

Policy CS29 – Criteria for Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Facilities

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
Point 3 of Policy CS29 is unnecessary and excessively onerous. The requirement to 'enhance and complement the range and quality of facilities provided in existing centres' does not reflect national policy and should be removed.	No change is recommended because point 3 of Policy CS29 is intended to allow the potential benefits of an edge-of-centre or out-of-centre proposal to be identified and taken into account.
The requirement to meet Policy CS42 – Development Management should be deleted as it replicates other Core Strategy policies. Tying Policy CS29 to Policy CS42 also reduces the flexibility to meet potential future change, given the limitations of Policy CS2 – Broad Spatial Strategy and Policy CS8 – Priorities for Leasowe, Moreton, Upton, Greasby and Woodchurch, on the reuse of employment sites in Moreton.	No change is recommended, as Policy CS42 – Development Management has been included to ensure that relevant Core Strategy policies are applied to every new development that requires planning permission, including edge-of-centre and out-of-centre retail proposals, and to prevent the proliferation of additional criteria throughout the other policies of the Core Strategy.
Point 1 of Policy CS29 should be re-worded as follows: “No alternative, suitable sites are available, first within, and then <u>appropriate edge-of-centre sites which are well connected to a centre listed in Policy CS25. If no suitable, available in or edge-of-centre sites are available then accessible out-of-centre sites will be considered.</u> ” to better reflect the National Planning Policy Framework.	Accepted, but it is recommended that point 2 of Policy CS29 is amended to read: “the site is easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and <u>preference has been given to sites which are, or will be, well-connected to a town, district or local centre;</u> ”
Point 3 of Policy CS29 should be deleted on the basis that there is no requirement in national policy to undertake a qualitative based assessment; the requirement is subjective, with no fixed parameters for assessment; and the requirement is anti-competitive, if this would prevent a new store of a comparable scale and quality from being introduced, given the need to enhance competition and choice.	No change is recommended because point 3 of Policy CS29 is intended to allow the potential benefits of an edge-of-centre or out-of-centre proposal to be identified and taken into account.
Welcome the requirement that edge-of-centre and out-of-centre facilities should have no significant adverse effect on the vitality and viability of a centre within an adjacent authority.	No change is recommended.
The addition of further retail 'tests', above and beyond national policy, is excessively onerous and unnecessary. Paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "When considering edge-of-centre and out-of-centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre." The wording of point 2 of Policy CS29 should therefore read: "The site is easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and <u>preference is given to sites that are well-connected to a town, district or local centre</u> " to ensure that the sequential test can be carried out properly.	Accepted. It is recommended that point 2 of Policy CS29 is amended to read: “the site is easily accessible by a choice of means of transport and <u>preference has been given to sites which are, or will be, well-connected to a town, district or local centre; and</u> ”

Policy CS29 – Criteria for Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Facilities

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
Point 6 of Policy CS29 which simply cross refers to Policy CS42 should be deleted to remove unnecessary repetition from the Core Strategy.	No change is proposed because Policy CS42 – Development Management has been included to ensure that relevant Core Strategy policies are applied to every new development that requires planning permission, including edge-of-centre and out-of-centre retail proposals, and to prevent the proliferation of additional criteria throughout the other policies of the Core Strategy.
Paragraph 21.30 is unacceptable, as it implies that Wirral Waters is a suitable location for retail. The Core Strategy must clearly state that retailing outside allocated centres, across the City Region, is not acceptable.	Accepted. It is recommended that paragraph 21.30 is amended to delete the reference to Wirral Waters to read: “The Council's preference is for new floorspace to first be directed to existing centres in line with the hierarchy identified under Policy CS25 and then, if a need is identified, to <u>have</u> regard to the need for regeneration, considerations of scale and impact on existing centres and support for the objectives of the Birkenhead Integrated Regeneration Study.”
Policy CS29 should be reworded to read: “...will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that <u>they accord with the policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, and:</u> ”	No change is recommended, as national planning policy is already a material consideration in planning decisions.
Policy CS29 should be reworded to ensure that the restrictive conditions referred to are not added as standard practice to all permissions for retail developments. Circular 11/95 makes it clear that conditions should only be applied to permissions where they are justified and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	Accepted. It is recommended that the final paragraph of Policy CS29 is amended to read: “ <u>Where appropriate, planning</u> conditions will be used to control the type, mix and quantum of gross and net retail floorspace; the range of goods sold; size of units; and number of operators per unit; to ensure that the impact on existing centres is minimised.”