



Licensing, Health and Safety and General Purposes Committee

Date: Wednesday, 23 November 2016

Time: 6.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Wallasey Town Hall

Contact Officer: Anne Beauchamp

Tel: 0151 691 8608

e-mail: annebeauchamp@wirral.gov.uk

Website: <http://www.wirral.gov.uk>

AGENDA

1. MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non pecuniary interests, in connection with any application on the agenda and state the nature of the interest.

2. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 12 and 27 October 2016.

3. REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES (Pages 9 - 14)

4. MONKS' FERRY SLIPWAY BIRKENHEAD (Pages 15 - 32)

The appendices referred to within the report will be available at the meeting.

5. EXEMPT INFORMATION - EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following items contain exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: That, under section 100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by the relevant paragraphs of Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to that Act. The Public Interest test has been applied and favours exclusion.

6. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR

To consider any other business that the Chair accepts as being urgent.

LICENSING, HEALTH AND SAFETY AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 12 October 2016

Present: Councillor WJ Davies (Chair)

Councillors RL Abbey D Roberts
T Johnson G Watt
A Hodson I Lewis
P Stuart

Deputy: Councillor A Brighthouse (In place of D Mitchell)

6 MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee were asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non pecuniary interests in connection with any application on the agenda and state the nature of the interest.

No such declarations were made.

7 MINUTES

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2016 be approved.

8 HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE TESTING ARRANGEMENTS

The Assistant Chief Executive submitted a report requesting Members' approval of the appointment of additional Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Compliance Testing Stations.

Members were advised that there were currently four testing stations approved to undertake the testing of Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Vehicles in Wirral, however, since these stations had been appointed in January 2010, a number of garages had expressed an interest in obtaining approval as a testing station.

Members had resolved, at a meeting of this Committee on 28 September 2015, that applications be invited from approved MOT testing centres in Wirral and that the responses and assessment results be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

The Licensing Manager reported that further to this process being completed, applications had been received from five testing stations and no reasons had

been identified why any of the five testing stations should not be appointed as Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle testing stations.

It was proposed that the wording of the current Vehicle Compliance Testing Document be amended to read:

Approved compliance testing stations must not issue certificates for vehicles owned by that testing station or associated companies and individuals. Such vehicles must be tested by an independent approved compliance testing station.

It was further proposed that this statement also be included in all Service Level agreements entered into with approved Testing Stations.

Resolved –

(1) That the appointment of the following additional MOT testing stations be approved to carry out Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Compliance Testing with effect from 1 November 2016:

- **ATS Euromaster, Pensby Road, Pensby**
- **BP Autos, Legh Road, New Ferry**
- **M53 Ford, Green Lane, Birkenhead**
- **Vittoria Motor Services, Vittoria Street, Birkenhead**
- **Wirral Tyre and Commercial, Bassendale Road, Bromborough.**

(2) That the wording contained within the Vehicle Compliance Testing Document be amended to read:

Approved compliance testing stations must not issue certificates for vehicles owned by that testing station or associated companies and individuals. Such vehicles must be tested by an independent approved compliance testing station.

(3) That this statement also be included in all Service Level agreements entered into with approved Testing Stations.

9 HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER CONVICTIONS POLICY - NEW APPLICANTS

The Assistant Chief Executive sought Members' approval of a revised policy in relation to the criteria applicable when considering the fitness and propriety of an individual in respect of their application for the grant of a Private Hire or Hackney Carriage Driver Licence when the applicant has committed an offence or offences.

The Licensing Manager reported that a General Policy Circular had been published by the Home Office in 1992 which provided guidance to Local

Authorities when considering applications for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Licences. This guidance set general time scales when licence applications should be considered after an applicant had been convicted of an offence. The timescales within these guidelines were set between three and ten years. Members of this Committee had approved a set of guidelines following the publication of the Circular in 1992 and these guidelines were subsequently reviewed in 2010.

Members were advised that a consultation exercise with other authorities across Merseyside had been conducted by officers with a view to developing a more consistent approach across Merseyside in relation to how local authorities dealt with applicants who had committed an offence or offences. A revised policy was attached as Appendix 2 to the report which had been developed to incorporate the changes needed to bring about the consistency sought. The Licensing Manager informed Members that officers in each of the authorities across Merseyside would be seeking to amend their policies in line with the revised policy attached at Appendix 2.

Resolved – That the revised policy attached as Appendix 2 to the report be adopted with immediate effect by the Committee as the policy to be used when determining applications for the grant of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Licences where the applicant has committed an offence or offences.

10 **INDEPENDENT SURVEY OF THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR HACKNEY CARRIAGE VEHICLES IN WIRRAL**

The Assistant Chief Executive updated Members in respect of the appointment of an independent company to carry out a survey to determine the level of demand for Hackney Carriage Vehicles in Wirral.

The Licensing Manager reported that there were currently 30 Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licences available which had received no applications through the current allocation procedure.

Members of this Committee on 23 January 2012 had resolved to impose a limit of 289 on the number of Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licences that could be issued by the Council. The limit had been set at 289 following recommendations made by Halcrow Group Limited who undertook an independent study of the demand for hackney carriages in Wirral during 2011. This recommendation followed their findings that at the time of their study, when there were 289 hackney carriages licensed, there had been no evidence of significant unmet demand for hackney carriages in Wirral. It was also reported that ‘in the medium term, however, as demand for taxis may continue to grow with the redevelopment of Wirral, it is possible that consumers may be inconvenienced by a limit of 289.’

The Licensing Manager advised Members that it was highly unlikely that the Council would be in a position where a Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence would be refused due to the limit on the number of licences that the Council would issue and suggested that it may no longer be necessary or appropriate to undertake an unmet demand survey at this time for the purpose of providing a defence should such an application be refused. The Licensing Manager also requested that Members consider amending the current allocation process as the number of applications was lower than the number of licences available.

Derek Cummins, Unite the Union, addressed the Committee and advised Members that he believed that there was still a need for a survey to be carried out.

Members discussed the resolution made by this Committee in February 2016 that an independent survey be carried out in respect of the supply and demand for Hackney Carriage Vehicles in Wirral and believed that the survey would identify the demand and provide some security for drivers.

The Licensing Manager advised that there could be a cost implication when fees were assessed. Mr D K Abraham, Legal Advisor to the Committee, suggested that the need for a survey could be kept under review and reconsidered if a large number of applications were received. He also pointed out that there was a risk that the result of a survey could lead to the removal or lowering of the limit on the number of Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licences.

Further to discussions Members expressed their wish that a survey be carried out. The Licensing Manager suggested that Members may wish to consider the weight that should be attached to the quality/cost in the procurement process.

It was moved by Councillor A Hodson and seconded by Councillor I Lewis that –

“An independent company be appointed to carry out a survey to determine the level of demand for Hackney Carriage Vehicles in Wirral.”

It was moved as an amendment by Councillor R Abbey and seconded by Councillor I Lewis that –

“The weighting attached to the survey be 60% for the quality criteria and 40% for the price criteria.”

The amendment was put and carried (9:0).

The substantive motion, as amended, was put and carried (9:0).

Resolved – That an independent company be appointed to carry out a survey to determine the level of demand for Hackney Carriage Vehicles in Wirral and that the weighting attached to the survey be 60% for the quality criteria and 40% for the price criteria.

This page is intentionally left blank

LICENSING, HEALTH AND SAFETY AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 27 October 2016

Present: Councillor WJ Davies (Chair)

Councillors RL Abbey I Lewis
T Johnson G Watt
P Stuart D Mitchell
D Roberts

Deputies: Councillors T Anderson (for A Hodson)

11 MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Committee were requested to declare whether they had any disclosable pecuniary and non pecuniary interests in connection with any application on the agenda and state the nature of the interest.

No such declarations were made.

12 POLLING STATION (POLLING DISTRICT NA AND NB WITHIN HOYLAKE NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA)

A report by the Chief Executive provided details for Members of necessary changes required in relation to polling stations within the Borough and sought approval of suitable alternatives. The recommendation was for Members to designate Hoylake Community Centre as the polling stations for polling district NA and NB contained within the Hoylake Neighbourhood Area.

It was reported that the Council has a duty under the Representation of the People Act 1983 to designate polling stations and that the Localism Act 2011 and accompanying regulations allowed communities to have more control over planning and development within their area.

Following public consultation, the Hoylake Neighbourhood Planning Forum and its corresponding neighbourhood area were designated as a neighbourhood forum which allowed the Forum to prepare and submit a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The Electoral Services Manager reported that the Council published the Decision Statement on the Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan on 14 September 2016 and subject to there being no challenge to the Decision Statement, the Plan will be submitted to a referendum of local electors on Thursday 1 December 2016, which would be conducted in accordance with procedures similar to those used at local government elections.

The Electoral Services Manager advised that the designated polling district NA is St Johns Church Centre, School Lane, Meols, however, for the referendum there are only 43 electors contained within the referendum area and are situated just outside the boundary of polling district NB. Members were advised that the designated polling district NB is Hoylake Holy Trinity C of E Primary School, Market Street, Hoylake and they had expressed their wish not to be used on this occasion to avoid further disruption to the pupils due to them already having to close the school for the local elections held on 5 May and the EU Referendum held on 23 June this year. Members were then advised that Hoylake Community Centre, Hoyle Road, Hoylake is situated within polling district NB and after inspection by Electoral Services is considered to be suitable for use as a polling station for the forthcoming referendum.

It was moved by Councillor T Anderson and seconded by Councillor P Stuart that –

“Hoylake Community Centre, Hoyle Road, Hoylake, CH47 3AG be determined as the designated polling station for Hoylake Neighbourhood Area.”

Resolved – That Hoylake Community Centre, Hoyle Road, Hoylake, CH47 3AG be determined as the designated polling place for Hoylake Neighbourhood Area.



LICENSING HEALTH AND SAFETY AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

23 NOVEMBER 2016

REPORT TITLE	REVIEW OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARES
REPORT OF	MANAGING DIRECTOR FOR DELIVERY

REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is for Members to consider whether to amend the current Hackney Carriage fare tariffs subject to any objections being received as part of the consultation process.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That Members consider the proposals to amend the Hackney Carriage Tariffs and determine whether it is appropriate to approve an increase in Hackney Carriage Tariffs, subject to any objections being received as part of the consultation process.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

1.1 It is a delegated function of this Committee to set Hackney Carriage Tariffs.

2.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 There is no provision for other options to be considered.

3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3.1 The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 section 65(1) gives the power to set hackney carriage fares to the local authority as follows:

- 1 A District Council may fix the rates or fares within the district as well for time as distance, and all other charges in connection with the hire of a vehicle or with the arrangements for the hire of a vehicle; to be paid in respect of the hire of a hackney carriage by means of a table (hereafter in this section referred to as a 'table of fares') made or varied in accordance with the provisions of this section.
- 2 When a District Council make or vary a table of fares they shall publish in at least one local newspaper circulating in the district a notice setting out the table of fares or the variation thereof and specifying the period, which shall not be less than fourteen days from the date of first publication of the notice, within which and the manner in which objections to the table of fares or variation can be made.

3.2 On 24 September 2007 Members of this Committee resolved to consider an annual review of fares based upon the Public Carriage Office (now Transport for London) recommendations for London.

3.3 Since that date the last increase of hackney carriage fares was in December 2012 as any change using this method in recent years would have resulted in a negligible impact on Hackney Carriage fares.

3.4 A proposal has been submitted by the Unite Hackney Carriage trade representatives to reduce the initial hiring distance by 300 yards on tariff 1, with all other tariffs, distances and charges to remain unchanged.

3.5 The current four tariffs are as follows:

Tariff 1	Standard Day Rate (6am to 10pm)
Tariff 2	Standard Night Rate (10pm to 6am) Public and Bank Holiday Day Rate (inc Easter Sunday)
Tariff 3	Public and Bank Holiday Night Rate (inc Easter Sunday)
Tariff 4	Christmas and New Year Day and Night Rate

Christmas is defined as the period from 18.00 hours on Christmas Eve until 06.00 hours on the day after Boxing Day.

New Year is defined as the period from 18.00 hours on New Year's Eve until 06.00 hours on the day after New Year's Day.

- 3.6 A table comparing the current and proposed rates is shown at Appendix 1. A table showing the effect of the proposed increases is attached at Appendix 2.
- 3.7 Should Members approve the amendments to the current tariffs, the proposal must be advertised for a period of fourteen days. If no objections to the proposal are received, the revised tariff will become effective on 15 December 2016. If objections are received, they will be reported back to this Committee for consideration.
- 3.8 Members of this Committee considered a number of proposals for an increase of hackney carriage fares at their meeting on 25 November 2015. After consideration of the proposals and a petition from Hackney Carriage Drivers objecting to an increase Members resolved not to amend the Hackney Carriage fare tariffs.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The cost of the public advertisement will be recovered from licence fees.

5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are no specific implications arising from this report.

6.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: ICT, STAFFING AND ASSETS

- 6.1 There are no specific implications arising from this report.

7.0 RISKS

- 7.1 There are no specific implications arising from this report.

8.0 ENGAGEMENT/CONSULTATION

- 8.1 The proposal must be advertised for a period of fourteen days.

9.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There are no specific implications arising from this report.

REPORT AUTHOR: Margaret O'Donnell
Licensing Manager
telephone: (0151) 691 8606
email: margaretodonnell@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Table comparing the current and proposed rates

Appendix 2 - Table showing the effect of the proposal

REFERENCE MATERIAL

None

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date
Licensing Health and Safety and General Purposes Committee	25 November 2015

Comparison of current and proposed Hackney Carriage tariffs

	Current rate	Proposed rate
Tariff 1		
First 600 yards	£2.80	
First 300 yards		£2.80
Each subsequent 245 yards	20p	20p
Tariff 2		
First 900 yards	£3.30	unchanged
Each subsequent 205 yards	20p	unchanged
Tariff 3		
First 966 yards	£3.90	unchanged
Each subsequent 182 yards	20p	unchanged
Tariff 4		
First 966 yards	£5.20	unchanged
Each subsequent 137 yards	20p	unchanged

Table showing effect of the proposal

	Distance	Fare based on current tariff	Fare based on proposed tariff
Tariff 1	1 mile	£3.80	£4.00
	2 miles	£5.20	£5.60
	3 miles	£6.80	£7.00
	4 miles	£8.20	£8.40
	5 miles	£9.60	£9.80
	10 miles	£16.80	£17.00
Tariff 2	1 mile	£4.30	unchanged
	2 miles	£5.90	
	3 miles	£7.70	
	4 miles	£9.30	
	5 miles	£11.10	
	10 miles	£19.70	
Tariff 3	1 mile	£4.90	unchanged
	2 miles	£6.90	
	3 miles	£8.70	
	4 miles	£10.70	
	5 miles	£12.70	
	10 miles	£22.30	
Tariff 4	1 mile	£6.40	unchanged
	2 miles	£9.00	
	3 miles	£11.60	
	4 miles	£14.20	
	5 miles	£16.80	
	10 miles	£29.60	



**LICENSING HEALTH AND SAFETY AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE
23 NOVEMBER 2016**

REPORT TITLE	MONKS' FERRY SLIPWAY BIRKENHEAD
REPORT OF	MANAGING DIRECTOR FOR DELIVERY

REPORT SUMMARY

Wirral Borough Council is designated as the Surveying Authority pursuant to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (“the 1981 Act”) with responsibilities for the maintenance of the Definitive Map of Rights of Way within the Borough. As Surveying Authority the Council has received an application under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 section 53(5) from Richard Buxton Environmental and Public Law dated 15 July 2015 on behalf of members of the Mersey Charter-boat owners and other users of the Monks' Ferry Slipway.

The application seeks an order to modify the Definitive Map to show a public footpath from the public highway on the car park at Monks' Ferry, Alabama Way, Birkenhead, Merseyside, CH41, down the slipway as far as the low-water mark.

The land subject to the application is in the ownership of the Council

The application claims that the slipway and its access to the public highway has been actually enjoyed by pedestrian members of the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of 20 years and as such should be deemed to have been dedicated as a public footpath. They have provided evidence in support of their application

The Council contests this application and has provided evidence in support of this objection

Having carefully considered the evidence from both parties the Surveying Authority recommends that the Council refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report. The Committee is requested to consider the evidence, and the recommendations, and determine the application.

RECOMMENDATION/S

(1) That the application under s53(5) Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (“the 1981 Act”) from Richard Buxton Environmental and Public Law dated 15 July 2015 on behalf of members of the Mersey Charter-boat owners and other users of the Monks' Ferry Slipway for an order under subsection 53(2) to modify the Definitive Map be refused for the following reasons:

A) As required by s31(1) Highways Act 1980, for the reasons set out in the report, the applicant has failed to demonstrate:

- Use of the slipway as a way by the public for a full 20 year period,
- Use of the slipway without interruption,
- Use of the slipway “as of right” which means not secretly or by force or by the licence or permission of the owner from time to time given.

B) That pursuant to Section 53(3)(c)(i) Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the applicant has failed to provide evidence which (when considered with all other relevant evidence available to the Council) shows that a right of way which is not shown in the map and statement subsists or is reasonably alleged to subsist over land in the area to which the map relates.

C). That pursuant to Section 53(3)(b) Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, 20 years use as of right has not been demonstrated on the balance of probabilities. Therefore there is no presumption that the way has been dedicated as a public path.

(2)That the application under Common Law be refused as there is no inference of dedication of the slipway as a way at Common Law and further that the use was not “as of right” at Common Law.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1.1. To determine the application

2.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 2.1. None

3.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 The application is made in accordance with Schedule 14 to the 1981 Act and the Wildlife and Countryside (Definitive Maps and Statements) Regulations 1993. The Highways Act 1980 s31 (1) and (9) apply. The committee's attention is drawn to Appendix 1 to this Report which clearly sets out the legislative background to this application and the factors which the Committee should take into account in determining this application. (Application is attached as Appendix 2 to this report).
- 3.2 The application claims that the slipway and its access to the public highway has been actually enjoyed by pedestrian members of the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of 20 years and as such should be deemed to have been dedicated as a public footpath. As set down in s31(2) of the Highways Act 1980 the 20 year period is calculated backward from the date when the right of the public to use the way is brought into question. The application is dated 15 July 2015 but was preceded by a letter stating the applicants' intention to submit the application. This letter was dated 26 June 2015 which is therefore the date on which the right of the public to use the right of way is brought into question, and the 20 year period runs back from that date to 25 June 1995.
- 3.3 The application claims that the public involved include members of the public going to and from charter boats and members of the general public enjoying views of the River Mersey and its shipping and of Liverpool.
- 3.4 As Surveying Authority the Council has a duty to keep the Definitive Map and Statement under review. As regards every definitive map and statement, the Surveying Authority shall:
 - (a) as soon as reasonably practicable after the commencement date, by order make such modifications to the map and statement as appear to them to be requisite in consequence of the occurrence, before that date, of any of the events specified in s53, of the 1993 Act, subsection (3); and
 - (b) as from that date, keep the map and statement under continuous review and as soon as reasonably practicable after the occurrence, on or after that date, of any of those events, by order make such modifications to the map and statement as appear to them to be requisite in consequence of the occurrence of that event.

The events referred to in subsection 3 include:

- (c) the discovery by the authority of evidence which (when considered with all other relevant evidence available to them) shows
- (i) that a right of way which is not shown in the map and statement subsists or is reasonably alleged to subsist over land in the area to which the map relates.

4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 If the application is refused there will be financial implications in either replacing the damaged bollard or in removing the existing bollard base and sealing the gap with new rails attached to the existing gate post and the fencing.
- 4.2 If the application is approved it would be necessary to improve the surface by possibly resurfacing it. Also a regular cleansing schedule would need to be introduced to ensure that the surface was free from deposited material from the river and detritus from tidal action.

5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The legal issues relating to consideration of the evidence are set out in Appendix 1 to this report and Members attention is specifically drawn to the contents of that Appendix. Consideration of this matter must be in accordance with the legislation and guidance set out in that Appendix.

6.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: ICT, STAFFING AND ASSETS

7.0 RELEVANT RISKS

7.1 The slipway is not currently maintained for public use and there is a risk that anyone accessing it and using it for leisure purposes may suffer injury from falling or slipping

8.0 ENGAGEMENT/CONSULTATION

Interviews have been held with the members of the public who claim to use the slipway for leisure purposes.

9.0 THE APPLICATION

- 9.1 The basis of the application is that the Monks Ferry slipway and its access to the public highway has been actually enjoyed by pedestrian members of the public as of right and without interruption for a full period of 20 years and as such should be deemed to have been dedicated as a public footpath.
- 9.2 The application goes on to state that, “as established by unchallenged evidence in a recent planning appeal, (reference APP/W4325/W/14/3000737), this access has continued for more than 20 years to the knowledge of the Council but without permission and that at no time during the 20-year period has there been any notice

inconsistent with the dedication of the way as a public footpath, nor is there any other evidence to negate the intention to dedicate the way as a public footpath. No signs in respect of pedestrian use and no barrier preventing pedestrian use have been erected.”

- 9.3 The application refers to an email from the Council to the applicant dated 30 June 2015 from the Council in respect of the applicants notice of intent to make the application which stated that "the slipway is separated from the highway by a locked gate and also a damaged bollard". The application states that the email referred to above fails to record the fact that the gate has at all times had a gap which easily permits pedestrian access.
- 9.4 The application claims that the Council as owner has at all times had full capacity to dedicate a way over that land as a public footpath.

10.0 LEGAL ISSUES WHEN CONSIDERING THE EVIDENCE

- 10.1 The legal issues relating to consideration of the evidence are set out in Appendix 1 to this report and the committees attention is specifically drawn to the contents of that Appendix. Consideration of this matter must be in accordance with the legislation and guidance set out in that Appendix.

11.0 EVIDENCE FROM THE APPLICANT

- 11.1 A copy of the Application is annexed as Appendix 2 to this report and the accompanying witness statements are at Appendix 3. Nine witness statements have been provided by the applicant in support of the application from:

George Collings
Stephen Dalton
Tom Dalton
Colin Evans
Gary Flint
Huw Williams
Stan Dickinson
Kevin McKie
Statement and letter from Nigel Mercer to Wirral Borough Council

- 11.2 Three of these witness statements contain evidence from people who claim to have used the slipway personally. The evidence from these witnesses:

Stan Dickinson
Kevin McKie
Nigel Mercer
is considered below at paragraph 8.3.2

- 11.3 The other six statements are from charter boat operators who, for a various length of time from 1990 onwards have operated charter boats which they claim to have moored at Monks Ferry Slipway to board and off-load passengers to their boats. The numbers of passengers vary between each of the charter boat operators as does the frequency of the moorings.

11.4 These six statements all state that “typically the passengers would walk from and to a motor vehicle parked in Monks Ferry car park”, that “there was never a barrier that prevented its use by pedestrians” and that “this pedestrian use of the slipway was carried out openly, without force and without seeking or being given permission” These witnesses themselves have actually only used the slipway to moor of boats over a period rather than use of the slipway as a right of way. These statements do not provide any evidence of the witnesses having actually used the slipway personally as a public right of way for a full 20 year period, as of right and without interruption.

The statements do not provide detail on the important issue of how the slipway was accessed or exited at its landward (fence line) side. On that basis the evidence is to be given less weight than evidence from those who did actually use the slipway to access the boats

11.5 There are no witness statements submitted in the application in support of these six witness statements from any of the passengers who are claimed in these statements to have actually used the slipway as a public right of way to board or exit from the boats.

11.6 In addition the applicant has submitted an email dated 26 April 2016 together with photographs and a plan. (The email and attachments are appended as Appendix 4). The applicant raises the following issues:

(i) The Council’s definition of the “damaged” bollard. They contend that the bollard has been cut down as opposed to being damaged and attach photographs both dated 10 February 2016 (referenced 10/2/1 and 10/2/2 in Appendix 4).

(ii) They state that it would be wrong to claim that the bollard at the top of the slipway is damaged until there is clarification as to why the bollards were installed in the area.

(iii) They claim that the permanent boat moorings on the slipway demonstrates the use of the slipway by the chartered boat operators. They attach photograph ref 26/4/3 which shows the boat moorings and an old map ref 26/4/4 (See Appendix 6).

(iv) They question whether the purpose of the gate at the top of the slipway was to stop boats launching rather than use of the slipway by the chartered boat companies for fishing expeditions. They rely on photographs ref 26/4/5 dated 1987 and 26/4/6 dated 1989 to support this point.

12.0 EVIDENCE FROM THE COUNCIL

12.1 The Council as Landowner have submitted a witness statement setting out its views on the application. The statement is from Neil Thomas, Team Leader – Highway Assets in Highway Management (Appendix 5 to this report).

12.2 The statement refers to a bollard, seen on the accompanying photographs of the Monks Ferry Slipway (Appendix 6) which was erected by Merseyside Development Corporation during their regeneration of the area in the mid-1990s. Mr. Thomas states that the bollard was positioned so as to fill the gap between the fenceline to

the retaining wall parallel to the south side of the slipway and the short fenceline at the top of the slipway immediately to the south of the gate.

12.3 The earliest photograph showing the bollard is dcp_2108 which is time stamped as 29th November 2002. A later inspection photograph (DSC05236) from March 2012 shows the bollard in place, whereas photograph birkenhead_monks_ferry_03_09_2013 shows the bollard reduced to the bottom-most segment. Mr. Thomas states that the bollard was removed at some time between March 2012 and September 2013.

12.4 Mr. Thomas confirms that the Council did not remove the bollard nor would its removal have been caused by environmental processes such as wave damage. He further states that the Council has never accepted that Monks Ferry Slipway is a public right of way.

12.5 With regards to the applicant's email of 26 April 2016 (see paragraph 5.6 above), Mark Wardle, Assistant Engineer, Highways Management – Coast Protection has made the following responses in an email dated 29 April 2016 (attached, with accompanying photographs, as Appendix 7 to this report)

(i) With regards to the damaged bollard, he reiterates that the Council has produced evidence of the bollards in different states over various time periods (see 6.3 above and Appendix 6 to this report). He agrees with the applicant that the bollards have been "cut down" by segments. He states that the bollard in question was constructed in segments and the weakest points would be the joints between those segments. An act of vandalism would likely result in a segment or number of segments being removed in one piece. He visited the area at low water on the 29th April and found bollard segments discarded on the foreshore adjacent to the slipway. He states that photos referenced 29/4/1 and 29/4/2 (see Appendix 6) clearly show discarded segments of bollard. He further states that if the Council had intended to afford passage to the slipway through the aperture left by the removal of the bollard, the lowest section would also have been removed so as to avoid a trip hazard. He states that to his knowledge the Council has never issued an order to have the bollards shortened.

(ii) Mr Wardle states that, looking at the attachments forwarded by the applicant (see Appendix 4), the mooring points shown on the archive map ref 26/4/4 are alongside a graving dock or on a slipway further to the north than the Monks Ferry slipway, which is shown far right on the plan. The photo from 1989 ref 26/4/6 purporting to show 'civic improvements to the area but not a gate' doesn't actually show the slipway but rather the higher level car park. The photo ref 26/4/5 dated 1987 appears to be taken from the junction of Church Street and Ivy Street and also doesn't show the slipway.

(ii) With regards to the moorings on the slipway, Mr. Wardle submits as evidence a copy of an order that was issued on the 18th May 1998 (ref 29/4/7) that asks for 20 no. 'small bollards' to be manufactured and placed at Monks Ferry slipway. He believes these are the boat moorings referred to by the applicant. The incident details on the order state 'Safety issue for rescue services'. This order was sent on the same day as another order for Monks Ferry (ref 29/4/8) asking for the painting of hatching and text reading "Emergency Access Keep Clear". He states

that this would indicate that the slipway was intended for emergency use only by rescue services.

13.0 ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

- 13.1 In addition the Investigating Officers for the Surveying Authority have taken photographs of the site as it currently stands showing the bottom segment of the bollard only dated 4th August 2015. They have found a photograph using Google Maps which is dated October 2008 which shows the bollard in place. (Appendix 7 to this report, ref AE/1).
- 13.2 On 20 October 2016 the applicant submitted to the Council an Assets of Community Value Nomination Form (Appendix 10 to this report). The details of this application are not relevant to the Definitive Map application before the Committee, however the Nomination Form appended photographs of the slipway and car park at 'Annex 3 to the Form'. When looking at these undated photographs the bollard, at almost full height, can clearly be seen on the first photograph, whilst on the second photograph it can be seen in its current state, with just the bottom section in situ.
- 13.3 The Investigating Officers have taken measurements of the fence line and the current gap in the fence. The fence / railings are 1.12m high on each side of the gap. The railings to the top right of the slipway appear to be higher than that along the top of the slipway as the railings are erected on slightly higher land. The gap in the fencing at the top of the slipway is 240mm/ 9" at the top and 300mm/12" at the bottom. They have also estimated the height of the bollard which was in place between the gap in the fence line from at least 2002 – 2012 as being 1.2 metres.
- 13.4 The Surveying Authority understand that the bollard was erected by Merseyside Development Corporation in the mid 1990's at the time of construction of the promenade at Monks Ferry. The Surveying Authority has not been able to identify the exact date the bollard was erected.
- 13.5 The fence line along the top of the slipway includes a locked gate which is fronted by a notice on the road which reads "Emergency Access Keep Clear" (as shown in Appendix 7 photograph ref. AE/2). This access is used by emergency services for rescue purposes. Keys are held by the emergency services and by relevant Council officers.

14.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE EVIDENCE

- 14.1 As set out in Appendix 1 to this report, to succeed the applicant must prove
- Use of the slipway as a way by the public for a full 20 year period
 - Use of the slipway without interruption
 - Use of the slipway "as of right" which means not secretly or by force or by the licence or permission of the owner from time to time given
- 14.2 In considering whether or not to approve the application for the right of way to be added to the Definitive Map, Members must consider;
- A) Has a right of way been shown to subsist on the balance of probability or
B) has a right of way been reasonably alleged to subsist?

14.3 Witness Statements from the applicant

- 14.3.1 Only three of the witness statements submitted with the application (Appendix 3) are considered to have significant evidential relevance. The remaining six statements refer to witnesses mooring boats on the slipway over periods in excess of 20 years rather than using the slipway personally as a way over that period. These six statements all state that “typically the passengers would walk from and to a motor vehicle parked in Monks Ferry car park”, that “there was never a barrier that prevented its use by pedestrians” and that “this pedestrian use of the slipway was carried out openly, without force and without seeking or being given permission” These statements are not supported by evidence from the passengers who are alleged to have actually used the slipway as a right of way. They do not provide detail on the important issue of how the slipway was accessed or exited at its landward (fence line) side. On that basis the evidence in these six statements is to be given less weight than evidence from those who used the slipway in person.
- 14.3.2 Consideration must be given to the remaining three witness statements from Mr. Stan Dickson, Mr. Kevin McKie and Mr. Nigel Mercer (Appendix 3) who each refer to personal use of the slipway as a way.

1. Stan Dickson, states that he used the slipway to board vessels between 1992 and 2005. He states that since then he has moored boats at the slipway for passengers to board and offload. However, as the relevant 20 year period runs retrospectively, only use as from 25 June 1995 is relevant for this application. (The date the right of the public to use the way was brought into question was 26 June 2015). Therefore Mr. Dickson can only demonstrate 10 years use within that 20 year period. However it is possible to consider use of a way by different persons, each for periods of less than 20 years, where taken together they total a continuous 20 years or more. Therefore this statement may contribute to a finding that the use has been for a period of 20 years. The statement does not provide detail on the important issue of how the slipway was accessed or exited at its landward (fence line) side.

From 2005 Mr. Dickson has used the slipway to moor boats rather than use of the slipway as a way. The statement says that “typically the passengers would walk from and to a motor vehicle parked in Monks Ferry car park”, that “there was never a barrier that prevented its use by pedestrians” and that “this pedestrian use of the slipway was carried out openly, without force and without seeking or being given permission” There are no witness statements submitted in support of this witness statement from any of the passengers who are claimed to have actually used the slipway as a public right of way to board or exit from the boats since 2005. The statement does not provide detail on the important issue of how the slipway was accessed or exited at its landward (fence line) side by the alleged users.

2. Kevin McKie states that he started using the slipway to get on and off charter boats from 1991 to 2012 and since then has moored a charter boat on the slipway when he claims passengers have used the slipway to board and leave the boat. The period from 1991 – 2012 demonstrates personal use of the slipway for a period of over 20 years. However, as the relevant 20 year period runs retrospectively, only use as from 25 June 1995 is relevant for this application. (The date the right of the public to use the way was brought into question was 26 June 2015). Therefore Mr. Dickson can only demonstrate 17 years use within that 20 year period. It is possible

to consider use of a way by different persons, each for periods of less than 20 years, where taken together they total a continuous 20 years or more. Therefore this statement may contribute to a finding that the use has been for a period of 20 years.

3. Mr Mckie was interviewed by Cecilia Rathe, Senior Solicitor and Investigating Officer, on 10 February 2016. Mr. Mckie confirmed the contents of his statement. He explained that he had personally used the Monks Ferry slipway to access fishing boats approximately once a month during the period 1991 - 2012. From 2013 he had boarded and offloaded passengers to his own fishing boat but had not used the slipway personally since 2013.

Mr. Mckie was questioned about the size of the current gap in the fence line at the top of the slipway and how the slipway was currently accessed by his passengers. He stated that they get through the gap, stepping on the lower section of the bollard, and passing any fishing equipment over the top.

Mr. McKie was shown the photographs from the Council's witness which show a bollard in place between the gap from 2002 – 2012 and was asked how he had personally accessed the slipway during that period. He replied that the bollard wasn't very high, only about to his hip level, and that he stepped on to the bollard, over the remaining gap in the fence and onto the slipway. He said he would pass his fishing equipment over the top before doing this.

4. Nigel Mercer states that he has used the slipway since 1990 to gain access to fishing charter boats as a member of initially the Apollo Fishing Club (1990 – 2005) and then the Houlihans Sea Angling Club (2005 to date). This therefore establishes 20 years user of the slipway within the relevant 20 year period from 25 June 1995 – 26 June 2015.

Mr. Mercer was interviewed by the Investigating officer, Cecilia Rathe on 10 February 2016. Mr. Mercer stated that he used the slipway about 18 times a year to gain access to charter boats. He was asked how he currently accessed the slipway to gain access to the boats. He replied that he "squeezed through" the gap between the fence line or climbed over the fence.

Mr. Mercer was shown the photographs from the Council's witness which show a bollard in place between the gap from 2002 – 2012 and was asked how he had personally accessed the slipway during that period. He stated that he had "gone over the fence."

Mr. Mercer further stated that at no time were there any notices or signs in place on or near the slipway saying No Access to the slipway or that the slipway was Private.

He also referred to the fact that he was aware that charity swimmers used the slipway on occasion after completing swims from Egremont beach to the slipway. He stated he was aware of hundreds of anglers using the slipway on a regular basis, and that had access been unavailable the anglers would have taken this up with the Council at an earlier stage. He said that the slipway had been used by anglers for as long as he could remember.

Mr. Mercer further stated that although he was disabled he could still access the slipway.

14.4 Witness Statements from the Council

- 14.4.1 The Council has stated that a bollard was erected by Merseyside Development Corporation during their regeneration of the area in the mid-1990s. They have provided photographic evidence which shows the bollard in position from 2002 – 2012. (Appendix 5).
- 14.4.2 The bollard was positioned so as to significantly fill the gap which existed along the boundary line created by a metal fence and an emergency access gate between the slipway and the car park and the public path. This is supported by the findings of the Investigating Officers as to the size of the bollard and the size of the gap in the fenceline (see 7.3 above).
- 14.4.3 The photographic evidence shows that this bollard was largely removed, leaving just the base of the bollard, at some time between March 2012 and September 2013. Mr. Thomas states (Appendix 5) that the bollard was not removed by the Council, and that the current state of the bollard would not be due to environmental damage.
- 14.4.4 The evidence from Mr. Wardle in his email dated 29 April 2016 further supports the Council's position that the Council did not remove the segments of the bollards. Mr. Wardle has provided photographs (Appendix 7) of damaged sections of a bollard on the foreshore at Monks Ferry and he claims that this was the result of vandalism and the segments were subsequently discarded on the foreshore.

14.5 The Application documents

- 14.5.1 The application refers to “unchallenged evidence” in a recent planning appeal, (reference APP/W4325/W/14/3000737) that this access has continued for more than 20 years to the knowledge of the Council but without permission and that at no time during the 20-year period has there been any notice inconsistent with the dedication of the way as a public footpath, nor is there any other evidence to negate the intention to dedicate the way as a public footpath. No signs in respect of pedestrian use and no barrier preventing pedestrian use have been erected.
- 14.5.2 As set out in a summary of the Inspectors findings on this matter (Appendix 9 to this report) the evidence was challenged by the Council during the course of the appeal although the matter was not considered in any detail by the Inspector as it was not relevant to the Planning Appeal. At the subsequent High Court appeal against the Inspectors decision, one of the grounds for the appeal was that the Inspector had failed adequately to address the adverse impact of the proposed development on charter-boat operators. In the High Court decision on 6 May 2016 Mrs. Justice Lang found that there had been no error of law in the Inspector's approach to the consideration of this particular matter (The Inspectors decision was however quashed on other grounds not relevant to the consideration of this application for a modification of the Definitive Map).

15.0 INVESTIGATION CONCLUSIONS

- 15.1 As set out in Appendix 1 to this report (“Legal Issues”), when considering whether a right of way subsists in an application under Section 53(3)(c)(i) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the discovery by the authority of evidence which (when

considered with all other relevant evidence available to them) shows that a right of way which is not shown in the map and statement subsists (Test A) or is reasonably alleged to subsist (Test B) over land will lead to the right of way being added to the Definitive Map

Conclusion relating to Test A

15.1.1 As set out in Appendix 1 “Legal Issues”, in accordance with s31(1) Highways Act 1980, to succeed in this application to have the Definitive Map amended by the addition of a new right of way over the Monks Ferry slipway, the applicant must prove all of the following:

- Use of the slipway as a way by the public for a full 20 year period
- Use of the slipway without interruption
- Use of the slipway “as of right” which means not secretly or by force or by the licence or permission of the owner from time to time given

15.1.2 When considering Test A (i.e. whether a right of way has been shown to subsist on the balance of probability), clear evidence in favour of the appellant is required and no credible evidence to the contrary.

15.1.3 There is evidence in the application from the witness Mr. Mercer, that he has used the slipway for pedestrian access for the required 20 year period. This 20 year user is supported by the evidence of Mr. McKie of personal use of 17 years from 1995 – 2012 during the relevant period 20 year period (being June 1995-June 2015) and Mr. Dickson of personal use of the slipway for a 10 year period during the relevant 20 years (between 1995 and 2005). It is also supported by the statement of Mr. Dickson of personal use for a ten year period from 1995 - 2005

15.1.4 There are six statements from charter boat operators who, for various lengths of time from 1990 onwards, have operated charter boats which they claim to have moored at Monks Ferry Slipway to board and off-load passengers to their boats. . These six statements all state that “typically the passengers would walk from and to a motor vehicle parked in Monks Ferry car park” and that “this pedestrian use of the slipway was carried out openly, without force and without seeking or being given permission” These statements do not provide any evidence of the witnesses having used the slipway personally. The statements all say that “there was never a barrier that prevented use by pedestrians” This however conflicts with the incontrovertible evidence set out in 8.1.5 below. The statements do not provide detail on the important issue of how the slipway was accessed or exited at its landward (fence line) side by the passengers. On that basis the evidence has been given less weight than evidence from those who did use the slipway in person

15.1.5 There is clear, credible and incontrovertible evidence from the Council, supported by photographs and confirmed by Mr. McKie and Mr. Mercer when interviewed, that a bollard was in existence at the fence line at the top of the slipway, between the slipway and the car park and the public path, from at least 29 November 2002 to March 2012. The bollard was positioned, and was of such a size, as to fill the gap which otherwise would have existed along the boundary line created by the metal fence and the emergency access gate.

15.1.6 Having regard to the evidence in the witness statements provided by the applicants in support of their application (Appendix 3), supplemented by the responses from Mr. Mckie and Mr. Mercer when interviewed, and the Council's evidence (Appendices 5-7), it is therefore considered that;

1. Whilst the bollard was in place from at least November 2002 to March 2012 access to / egress from the slipway had to be by climbing over the bollard or the fence. This conclusion is supported by the evidence from both Mr. McKie and Mr. Mercer who accepted when interviewed that the bollard was there during that period and either it or the fence had to be climbed to gain access to or egress from the slipway. Mr. Mckie said that he stepped onto the bollard and over the remaining gap in the fence during that period, and Mr. Mercer said that he had "gone over the fence" during that period. Therefore the use of the slipway as a way is not "as of right" as the use has been by force, as defined in the Planning Inspectorate's "Definitive Map Orders: Consistency Guidelines" paragraph 5.22 (see Appendix 9) that "Force would include the breaking of locks, cutting of wire or passing over, through or around an intentional blockage such as a locked gate" or, as in the current circumstances, a bollard. The requirements of s31(1) Highways Act are not therefore met.

and / or

2. The presence of the bollard interrupted the use of the alleged right of way from November 2002 – March 2012 and that the requirements of s31(1) Highways Act are not therefore met

and/or

3. The presence of the bollard from November 2002 to March 2012 prevented the accrual of 20 years use of the slipway as a way from 25 June 1995 (retrospectively from 26 June 2015). The requirements of s31(1) Highways Act are not therefore met.

4. That the evidence produced by Mr. Wardle in his email dated 29/4/2016 (Appendix 6) supports a reasonable conclusion that

- the segments of the bollard were removed at some time after March 2012 by persons unknown and that the segments were probably subsequently discarded on the foreshore
- it is reasonable to conclude that this was an act of vandalism rather than an act by the Council as it is reasonable to conclude that the Council would have removed the whole of the bollard rather than leaving a segment which could be a tripping hazard and would be in breach of the Council's duty of care to highway users.

It should be noted that this conclusion does not detract from the finding in 9.1.6.1 above that the presence of the bollard prior to it being cut down, whether by vandalism or otherwise, prevented the use of the slipway "as of right" between 2002 – 2012, but rather it adds to the picture of use being forcible by demonstrating forcible use since 2012. As stated in the Planning Inspectorate's Guidelines at paragraph 5.22, force can include "the breaking of locks, cutting of wire" or in this case the probable vandalism of the bollard by persons unknown.

5. The contents of the applicant's email dated 26 April 2016 set out in paragraph 1.6 of Appendix 2 to this report (Consideration of the Evidence) does not provide any

clear evidence in favour of the applicant and the Council has provided credible evidence to the contrary as set out in paragraph 5.5 and 9.1.5 above.

6. Intention to dedicate is presumed once use as of right and without interruption is established. On the facts it is considered that neither use as of right nor without interruption has been established. Therefore intention by the Council to dedicate the slipway as a right of way cannot be presumed. Further, the presence of the bollard from November 2002 to March 2012 is clearly indicative of a lack of intention to dedicate the route as a way as the bollard effectively closed off the route, meaning that any access to the alleged way was by the use of force.

Conclusion under Test B

- 15.2 When considering whether a right of way has been reasonably alleged to subsist (Test B), if there is a conflict of credible evidence but no incontrovertible evidence that a way cannot be reasonably alleged to subsist, then the answer must be a public right of way has been reasonably alleged.
- 15.2.1 Whilst there is some conflict of credible evidence, for the reasons set out under test A above, the fact that the bollard was in place between November 2002 to March 2012 is incontrovertible evidence that a way cannot be reasonably alleged to subsist as 20 year user of the Monks Ferry Slipway as a way, as of right and without interruption, was simply not possible, the presence of the bollard between 2002 and 2012 is a clear demonstration of a lack of intention to dedicate.

Conclusion under s53(3)(b) Wildlife and Countryside Act

- 15.3 As set out in Appendix 1 to this report, when considering an application under S53 (3)(b) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the Council must consider the expiration of a period (20 years) such that the enjoyment of the public of the way during that period raises a presumption that the way has been dedicated as a public path. The matter is to be approached by reference to a balance of probabilities test.
- 15.3.1 For the reasons set out in 9.1.6 above, on the balance of probabilities, there is no presumption that the way has been dedicated as a public path.

Conclusion at Common Law

- 15.4 The applicant in addition relies on an inferred dedication of a right of way at Common Law. The presence of the bollard from 2002 to 2012 and the locking of the emergency gate defeats the necessary inference of dedication of the slipway as a right of way at Common Law.
- 15.4.1 Further, or alternatively, there is no particular period of usage for such a dedication to be inferred at Common Law, therefore 20 years usage need not be demonstrated. However Common Law still requires the applicant to prove that the use was “as of right”. On the facts of this matter the presence of the bollard from 2002 – 2012 would mean that the users of the claimed route could only have accessed the claimed route by force, and that therefore the use was not “as of right”.

Further considerations

15.5 For the purpose of completeness, reference should be made to other comments made in the application document and during witness interviews. These points are dealt with below:-

- In the application documents, the applicants state that “as established by unchallenged evidence in a recent planning appeal” (reference APP/W4325/W/14/3000737)” the “access to the slipway has continued for more than 20 years to the knowledge of the Council but without permission”. The Planning appeal related to an application for development on the car park at Alabama Way, Birkenhead immediately adjacent to the slipway. As set out in a summary of the Inspector’s findings on this matter (attached at Appendix 8) the evidence was challenged during the course of the appeal. In paragraph 65 of the summary of the Appeal decision the Planning Inspector states “Although the charter boat operators make use of the slipway, their right to do so has been questioned by the Appellant.” The summary also states in paragraph 65 that the Council “has explained that the slipway is not open to the public, that there are no recorded permit holders, and that it is intended for use by the Council, emergency services and Government agencies”. The summary further states that whilst “private rights of way could be established if there was evidence of uninterrupted use over a period of 20 years, that is not a matter for consideration as part of this appeal”. Therefore continued use of the slipway for more than 20 years to the knowledge of the Council but without permission has not, and indeed cannot, be established by evidence submitted as part of a planning appeal.
- The application states that “the gate” has at all times had a gap which easily permits pedestrian access. The gate is located at the top of the slipway and forms part of the fence line. The gate is for emergency access to the slipway only, and is kept locked at all times other than when needed for such an emergency or to enable particular events to take place (see further below for examples). It is clear that there has never been a gap in the gate itself.
- The application states that the slipway has been used by “members of the general public enjoying views of the River Mersey and its shipping and of Liverpool”. However no witness statements have been provided in support of this claimed use. The Investigating officers have found that whilst there have been times when the general public have been allowed access to the slipway for various events on the River Mersey this has been with the permission of the Council and the gates at the top of the slipway have been opened by the council to enable such access.
- The applicant is correct in stating that there has not been any notice inconsistent with dedication as a footpath nor any signs erected in respect of pedestrian use. However the evidence from the Council by way of the statement and photographic evidence, for the reasons set out in this Conclusion, means that a presumption of dedication as a right of way does not arise.
- The applicant is incorrect in stating that no barrier preventing pedestrian use has been erected. The bollard which the Council says was erected in the mid 1990’s, and which photographic evidence shows was in place from November 2002 – March 2012, was clearly a barrier intended to prevent pedestrian use. It may be that the bollard was used due to the difference in height line between the railings

on the right of the slipway and the railings at the top of the slipway, but there is no clear evidence to support this. However it is clear from the statements from Mr. McKie when interviewed by the Investigating Officer that the bollard did act as a barrier which was climbed over to gain access to the slipway.

- The witness statements of Mr. Huw Williams and Mr. George Collings refer to use of the slipway for medical emergencies. On these occasions the emergency gate would have been opened by a key holder, and therefore such use of the slipway would be by permission.
- The application does not contain evidence from any persons who have used the slipway as anglers (Mr. Mercer referred to such use in his interview).
- The application does not contain evidence relating to use of the slipway for swimming events (Mr. Mercer referred to such use in his interview) The Investigating Officers have made enquiries and it would appear that the emergency access gate had been opened by a key holder to enable access to the slipway and the safe operation of this event. This use was therefore with permission.
- It may also be arguable that the frequency of use of the alleged right of way as claimed in the witness statements in support of the application fails to meet the requirements set out in the case of R (Lewis) v Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (2010). In the Court of Appeal Lord Justice Dyson reiterated that “...no actual user can be sufficient to satisfy the statute, unless during the whole of the statutory term (i.e the 20 year period) the user is enough at any rate to carry to the mind of a reasonable person the fact that a continuous right to enjoyment is being asserted”.

9.0 EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

(a) Yes and impact review is attached – (*insert appropriate hyperlink*).

<https://www.wirral.gov.uk/my-services/community-and-living/equality-diversity-cohesion/equality-impact-assessments/eias-april-2014/eias-regeneration-envir>

REPORT AUTHOR: **Shaun Brady**
Highways Asset Manager
telephone: (0151) 606 2098
email: shaunbrady@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES

- 1) Legal Issues relating to Monks Ferry Definitive Map Application
- 2) Application from Richard Buxton Solicitors
- 3) Applicants Witness Statements
- 4) Email from Richard Buxton Solicitors with photographs
- 5) Statement from Neil Thomas with photographs
- 6) Email from Mark Wardle with photographs and engineer order

- 7) Additional photographs 4/8/1-2 dated 4/8/2015 and AE/1 and AE/2 dated October 2008
- 8) Extract from Planning Appeal Decision APP/W4325/W/14/3000737
- 9) Extract from Definitive Map Guidance 2013
- 10) Assets of Community Value Nomination Form dated 20 October 2016

REFERENCE MATERIAL

No reference material has been used in the preparation of this report.

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date

This page is intentionally left blank