

Minimum Scores

3.11 The minimum standard scores which are detailed have been developed through open and transparent testing by partner authorities and stakeholders on Merseyside. The scores have been tried and tested by transport and development professionals on real life developments.

Table 3.1: Minimum Levels of Accessibility: Minimum Scores for 'Medium' 'Large' and 'Major' Developments

Development Type	Location (see key below)	Development Size	Minimum score for walking	Minimum score for cycling	Minimum score for public transport	Minimum score for vehicle access
A1 Retail D2 Assembly & Leisure	Urban Centre	Major & Large	2	5	5	3
		Medium	2	3	3	2
	Other Urban	Major & Large	4	5	6	2
		Medium	4	3	4	1
A3 Restaurants & Cafes A4 Drinking Establishments A5 Hot Food Takeaway	Urban Centre	All	1	4	4	3
	Other Urban	All	4	5	4	1
A2 Financial and Professional Services	Urban Centre	Major & Large	2	5	5	3
		Medium	2	4	5	2
	Other Urban	Major & Large	4	5	6	1 or 3 ⁽²⁾
		Medium	4	4	4	1
B1 Business (including educational sites)	Urban Centre	Major & Large	2	5	5	3
		Medium	2	4	5	2
	Other Urban	Major & Large	4	5	6	1 or 3 ⁽²⁾
		Medium	4	4	4	1
B2 Industrial Uses	Urban Centre	Major & Large	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Medium	2	4	4	1
	Other Urban	Major & Large	2	3	5	1 or 3 ⁽²⁾
		Medium	2	2	4	1
B8 Storage and distribution	Urban Centre	Major & Large	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Medium	2	4	4	1

Development Type	Location (see key below)	Development Size	Minimum score for walking	Minimum score for cycling	Minimum score for public transport	Minimum score for vehicle access
	Other Urban	Major & Large	2	3	5	1 or 3 ⁽²⁾
		Medium	2	2	4	1
C1 Hotels	Urban Centre	Major & Large	2	5	5	3
		Medium	2	3	5	3
	Other Urban	Major & Large	4	5	5	1
		Medium	4	3	4	1
C3 Dwelling Houses (For flats with no 'internal circulation', issues, i.e. no car park, reduce walking and cycling target by 1.)	Urban Centre	Major & Large	4	4	5	3
		Medium	2	3	5	3
	Other Urban	Major & Large	4	5	5	1
		Medium	4	3	5	1
C2 and D1 Residential and non-residential institutions (medical centres, museums and galleries, public halls and meeting places)	Urban Centre	All	2	5	5	3
	Other Urban	All	4	5	6	1

Notes:

(1) Urban Centres = Urban Centres in Liverpool are the City Centre (as defined by the Liverpool Vision City Centre boundary in Appendix F), and District Centres as shown on the UDP/LDF proposals map.

Other Urban = The areas that are not in the City / District Centres.

(2) In locations outside of the main centres, if reduced parking standards can not be applied with on-street parking controls (score 3), then the maximum parking level may be sought (score 1)

Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment**Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment**

Proposal: Proposed Discount Foodstore, Church Road North, Wavertree

Address: Church Road North, Wavertree				
Completed By: Jack Hulme, SCP				
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 / No
Access on Foot			Points	Score
Safety	Is there safe pedestrian access to and within the site, and for pedestrians passing the site (2m minimum width footpath on both sides of the road)? If no your application must address safe pedestrian access.			Yes / No <input type="checkbox"/> 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) more than 50 houses per hectare (see Accessibility Map 4 in Appendix F)	Yes	2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
		No	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?	Yes	1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	0	
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. 	There are barriers	-2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		There are no barriers	1	
Other	The development links to identified recreational walking network (see Accessibility Map 1). If no, please provide reasons why not.			Yes / No <input type="checkbox"/>
Total (B)				<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (from Table 3.1)	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall	
	Box B: Actual Score	<input type="checkbox"/> 4		

Access by Cycle			Points	Score
Safety	Are there safety issues for cyclists either turning into or out of the site or a 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.			Yes / No <input type="checkbox"/> 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 cycle parking standards and cycle parking facilities.			Yes / No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Location	Housing_Development: Is the development within 1 mile of a district or local centre (see Accessibility Map 1) Other_Development: Is the density of local housing (e.g. within 1 mile) more than 50 houses per hectare (see Accessibility Map 4 in Appendix F)	Yes	2	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	0	
External Access	The development is within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle route (see Accessibility Map 1 in Appendix F) and / or proposes to create a link to a cycle route, or develop a route?		1	<input type="checkbox"/> -1
	The development is not within 400m of an existing or proposed cycle route (see Accessibility Map 1 in Appendix F)		-1	
Other	Development includes shower facilities and lockers for cyclists	Yes	1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
		No	0	
			Total (B)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (From Table 3.1)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Comments or action needed to meet any shortfall	

3 Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment

	Box B: Actual Score				
		3			
Access by Public Transport				Points	Score
Location and access to public transport	Is the site within a 200m safe and convenient walking distance of a bus stop, and/or within 400m of a rail station? (See Accessibility Map 2 in Appendix F).	Yes	2	2	
		No	0		
	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; or • Bus access kerbs. 	There are barriers	0	1	
		There are no barriers	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	0	
	The proposal contributes to an existing or new bus service		1		
Total (B):					5

Summary	Box A: Minimum Standard (from Table 3.1)	4	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 / No
	Can the site be adequately serviced? If no, you must address service issues.		Yes / No
	Is the safety and convenience of other users (pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) affected by the proposal? If yes, you must address safety issues.		Yes / No
	Has access for the emergency services been provided? If no, you must provide emergency service provision.		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) (see Accessibility Map 3 in Appendix F)? If no, please provide an explanation.		Yes / No
Parking	The off-street parking provided is more than advised in Section 4 for that development type. If yes, parking provision must be reassessed.		Yes / No

3 Minimum Accessibility Standard Assessment

	The off-street parking provided is as advised in Section 4 for that development type	1	Yes / 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	Yes / No
	For development in controlled parking zones:		Yes / No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it a car free development? 	1	Yes / No
	<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) 	1	Yes / No
Total (B):			2
Summary	<p>Box A:</p> <p>Minimum Standard</p> <p>(From Table 3.1)</p> <p>Box B:</p> <p>Total Score</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 30px;">1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 30px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 30px;">2</div>	<p>Comments or action needed to correct any shortfall. If conditions are appropriate for the reduced level of parking (see section 4), but this has not been provided, please explain why.</p>