus services or trains an hour)			
	Medium (two or three bus services or trains an hour)		1	1
	Low (less than two bus services or trains an hour)		0	
Other	The proposal contributes to bus priority measures serving the site			
	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	1
	The proposal contributes to an existing or new supported bus service			
			Total (B)	5
Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (from Table 2)	6	Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall	
	Box B: Total Score	5		

Vehicle access and parking			Points	Score
Vehicle access and circulation	Is there safe access to and from the road? If no you must address safety issues.			Yes
	Can the site be adequately serviced? If no you must address safety issues.			Yes
	Is the safety and convenience of other users (pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) affected by the proposal? If no you must address safety issues.			No
	Has access for the emergency services been provided? If no you must address safety issues.			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) (see Accessibility Map 3)? If no please provide an explanation.			N/A
Parking	The off-street parking provided is more than advised in Section 4 for that development type? If yes, parking provision must be reassessed.			No
	The off-street parking provided is as advised in Section 4 for that development type			No
	The off street parking provided is less than 75% of the amount advised in Section 4 for that development type (or shares parking provision with another development)		2	2
	For development in controlled parking zones			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is a car free development		N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">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	
			Total (B)	2
Summary	Box A; Minimum Standard (from Table 3.1)	2 2	Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall. If conditions are appropriate for the reduced level of parking (see section 3), but this has not been provided, please explain why.	