

## Policy CS16 – Criteria for Port-Related Development

PSD ID	Limehouse	Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
PD12 PD14 PD15	111 138 339	Point 1 of Policy CS16 should read “be well related to the Strategic Freight Network <u>and connected to the rail freight network</u> ”, as it is essential to have rail access to deliver a sustainable pattern of activity.	No change is proposed, as Point 3 of Policy CS16 already requires proposals to: “contribute towards the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, through the more efficient use of rail and water transport”. As not all dock facilities have access to rail transport it would be unreasonable and unduly restrictive to require it in all cases before planning permission was granted, if other impacts were acceptable. The greater use of sustainable transport is also supported under Policy CS40 – Transport Requirements.
PD50	235/2	Policy CS16 should be amended to read: “ <u>Where permitted development rights do not apply...</u> ” to reflect the existing rights for port-related storage and distribution within the existing Dock Estates.	Accepted but a simplified wording is recommended to read: “Port and marine-related development <u>requiring planning permission</u> will be permitted within the existing Dock Estates at Birkenhead and Eastham; at Twelve Quays; along the Tranmere waterfront at Cammell Lairds; and along the Bromborough Coast; where proposals will...” It is also recommended to amend paragraph 19.18 to read: “Most port-related development <u>for storage and distribution</u> within the existing boundaries of the Dock Estates...”
PD50	235/1	Criterion 5 of Policy CS16 should be amended to read: “...have no <u>unacceptable</u> adverse impact...”, as the National Planning Policy Framework only provides for development to be refused where there will be significant harm to biodiversity which cannot be mitigated or compensated for.	Accepted but any revised wording must also reflect the statutory requirements of regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations. It is therefore recommended that criterion 5 of Policy CS16 is amended to read: “have no <u>unacceptable</u> adverse impact on water quality or <u>adverse effect</u> on designated European Sites or their supporting habitats”, subject to the approval of the Environment Agency and Natural England.
PD50	235/2	The Sustainability Appraisal Summary for Policy CS16 should be re-considered. Negative comments are unjustified as mitigation measures can be employed. The text should be amended to delete the reference to “uncertain impacts” and say: “... <u>Potential</u> effects related to heritage, noise and light pollution and traffic intrusion, particularly with regard to Eastham Village and related to waste and energy consumption are mitigated by Policy CS7, Policy CS34, Policy CS35, Policy CS39, Policy CS40, Policy CS42 and Policy CS43. <u>These potential effects</u> will also be mitigated through the detailed	No change is recommended, at this stage. The sustainability appraisal was prepared in consultation with an independent Sustainability Appraisal Panel. The comments raised will be reported back to the Panel, when the changes being proposed to each policy are re-appraised prior to submission to the Secretary of State. It may not be appropriate to include the uncertain impacts if final solutions are still to be identified and agreed.

## Policy CS16 – Criteria for Port-Related Development

<b>PSD ID</b>	<b>Limehouse</b>	<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<b>Recommended Response</b>
		<u>design of the scheme and use of appropriate conditions attached to future planning permissions.</u> “	