

Appendix 1.1

Record of Liverpool City Council Highways Meetings

Record of meeting/discussion



Project title Princes Reach

Division ITD

Subject TA Scoping Meeting

Project no 364117

Location LCC Municipal Building

Date of meeting 18/11/15

Present Mike Taylor (MT) – Liverpool City Council
Duncan Crockett (DC) – Mott MacDonald
Tom Roberts (TR) – Mott MacDonald

Recorded by	Distribution	
TR	MT, DC, Client & Design Team	

Item	Text	Action on
	On the proposed development:	
1	TR / DC outlined the current proposal; site location with Princes Dock, 300-350 PRS apartments, private communal leisure facilities, potential ground floor restaurant unit and car parking at 20% - 30% ratio. The application is due for submission prior to the end of March 2016.	-
2	TR / DC also set out the proposal within the context of the wider outline Liverpool Waters consent (10O/2424); with Princes Reach representing the first residential piece of the scheme.	-
	On TA scope:	
3	MT agreed that given the highly sustainable location of the development, the relatively low provision of car parking and the existing outline consent of Liverpool Waters – no junction modelling would be required as part of the Transport Assessment (TA) that supports this application.	-
4	Existing modelling undertaken for the Liverpool Waters consent should be briefly outlined, including comparison of the traffic generation of the proposed development within the context of the overall Princes Dock forecast traffic generation.	TR / DC
5	MT set out that the TA should instead focus upon the reviewing the adequacy of walk routes between the site and key destinations. The review will also need to take into account committed / likely highway schemes and other changes to the transport network.	TR / DC
6	MT requested that a full road traffic accident history review is undertaken using STATS19.	TR / DC
7	It was agreed that a framework travel plan would be submitted at this stage.	TR / DC
	On parking standards:	
8	MT highlighted that as the development is located outside of the controlled parking zone of the city centre, the usual stance would be for 1 car parking	

Record of meeting/discussion

Continuation sheet



Project No.

Date of Meeting

Item	Text	Action on
	space per dwelling; in order to minimise the potential for on-street car parking. However, it was also recognised that this would be excessive given the tenure, location and built form of the development. MT suggested that the development should benchmark proposed car parking levels against existing precedents set within Princes Dock – ensuring the method for this is set out within the TA.	TR / DC / FCH
9	Cycle parking was also discussed. Again, the existing policy of 1 space per dwelling (plus visitor spaces) was agreed to be excessive. The development should again take existing precedents and set out a suggested number of secure, covered storage facilities.	TR / DC / FCH
10	No disabled parking standards were outlined – however specific disabled parking bays are not usually set out within a private residential development.	Note all
	On existing/ previous consents:	
11	DC highlighted that the proposal site was subject to an extant planning consent (10F/2787) for an 8 to 34-storey mixed-use residential, office, hotel and retail development. This development was required to contribute a commuted sum of £440,000, through a S106 Agreement, towards an enhanced pedestrian crossing facility on Bath Street and King Edward Street. However, the development did not come forward and the permission has expired.	Note all
12	DC furthered this by highlighting that a detailed planning application for the adjacent plot has recently received consent; William Jessop House (15F/0560). It was discussed that in the case officer's report for this development, specific reference was made to the provision of a pedestrian crossing at Bath Street; in that <i>"The Highways Manager has looked at this matter objectively, and is satisfied that these improvements are included within a Highways Capital Scheme as part of the Regional Growth Fund programme, and will therefore not need to be funded by the developer."</i> Subsequently, MM consider the same stance should be taken for this development.	Note all
13	As part of the William Jessop House application, servicing was agreed to take place from William Jessop Way, to the front of the building. MT subsequently agreed the proposed ground-floor unit at Princes Reach could also be serviced in this way.	Note all
14	TR raised the conditions associated with the Liverpool Waters outline permission and the influences this would have on Princes Reach. MT agreed that a checklist of Highways conditions adherence would be useful as part of this TA.	TR / DC

Record of meeting/discussion



Project title Princes Reach

Division ITD

Subject Draft TA Review Meeting

Project no 364117

Location LCC Municipal Building

Date of meeting 21/04/16

Present Mike Taylor (MT) – Liverpool City Council
Duncan Crockett (DC) – Mott MacDonald
Adam McAleavey (AM) – Mott MacDonald

Recorded by AM	Distribution MT, DC, Client & Design Team
--------------------------	---

Item	Text	Action on
1	DC set out the proposal within the context of the wider outline Liverpool Waters consent (100/2424); with Princes Reach representing the first residential piece of the scheme.	-
2	DC outlined the details of the proposal including; the site location within Princes Dock, 304 residential PRS apartments, circa 34 storeys, amenity facilities, 80 secure cycle parking spaces, 40 space car park, 3-car space layby and servicing access to the rear of the building from William Jessop Way.	-
3	DC confirmed that the following had been completed as part of the TA scope agreed with MT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing modelling undertaken for the Liverpool Waters consent, briefly outlined. - Review of walk routes between the site and key destinations, taking into account committed /likely highway schemes and other changes to the transport network. - A full road traffic accident history review undertaken using STATS19. - A framework travel plan. 	-
4	Following MT's suggestion that the development should benchmark proposed car parking levels against existing precedents set within Princes Dock, it was agreed that 40 contract parking spaces should be adequate provision with recognisable further provision for residents available at Princes Dock and Capital multi-storey car parks. Ultimately, if residents wish to park in this area of the city centre, they will pay for it.	-
5	Existing cycle policy of 1 space per dwelling (plus visitor spaces) was agreed to be excessive and that 80 secure spaces should be adequate for the development.	-
6	No disabled parking standards were outlined – it was confirmed that no disabled parking has been provided as part of the development.	-
7	With reference to walking routes between the site and key destinations, Bath street crossing was discussed. DC raised the point that in the case officer's report for the adjacent William Jessop House (15F/0560) development, specific reference was made to the provision of a pedestrian crossing at Bath Street; in that <i>"The Highways Manager has looked at this</i>	

Record of meeting/discussion

Continuation sheet



Project No.

Date of Meeting

Item	Text	Action on
8	<p><i>matter objectively, and is satisfied that these improvements are included within a Highways Capital Scheme as part of the Regional Growth Fund programme, and will therefore not need to be funded by the developer."</i></p> <p>Subsequently, Mott MacDonald consider the same stance should be taken for this development.</p> <p>MT said that the Princes Reach development must be self-sufficient. Despite other developments proposed to take place at Princes Dock, the Princes Reach development must be assessed as a stand-alone development in its own right. As a result of this, it is likely that LCC will request a contribution is made by the Princes Reach developer in support of improvements to Bath Street pedestrian crossing.</p>	-